

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held November 1, 2010

A business meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 7:33 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Supervisors present in addition to Mr. Hawk were: William C. Seeds, Sr., William L. Hornung, Gary A. Crissman, and David B. Blain.

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Steven Fleming, HRG, Inc.; Mark DiSanto, Holy Name of Jesus Church; James Snyder, Snyder Secary & Associates, LLC; Eric Epstein, Mark Levine, Watson Fisher, and Ted Robertson, SWAN.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Hornung led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Seeds made a correction to the minutes for October 5, 2010 meeting. He noted on page 12, first paragraph, sixth sentence, the words "but not two to one slope" should be deleted. He made a motion to approve the minutes with the noted correction. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion but he questioned if the motion also included the minutes from the October 19, 2010 business meeting. Mr. Seeds answered yes. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

## **Public Comment**

Mr. Mark Levine, 1507 Knollcrest Road, explained that he heard that the businesses in Linglestown were losing a lot of revenue due to the construction along Route 39. He explained that he is a member of the Capital City Cruisers and he spoke with Mr. Hornung, Mr. Seeds and Mr. Luetchford, from the Parks and Recreation Department and received permission to stage a cruise-in at Koons Park in conjunction with the Linglestown Merchants Association Fall Festival. He explained that he wanted to thank the three individuals involved in the event. Mr. Seeds expressed his thanks to Mr. Levine, on behalf of the merchants, for his efforts.

Mr. Eric Epstein explained that he had two handouts to present to the Township for distribution from his firm, EFMR Monitoring Group. He noted that the first pamphlet entitled “Where to go if you need help” is a public service guide and is also available on his website, EFMR.org. He noted that the pamphlet provides information for access to agencies concerning public issues. He noted the second free item that he would like to present to the Township which is embraced by Penn State University and a state agency, is a non-partisan guide to Marcellus Shale. He noted that it is non-judgmental training document and will provide a background on the issues and allow you to draw your own conclusions. He noted that both resources have been distributed around the State. He explained that he has distributed 20,000 copies of the “Where to go... guide” and the Marcellus Shale Guide would be a good resource to have as the State wrestles with this issue. He noted if additional copies of either document are needed, to let him know. Mr. Hawk thanked Mr. Epstein for the information and noted that he has read the pamphlet on the Marcellus Shale and it is very well done.

## **Chairman & Board Members’ Comments**

No comments were presented.

## **Manager's Report**

Mr. Wolfe noted that tomorrow is Election Day and requested citizens to do their civic duty and vote.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Lower Paxton Township Public Works Department has begun the vacuum leaf collection services today, and a schedule of the collection times and locations can be found on the Township website.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Waste Management is a little behind in its collection of yard waste due to the heavy volume of materials. He noted if Waste Management is behind in your neighborhood to leave the yard waste out as they will catch up.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it was fortunate for the Linglestown Community that the Capital City Cruisers participated in the Linglestown Fall Festival. He explained that significant construction activities are ongoing this week affecting Blackberry and Raspberry Alleys as they are being prepared to be paved. He noted that this is causing additional navigation problems in the Village of Linglestown. He noted that you can still get around in the Village, but while the Township is working in the alleys it is more difficult to do so. He explained if the Township does not pave the alleys now, it will not be able to do so until spring, and the Township's source of funds could expire at that point. He noted that he hopes that the paving work will be completed this week.

Mr. Seeds questioned when the speed tables in the alleys would be installed. Mr. Wolfe answered that they would be placed in the spring. Mr. Seeds noted that the contractor did a very nice job on Raspberry Alley but it has become a speedway. He noted that the Township can better enforce the speed limit now since it has taken over ownership of the alleys. He noted that

it is important that people not speed in the alleys as there are parks adjacent to Raspberry Alley and children often play in the alleys.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### Ordinance 09-16; adopting the Lower Paxton Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance of 2010

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Township has been working on this Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO) for quite some time and it is important to note that if changes are needed, it can be amended. He noted that the existing ordinance was adopted in 1988, and it is in need of revision. He noted that the process began with joint meetings of the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission approximately three years ago using the services of HRG, Inc. to completely rewrite the SALDO regulations. He noted that the final draft is before the Board for consideration, and Mr. Stine will conduct a public hearing on Ordinance 09-16, and after the Public Hearing, it would be complete for Board action.

Mr. Stine noted that this is the time and date set for Public Hearing on Ordinance 09-16; adopting the Lower Paxton Township SALDO of 2010. He questioned if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this Ordinance.

Mr. Eric Epstein explained that Stray Winds Area Neighbors (SWAN) submitted comments throughout the process and the Board has been supplied with a copy of those comments. He explained that he was in error on several issues and all the comments have been addressed by Mr. Wolfe. He noted that although he sent a memo requesting the Board to hold up the vote on the new SALDO tonight, he noted that those outstanding issues were resolved. He noted that SWAN supports the current draft of the SALDO, and he wanted to provide a large amount of credit to Mr. Wolfe's in depth response to the outstanding issues that SWAN

presented to the Board. He noted that SWAN had a subcommittee devoted to the study of the SALDO and registered numerous comments. He noted that Mr. Wolfe accurately pointed out that some of the issues need to be parked in other areas, so SWAN will be following up with these issues in their appropriate area.

Mr. Epstein noted that he hopes that the Board will move forward with the vote tonight on the SALDO; however, Mr. Mark Levine has a few comments that are still lingering from the SWAN subcommittee.

Mr. Epstein invited the Board members to the SWAN Holiday Potluck Dinner to be held on December 13, 2010 at 7 p.m. at Epiphany Lutheran Church on Colonial Road.

Mr. Hawk expressed his delight with Mr. Epstein's kind comments, and he noted that amendments can be made to the SALDO. Mr. Epstein noted that SWAN was looking for more specific language and Mr. Wolfe explained that the Board wanted flexibility to be able to preserve its right to make some decisions. He noted after the three-year process, it is time to move forward with the vote for the SALDO, and postponing the vote is not in the best interest of the Township. Mr. Crissman noted that the Board is where it is tonight as a result of great community assistance along with the capable staff working in a cooperative effort. He noted that it is these kinds of things that make this Township outstanding in the State. He noted that he applauds the citizens for being part of the process to make it a successful adventure. He explained that Mr. James Madison, the Father of the Constitution, stated at the time it was adopted, "This is the best document that we have, and it will be a growing document." He noted that 200 years later we are still working on the Constitution.

Mr. Seeds noted that he appreciated everyone's help, in particular SWAN's, noting that it has been a long process, and it can always be amended. He noted that he is not 100% happy with

the final product, but he is only one person, and everyone worked together, and it is a good overall ordinance. He noted that it must be continuously updated. He noted that he would like to thank Ms. Wissler, who was in the audience for her exhaustive work in preparing the document prior to her retirement.

Mr. Mark Levine noted that he read the entire document and emailed comments to the Township today. He explained that he had some further suggestions for the SALDO and Mr. Wolfe explained that he distributed those comments to the Board members.

Mr. Levine noted that he wanted to discuss his comments with the Board and the viewing audience. He noted under the definitions of subdivisions, his suggestion is that it should be defined as five lots or less, whereas a development should be six lots or more. He noted that there is a need for a definition for a cartway centerline, noting that it should be defined as the mid point of a cartway or a division between opposing and opposite lines of traffic. He explained that it is necessary because cartway centerline is noted in Section 180-308.F. He noted that a centerline can be very confusing on a road, especially for a three or five lane road. He questioned where the centerline is when you have turn lanes. He explained that when he was working for Metropolitan Edison, the centerline was critical as to where you located the utilities. He noted, according to PENNDOT, the centerline is the center of where the two opposing parallel traffic lanes would be. He noted if you have two lanes on one side of the street and one lane on the other side of the street, the centerline would be where the double yellow line is located. He suggested that it needs to be added to the definitions.

Mr. Levine noted Section 180-303.E.5.a, has to do with final plans, and he suggested that a notation should be added which has to do with the five-year period, noting if nothing is done within the five-year period, the plan would be null and void. He noted if the plan would be

granted an extension by the Board of Supervisors, he would suggest, after the extension is completed, and nothing has been done, then the plan should be null and void.

Mr. Levine noted for Section 180-402, there is a need to add the letter H, for proof of entrance/egress for each lot to a public thoroughfare. He noted that this is needed for landlocked parcels to show that it has an entrance.

Mr. Levine noted for Section 180-403, there is a need for a requirement for street name signs. He noted for Section 180-504.G.a change should be made from “possible” to “practical”, noting that it has to deal with placing utilities on a lot line. He noted that sometimes it is not practical to put a utility on a lot line that divided two different lots. He noted that sometimes it is more practical to run a utility from the thoroughfare directly to the house or building. He noted that water lines should not have to follow a lot line and make a left or right turn to the building. He noted that “shall” should be changed to “may”.

Mr. Levine noted for Section 180-507.C.1, at the bottom of the chart for street lighting, it mentions using sodium vapor lights, and he suggested adding, “or approved L.E.D. (Light Emitting Diode).” He noted that new street lights are being installed in various places and they are LED lights, noting that they provide very good lighting, but use less electricity. He noted that the chart should also state that, “No mercury vapor lighting is permitted.” He noted that they have been discontinued in the United States. He noted that Section 180-507.D.1 should add “normally ‘cobra head’.”

Mr. Levine noted that Section 180-507.D.2 should add, “if a lot or lots is/are to be developed along the 1,000’ by an entity other than the one which had to install it, (in regards to a dry sewer line in the direction of the extension of the sewer line) the new entity shall add to the system in an amount equal to the property frontage along the thoroughfare.” He explained at

Sasha's Restaurant on Route 39, if Mr. Eshenaur was going to develop a piece of property, now he must install 1,000 foot of sewer line towards Linglestown assuming that there is no sewer line in the area, and assuming that would be the closest proximity to a hook-up. He noted if someone closer to Linglestown than the property mentioned would decide to develop their piece of property then they should have to extend the first property's dry sewer to Linglestown also, until the sewer line is run for the entire distance.

Mr. Levine noted for Section 180-511.E.4 the following should be added in relation to the private sewage plant, "The lot may be within the 100 year floodplain provided that the top of all the water levels in the processing plant be ten feet (10") above that of the 100 year floodplain limit."

Mr. Levine noted for Section 180-512.B.2 it should be changed from one year to five years. He noted that this had to do with a water line for future development and it would require a developer to install a dry water line in the event that water is proposed for the area within five years. He noted that it would be in accordance with the stormsewer regulations. He noted that the following words should be added, "if the water line would go in the same direction as the mandatory 1,000' dry sewer line, a dry water line must be installed in parallel by the developer." He noted that it should also read that "in the event of a new construction or reconstruction, even if the reconstruction is on the same footprint (foundation), if the unit is not on public water and if public water is to or alongside the lot, the construction must include the hookup to the public water." He noted that they should be made to hook up to the public water source.

Mr. Levine noted that he would like the Board to discuss these issues more in a workshop session, and he requested that these comments be made as part of an amendment to the SALDO.

Mr. John Trish, 600 Prince Street, noted that he initially wanted to speak to waivers, since the SALDO was being rewritten. He noted as far as the centerline goes in the roadway, you would also have to consider the State law as far as building codes as there is already a definition in that code, and there is also something mentioned about egress. He noted that the industry standard should be the type approved at the time the lights are installed. He noted that for the requirement for dry sewer and water lines, he would foresee litigation if the same standard is not maintained for every development. He noted that many developers will request waivers and if they are granted, the person who does not get the waiver will take the Township to court. He noted that many of the fire department connectors for building hook ups are already covered in the Fire Code. He noted that since the plan has been revised, there should not be many requests for waivers granted. He noted that every time someone wants to do something they need a waiver for this or that. He noted that some plans have numerous waivers, and when the SALDO is approved, hopefully it meets the minimum standard for the safety of all, and the quality of development in the Township.

Mr. Hornung noted that he would like to make a comment on waivers. He noted that many people ask him why the Board permits so many waivers. He noted that it is better for the Township to make the regulations more stringent, in order to grant waivers as deemed necessary. He noted if you do not make the regulations stringent enough, then no enforcement can be required. He noted that the Township will receive more waiver requests; however, it allows better control of what is allowed. He noted that it provides the Board of Supervisors the ability to negotiate items that could be a win-win for both parties, to acquire other improvements.

Mr. Trish noted that it makes sense, however, the Township is writing standards, and whether they are stringent or not, in some cases, it makes perfect sense to waive something. He

suggested that he could go back to an item that was passed ten years ago where Lot A was developed and did not need sidewalks. He noted if Lot B was developed within the next ten years, then Lot A has to install sidewalks. He noted that there is no way to know how many plans are not complying with this. He noted that this is true for dry wells, and if water comes within 200 feet of the property then public water must be installed. He questioned if he is wrong. Mr. Hornung noted that the Township has a means to tract these instances. He noted that staff checks surrounding properties to see if there are any written recordings to require installing sidewalks. He noted that the SALDO will be a document in progress and will be amended as needed.

Mr. Stine noted that seeing no further response, it was appropriate to close the public hearing on Ordinance 2009-16 and the Board may take action if it so desires.

Mr. Hawk noted that this represents a much better document that what is currently in place, and a tremendous improvement. He noted that Mr. Levine's comments will be referred back to the Planning Commission for their review and possible modification.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Ordinance 2009-16, the Lower Paxton Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance of 2010. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a roll call vote: Mr. Blain, aye; Mr. Crissman, aye; Mr. Hornung, aye; Mr. Seeds, aye; and Mr. Hawk, aye.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### Action on proposals to provide survey for the SC-1E and BC-6A, 6B, and 6C sanitary sewer mini-basin projects

Mr. Wolfe noted that five bids were received, and R. J. Fisher and Associates provided the lowest proposal in the amount of \$24,802. He noted that the Authority has used R. J. Fisher

in the past for sanitary sewer survey work, and he requested the Board to approve the contract to R. J. Fisher for the sanitary sewer survey work.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to award the bid to R. J. Fisher and Associates to provide sanitary sewer survey work for the SC-1E, BC-6A, 6B, and 6C in the amount of \$24,802.00. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

#### Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for Holy Name of Jesus Church

Mr. Wolfe explained that the purpose of this plan is to construct of a new 26,000 square foot, 1,400 seat worship facility and related site improvements. The property is zoned CN, Neighborhood Commercial, and is located north of Allentown Boulevard, east of North Mountain Road, and west of Blue Ribbon Avenue. The property consists of 8.77 acres and is served by public sewer and public water. He noted that there are several parcels of land involved and this parcel is located to the rear of the property. He noted that access to the church will be gained through the existing church property, either from Allentown Boulevard to the south or from Blue Ribbon Avenue to the east.

Mr. Wolfe noted on August 11, 2010 the Planning Commission recommended approval of the plan subject to addressing comments.

Mr. Wolfe noted on August 26, 2010 the Zoning Hearing Board granted variances for rear yard setbacks and stormwater basin landscaping.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there are six general conditions and three staff comments. He noted that no waivers are requested at this time. He noted that there is correspondence from HRG, Inc., dated October 29, 2010 to include fifteen comments. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Steve Fleming is present to explain any of the comments listed within his memorandum.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. John DiSanto is present to represent the plan along with Jim Snyder, of Snyder Secary and Associates, LLC.

Mr. John DiSanto noted that he is representing the plan. He noted that there are two minor questions that he is seeking clarification on from the HRG, Inc. memo. He noted that comment three was to have been resolved and removed from the list. He noted that comment 12 notes that the engineer recommends that a fence be installed around the detention basin. He explained that there was much dialogue on that comment and he requested that the Board not require the fence. He noted that he is in agreement with all the other comments.

Mr. Wolfe explained that during the last discussion, it was noted that comment three in HRG's memo was an off-site improvement. Mr. Fleming answered that was correct. Mr. Wolfe noted that it should be removed from the list.

Mr. Seeds questioned if comments four, five and six have been resolved. He noted that he was unable to attend that workshop meeting when they were discussed. Mr. Wolfe noted that all the outstanding items have been resolved except for the comment regarding the fence. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. DiSanto met with Corporal Needham in regards to his memo for the fire hydrant. Mr. DiSanto answered that it was resolved. Mr. Seeds questioned if the clear-sight triangle, and modifying an existing access... Mr. DiSanto explained that all those issues have been resolved as they are complying with the plan. Mr. Crissman noted that the only comment that needs further discussion is comment twelve.

Mr. Crissman noted that his opinion has not changed in regards to the fence, and as a former educator he strongly believes in the health and safety of children and that the fence is essential. He noted that his job would be to protect children. Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. DiSanto was willing to put the fence in.

Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Fleming what his opinion was in regard to the fence. Mr. Fleming noted that his recommendation continues to be to install the fence.

Mr. DiSanto noted that he will put the fence in if it is required to do it. He noted that his kids went to school there, and he supports the parish, but it is just a difference of opinion, a cost savings measure. He noted that the church is struggling, but he could state in full confidence that he does not view it as serious an issue as Mr. Crissman does. Mr. Crissman noted that he understands that Mr. DiSanto is speaking as a parent, whereas, he is speaking as a professional educator. He noted that his expertise tells him that he is responsible to protect all the children for the schools that he is responsible for, therefore, there would be a demand for him to provide the same protection for those children in that school.

Mr. Seeds noted that the pond has a three-to-one slope and over the years a fence was never required. He noted that now our engineer is telling the Board that it should have a fence due to the new Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) regulations that there could be standing water in the pond. Mr. Fleming explained that the new design is made to infiltrate and in order to do that there is an orifice that is located underneath the soil and it will trap water in the basin for a certain period of time which will eventually leave the basin through the underground drain. Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Fleming and Mr. Snyder may have a difference of opinion in the amount of time that the water would be retained in the pond. Mr. Fleming noted that it could be between ten to twelve hours.

Mr. Snyder noted that this was discussed during the workshop quite a bit and the basin is designed with flat slopes, and it has been the Township's position in the past that three-to-one slope or flatter did not require a fence for basins that do not retain water. He noted that he does not believe that fencing is necessary from a safety standpoint, and he is also concerned about

aesthetics, noting that the basin was designed to fit into the natural landscape and he suggests that it will drain in a sufficient time and will not be a safety issue.

Mr. Seeds requested Mr. Snyder to show where the basin is located on the plan noting that there is a parking area between the church and the basin. Mr. Seeds noted that the basin is quite a distance from the school. He noted that it would be a change in policy, and if the Board does it now, it must be consistent for the requirement for a fence for a three-to-one slope since it would be setting a precedent of requiring the fence. He suggested that the Board might have to look at how it wants to interpret this when children are involved. Mr. Crissman noted that this is a school situation and it is not in the middle of nowhere where you don't have many children, noting that there are children on the premises and it is a real threat in his opinion. He noted that Mr. Snyder noted that the drainage is in theory a paper calculation, and not a reality situation. He noted that he deals with reality.

Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Fleming if he was still of the opinion that the fence was necessary. Mr. Fleming answered yes. Mr. Seeds noted that it is very hard to argue with safety. Mr. Crissman noted that it is a temptation for children to enter into. He noted that it would be different if there wasn't a concentration of children on the site.

Mr. Blain noted that the Board must be consistent across the board because it would go back on the comment he made earlier that the Township has numerous detention basins in neighborhoods where there are just as many kids playing in the neighborhood and many are unsupervised. He noted that they are not in a school situation where you can keep your eyes on them and if the Board is going to require a fence around a detention basin, then the Board better be consistent and require everyone to install a fence when they ask for that waiver.

Mr. Fleming noted in the past, basins were designed differently with an orifice that was not obstructed by soil or plant material and if it was maintained and functioned properly it represented a much shorter period of time that a pool of water could exist, but this one could become clogged and hold water for a longer period of time than what it was designed to do, and it is HRG, Inc.'s professional opinion that it should be fenced.

Mr. Blain noted that there are a number of basins in the Township that are overgrown with vegetation, with cattails and they are not functional anymore. He noted if the Township is going to put these requirements on people to put fences around basins, then we better make sure that they get maintained. He noted if there is a clogging situation, then the Township should make sure that they are maintained.

Mr. Eric Epstein noted in 1988, in front of Herbert Hoover Elementary School on Linglestown Road, there was no fencing around the school. He noted a young man bolted across the street and was struck by a car and killed. He noted that you can't legislate the behavior of young children. He noted that he understands that the church is trying to save money, but when you are dealing with kids, they don't operate in the realm of logic. He noted that he is an educator too, and a good friend of John DiSanto which puts him in the middle ground for this issue. He noted all it takes is one tragic incident and no one wants to be held accountable for it. He noted that it makes sense to take the extra measure even though we are in desperate economic times. He noted that he knows what that family went through. Mr. Crissman agreed that it was a very bad time for the family as it was a friend's son. He added that you can't control what kids will do. Mr. Seeds noted that there are ponds all over the Township. Mr. Epstein noted that it doesn't mean that it is right. He noted if you are in an educational situation, such as a daycare or nursery school, you have to be consistent

Mr. John Trish noted that the Township can enforce the maintenance of the basins since there is a property maintenance code to cover it. He noted that there is a high grass and weed section contained in that code. Mr. Wolfe noted that high grass and weeds do not apply to wetland plants growing in a detention basin. Mr. Trish noted that whatever someone builds must be maintained.

Mr. Mark Levine suggested if you have a drainage system that is inoperable, it would have to do with codes enforcement and it would be their responsibility to ensure that it is properly working.

Mr. DiSanto requested the Board to make a motion and he would abide by whatever is requested and approved.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. John DiSanto if he was the spokesperson for the project. Mr. DiSanto answered yes. Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. DiSanto if he was in agreement with the six general conditions that include the HRG memo dated October 29, 2010 with the fourteen comments excluding comment number three. Mr. DiSanto answered yes. Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. DiSanto if he was in agreement with the three staff comments. Mr. DiSanto answered yes.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the preliminary/final land development plan for the Holy Name of Jesus church with the following conditions: 1) Plan approval shall be subject to providing original seals and signatures; 2) Plan approval shall be subject to the payment of engineering review fees; 3) Plan approval shall be subject to the establishment of an automatically renewable improvement guarantee for the proposed site improvements; 4) Plan approval shall be subject to the Dauphin County Conservation District's review of the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan; 5) Plan approval shall be subject to Lower Paxton Township

Sewer Department's review and approval of the sanitary sewer design; 6) Plan approval shall be subject to addressing the fourteen (14) comments of HRG's memo dated October 29, 2010, noting that comment three was deleted from the comments; 7) A street/storm sewer construction permit is required and is to be obtained prior to earthmoving activities. A pre-construction meeting is to be held prior to starting the project. Contact Matt Miller at 657-5615 to schedule the meeting. This may be held on conjunction with the Conservation District meeting; 8) When submitting revised plans, please respond in writing to all individual comments including Township, HRG and County; and 9) All signage must meet the requirements of the Lower Paxton Township Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk noted that the motion includes the requirement for the fence around the detention pond and deletes HRG comment number three. Mr. Seeds noted that they will still have to address comments 4, 5, 6, and 12. Mr. DiSanto noted that he will be able to resolve those issues. Mr. Hawk called for a roll call vote: Mr. Blain, aye; Mr. Crissman, aye; Mr. Hornung, aye; Mr. Seeds, aye; and Mr. Hawk, aye.

Mr. Crissman wanted to thank Mr. DiSanto and his staff for working with the Township staff to make the plan a reality. Mr. DiSanto explained that there was much robust dialogue and both Mr. Wolfe and Mr. Stine were very helpful along with Ms. Wissler and Ms. Moran. He thanked the Board for their help.

#### IMPROVEMENT GUARANTEES

Mr. Hawk noted that there were no improvement guarantees.

### **Payment of Bills**

Mr. Seeds made a motion to pay the bills of Lower Paxton Township and Lower Paxton Township Authority. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Announcements**

Mr. Hawk reminded the viewing public that tomorrow is Election Day and it is a very important time for everyone to exercise their right to vote.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman  
Township Secretary