

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held June 17, 2014

The business meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 7:32 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 Robin L. Lindsey.

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steve Stine, Township Attorney, Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering, Tracy McCormick and George Zimmerman, Hunt Club Kennels; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 19, 2014 and June 3, 2014 business meetings. Mrs. Lindsey seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

Public Comment

Mr. Darryl Hall, 580 Sue Ann Drive explained that he is present to discuss Ordinance 12-7 that has to do with grasses and weeds that are not mowed by Mr. Spangler who resides at 1529 Parkway West. He noted that his property line abuts Mr. Hall's property at its closest point, 18 feet from the corner of his house. He noted that it is a side yard, not a back yard. He explained that Mr. Spangler has not mowed his field along his property line this year. He noted that his children play in the yard and with the grass being four feet in height; there are increased varmints and deer bedding down, providing a higher risk of ticks. He noted that he is not asking that Mr. Spangler be punished but he is looking for an amendment to the ordinance which he assumed

was adopted based upon the International Property Maintenance Code that should benefit the Township and all its citizens.

Mr. Hall noted, after speaking with Mrs. Zerbe, the Township's Codes Enforcement Officer, he was told that the Ordinance requires that only a certain percentage of square footage of the overall property be mowed. He noted that he would ask that the Board consider installing a buffer requirement as he looks out his side, front and back yards as this land borders three sides of this property and he seeds weeds as high as the dias. He noted a requirement for Mr. Spangler to have to mow a certain percentage around his house does not help him or his neighbors. He noted in order to protect the interest of the community it is not helpful to require Mr. Spangler to mow the center of his property and leave a border with high grass. He noted that the ordinance is backwards because if he wants to have weeds grow up to his windows that he can see out and reach and pull them, that is his business, but making his house look nice does not help him or any of the other people that border Mr. Spangler's property.

Mr. Hall noted that he is not at this meeting to punish Mr. Spangler, noting that there are people in the Township that have similar issues. He requested the Board amend the ordinance for when R-1 abuts R-1, that a buffer zone be required so he doesn't have to mow his grass with four feet of weeds next to where his kids play. He noted that when a ball is tossed in that area, the weeds are as high as his youngest son. He stated that he would appreciate if the Board would look into this as it has visited this issue in the past, he would request that the Board consider a requirement to mow a buffer zone to provide the property owner's who live next to large tracts of land relief, so he does not have to worry about his kids when they play ball in the back yard. He noted he would be happy if the requirement would be to mow ten feet in from the property line, noting that there are foxes in the area and an occasional bear.

Mr. Hawk suggested that this could be put on the next workshop agenda to be held July 8th. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would bring the existing ordinance to that session for the Board to review.

Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Wolfe if the Township did not have the ten foot buffer provision in the ordinance. Mr. Wolfe answered what the Board came up with when it amended the ordinance in 2012 was that the area equal to the required lot area for a R-1 lot had to be cut. He noted that as long as that area was cut, which would be 20,000 square feet, the property owner would be in compliance with the ordinance.

Mr. Seeds noted that he remembered that discussion but the Board decided against it as there were many pros and cons. He noted that Mr. Hall is the first person to bring this to the Board's attention since the ordinance was amended.

Mr. Hornung questioned who came in before to complain about high grass. He thought that Mr. Kessler was involved with it and that the Township had an ordinance that stated that the buffer had to be mowed ten foot around the property. He noted that Mr. Kessler ended up mowing the grass. Mr. Wolfe noted that we had those discussions but the final document did not include the buffer. He noted that many times property owners mow beyond their property line.

Mr. Albert Sporik, 1001 Wooded Pond Drive, noted that he has only lived in the Township for one year. He explained that there are two school buses that are parked on Hidden Lake and there is no ordinance in the Township that prohibits a school bus from being parked in any residential area. He noted that he went to PennDOT and he researched it and he has talked to his neighbors and they said that nothing that can be done about it. He noted that he begs to differ. He noted that he did not move to Lower Paxton Township not to be able to use his patio because he is looking at a school bus and a van.

Mr. Sporik requested the Board to enact an ordinance to specify that any vehicle licensed to transport students is prohibited from parking on a Township street in a residential area. He noted that it would cover everything. He stated that he looked around at all the private schools and private kindergartens; they parked their vehicles on their lots. He noted that he belongs to his Association and was told that these people are not allowed to park the bus and van on the parking lot in the Association, so they park on the street. He noted that they are the only buses that he knows of in the Township that are not required to be parked at Central Dauphin, and if he has to, he will get enough of signatures... He noted that the Association can't do anything but he begs to differ.

Mr. Sporik noted that he worked on the State Senate Floor and remembers when Senator Romanelli entered a amendment to legalize slot machines with a vote of one aye and 48 nays in 1982. He noted today we have 14 casinos. He noted back then they said it couldn't be done and here we are. He noted the same with the school bus business, as they do not belong in a residential area.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the buses are parked there all the time. Mr. Sporik answered that the van is parked all year and the yellow bus is parked for nine months of the year. Mr. Seeds questioned if they are owned by the School District. Mr. Sporik answered that they are BYOL transport. Mr. Crissman noted that it is a private transport contractor; however the Central Dauphin School District has a contract with Durham.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if they are parked there overnight. Mr. Sporik answered yes, as the van is parked there now, noting that the yellow bus is parked there nine months out of the year. He noted that they go out in the morning and come back in the evening. He explained that sometimes they go out at lunch time but they are parked there overnight. He noted that the yellow bus carries a different category than the van. He noted that the yellow bus transports

students from the street, but the van can only go from school to school. He noted that is what he was told when he went to PennDOT.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the van is parked there all year long, even over the summer, when it is not transporting students. Mr. Sporik answered that it was last year. He noted that he has pictures of it.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the Township has received complainants about this before. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. He noted that it is a licensed vehicle parked on a street and there is no ordinance in the Township that would prohibit it. He noted that we regulate tractors and trailers in residential areas but that is it. Mr. Crissman noted that we also regulate boats as well. Mr. Wolfe noted that a trailered item cannot be parked unattached on a public street. He noted that a tractor trailer cannot be parked on a public street in a residential area as long-term parking.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if a school bus would be allowed to park on a street. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Crissman suggested that it is not a 32-passenger bus, probably a small one. Mr. Sporik noted that it is a 15 plus one bus. Mr. Wolfe noted that recreational vehicles and buses are not covered by the ordinance.

Mr. Sporik noted that the ordinance should include that any vehicle requiring a CDL should not be parked in a residential area.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if a cab for a tractor trailer is allowed to be parked on the street in a residential area. Mr. Wolfe answered no. Mr. Sporik noted that it would require a CDL license and the large school buses require a CDL but these don't. He noted that a vehicle that is licensed to transport would include the van and the bus as they are special licenses.

Mr. Seeds noted that buses need a CDL. He noted that you need a special license for a motorcycle as well. Mr. Sporik noted if you take any vehicle that is licensed to transport, noting that some could say that they use their car to do that, but they are not licensed to transport. He

noted that it would include a school bus, van or another category of vehicle. He noted that the van has students written on top of it and the yellow bus can pick up on the street but the van can only go from school to school and cannot pick up on the street. He noted that he went down to PennDOT and that was his understanding. He noted that his original thinking was the CDL route but it would not cover these vehicles.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned Mr. Sporik if he has spoken to the residents who drive the school bus and van. Mr. Sporik answered that he did not talk to them because he was told by his neighbors that a couple years ago they tried and they would not pay attention whatsoever. He noted that the women who lived there previously passed away and the neighbors said there was nothing that he could do but he begs to differ. Mrs. Lindsey questioned, as a new resident, if he went up and asked them if they could park the vehicles somewhere else as he can't sit out on his deck... Mr. Sporik noted that it would be a waste of time.

Mr. Hornung questioned what are the pros and cons for this. Mr. Wolfe answered that he has not thought this through as it would depend on how you would do this and who would enforce it. He noted if it was a zoning issue then there would be a civil enforcement procedure which does not remove it quickly. He noted that he does not know how pervasive the problem is in the Township or if there are other areas where bus parking is a problem. He noted that you would be regulating all; but he has not thought it through. He suggested that he would be happy to come up with the pros and cons for the Board.

Mr. Hornung noted he would not like to live in an area where people parked a school bus, noting that he has seen them around the Township. He noted that it is probably not the most aesthetically pleasing thing to see when you look out your window. He noted that the Board would investigate this to determine if it is appropriate or not.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the buses are parked in front of the driver's home or Mr. Sporik's home. Mr. Sporik answered that they are parked in front of his home.

Constance Cuthbertson, 1005 Seemore Drive, explained that she is a resident of Lower Paxton Township and would like to comment about the Hodges Heights Park. She noted that it was discussed during the June 10, 2014 workshop session. She explained that the fence was removed and she has taken pictures of it. She noted that the tennis court was a hazard with the macadam as it was built on a landfill. She noted that a friend, who is a contractor that did some work on her house, went to the site with her yesterday and he looked at the pavilion. She explained that the reason the pavilion is leaning is due to the floor as the ground has settled since it is located on a landfill. She explained that she put tennis and golf balls on the floor and they rolled downhill. She explained that the contractor noticed an ant problem although he did not know what type of ant it was, maybe even a termite, but that it should be taken care of. He also noticed that the heads of the nails are sticking up from every board and that is due to the settling.

Ms. Cuthbertson noted that she and the baseball coach looked at the baseball field with its hills and valleys due to the settling from the landfill. She explained that the coach suggested if clean fill was brought in, graded and compacted, they could plant grass and it could be marked off for a ball field for people to use. She explained that three families use the area but they ride their bicycles up to Rutherford to play ball since the ground at this park is so uneven. She noted that it was mentioned during last week's meeting that they might convert it to green space but why not make it a walking space by redoing the macadam as many people in the area like to walk. She noted that she walks three miles every day and if the macadam was cleaned up they would have somewhere to walk instead of walking along Conway Road.

Ms. Cuthbertson noted that the area near the playground equipment has standing water and it is awful. She noted that the one post that was leaning on the tennis court is a hazard, but

the basketball hoops are fine. She requested that something be done to the park as there has been no maintenance done for that park. She explained that she sat on the Parks and Recreation Board for 11 years.

Mr. Seeds noted that he served on the Parks and Recreation Board with Ms. Cuthbertson years ago. He noted that Mr. Luetchford was directed to remove the tennis courts as they are beyond repair. He noted that Mr. Wolfe will have staff check on the pavilion, and he suggested that they may try to fill in some of the depressions for the ball field. Mr. Wolfe explained that it was discussed to remove the macadam but the rest is up for discussion.

Mr. Hornung questioned when that discussion will occur. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would be ongoing, but he would schedule this item for a road tour. Ms. Cuthbertson noted that she along with others from her neighborhood would like to be a part of that discussion.

Mr. Seeds suggested that this would be best handled by the Parks and Recreation Board. Ms. Cuthbertson noted that she would like to be a part of that discussion.

Chairman and Board Member's Comments

Mr. Hawk noted this past Saturday, the Capital Area Sports for Youth had their annual outing and they had 360 kids involved. He noted that the kids were very excited as they had the opportunity to meet with experts on safe hunting, proper fishing techniques, and archery. He noted that Mrs. Lindsey had an opportunity to fire a rifle and shoot a bow and arrow.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that it was a great opportunity for the kids as they had people from Bucks and Franklin Counties. She noted that the kids learned to fish, canoe, rifling, and it was free for the attendees. She noted that next year it will be held on June 20, the Saturday before Father's Day. She suggested that something could be put in the spring newsletter next year regarding this event. She noted that it was a good family day for all.

Mr. Hawk noted that the event was held at Harrisburg Hunters and Anglers.

Manager's Report

Mr. Wolfe noted that Heroes Grove will have its groundbreaking ceremony, festival and parade on Saturday, July 5, with the parade starting at 9:30 a.m. at North Side Elementary School to Brightbill Park at which time there will be ground breaking ceremony at 11:15 a.m. followed by a community festival. He noted that the festival will include music, food and children's activities.

Mr. Seeds noted that the fireworks in Linglestown will take place on Saturday, July 5, 2014 at Koons Park at dusk. He noted that this event is sponsored by the Township and the Linglestown Fire Company. He noted that the rain date is Sunday, July 6th.

Mr. Wolfe noted that National Night Out for Public Safety will be held on Tuesday, August 5th from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. at George Park. He noted that this will be the 16th year the Police Department has sponsored this event.

Mr. Wolfe noted that during the summer, United Water PA starts to flush the water lines to clean the lines of sediment that builds up over the course of the year. He noted that United Water PA has 750 miles of water mains and over 3,500 fire hydrants. He noted when this is done; sometimes the water may appear a little turbid. He noted that there is no concern for public health safety from this normal maintenance activity.

OLD BUSINESS

Appointment of an individual to serve on the Lower Paxton Township Authority

Mr. Hawk noted that the Board needs to appoint someone to the Lower Paxton Township Authority as it now has a seven-member board with one vacancy. He nominated Justin Eby to fill the vacant position. Mr. Hawk explained that the Board conducted interviews and chose Mr. Eby to fill the position. Mr. Crissman made a motion to appoint Mr. Eby to the Authority Board. Mrs. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Presentation of the 1st quarter 2014 Key Indicator Report

Mr. Wolfe explained that this is the financial report for the first quarter of 2014. He noted the General Fund (GF) revenues and expenditures for 2014 are \$19,662,475. He noted that the State Aid used for the maintenance of local roads is \$1,007,280. He noted that the capital project funds for municipal operations, the General Improvement Fund (GIF) had expenditures budgeted at \$1,731,557. He noted that the Friendship Center (FC) enterprise fund has revenues of \$2,250,904 with expenditures budgeted at \$2,265,454. He noted that the Township's Authority (LPTA) enterprise fund has revenues of \$13,800,000 and expenditures of \$27,150,388. He noted that the capital projects for that fund are budgeted at \$14,746,500. He noted that the spending plan for all funds is significant.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the beginning fund balance for 2014 for the GF was \$7,187,495 and for the GIF was \$2,741,785. He noted that that the Fire Equipment Capital Fund (FECF) balance was \$979,360 and the Length of Service Awards Program, (LOSAP) was \$379,973. He noted that the FC Capital Fund balance was \$60,660 and the Operating Fund balance was negative \$36,553. He stated that the LPTA fund balance was \$22,977,547. He explained that the Board manages, on a fiduciary base, the Township's two pension funds having a fund balance of \$31,943,851.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the historic trends can be summarized into three periods of time. The first would be prior to 2008 where growth in revenues and expenditures in the Township increased as a result of the demand for the municipal services. He noted from 2008 to 2011, the national recession occurred and it caused significant reductions in municipal services in response to diminished revenues. He noted, starting in 2012 and 2013, there was a moderate rebound in revenues, but the Township has not returned back to its pre-recession levels. He noted that although there has been an increase in revenues over the past two years, the Township has not

increased the municipal expenditures for operations. He displayed a chart showing the historical perspective of year-end fund balances noting in years 2003 through 2007, revenues and expenditures kept pace with each other but the uphill trend in 2005 and 2006 was very steep. He noted, in 2009 through 2011 the Township did not have enough revenue in those years to meet expenditures and used the fund balance. He noted in the last two years, revenues over expenditures, have improved a little in part to the improving economy.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has incurred debt to undergo capital projects and in 2012 the Board borrowed \$2 million for stormwater improvement and \$750,000 for road maintenance projects. He noted that these funds included a new roof for the municipal center and a financial management package. He noted in 2013, the Board issued an additional \$4 million in new debt for capital projects for stormwater improvements and improvements for the FC. He noted in the first quarter of 2014, the Board issued \$7 million in debt for stormwater projects and improvements and an addition to the Public Works building.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the history for GIF expenditures for capital projects is as follows: 2013 - \$1,619,479; 2012 - \$2,078,509; 2011 - \$1,071,041; 2010 - \$1,070,024; 2009 - \$1,273,680, providing a five-year total of \$7,112,743.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the GF used for daily operations at the beginning of 2014 was \$7,187,495. He noted that the Board policy is that 25% of \$19,662,475 must be maintained in this fund as a rainy day fund for capital projects. That amount is \$4,915,619. He noted at the end of the 1st quarter that fund was \$6,320,589. He explained that every year the Township runs a deficit in the 1st quarter for operations until the tax revenues are received in the 2nd quarter.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the 2014 GF revenues for the 1st quarter were \$3,504,658 with expenditures of \$4,371,561 producing a net loss of \$866,904. He noted that revenues compared to the 1st quarter of 2013 were 5% lower; however in 2013 the Township received a reality

transfer tax in the 1st quarter that was very large and unexpected. He noted for that fund in 2013 the revenues were over \$496,008 as compared to \$94,185 in 2014. He noted that the GF expenses were 7% higher in 2014 compared to 2013.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the 2014 State Aid Fund had a beginning balance of \$235,438, receiving \$1,126,637 in 2014 with expenditures to date of \$315,836, providing a fund balance of \$1,046,239. He noted that the Township spent \$254,725 for salt and anti-skid materials for the extreme winter weather as compared to \$100,000 spent in 2013. He noted that this does not include overtime for personnel or equipment repairs.

Mr. Wolfe noted the FECP had beginning revenues of \$979,360 with the Township's contribution being made in the 2nd quarter of the year. He noted that there were no expenses in this fund to date.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the LOSAP journal entries will occur in the 2nd quarter and as of the end of the first quarter the fund balance was \$379,970. He noted that ten members are receiving benefits from this fund that is paid by a Township third party. He noted that revenues from the Township's tax contribution will also be posted in the 2nd quarter.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the GIF is for one-time capital projects. He noted that in 2014, expenditures are budgeted at \$1,732,000. He noted that the beginning balance was \$2,741,785, mainly composed of 2013 bond funds, with revenues of \$423 and expenditures of \$80,154. He noted that the balance at the end of the 1st quarter was \$2,662,054 and the majority of the funds are earmarked for stormwater projects.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the FC in the 1st quarter had revenues of \$466,702 with expenditures of \$308,986 producing a net gain of \$157,716. He noted that it was good news but less than what was received in 2013 by 23%. He noted that a good portion of that is due to the timing of the Township's \$100,000 contribution that was made in March of 2013. He noted that

it was made in April of 2014. He explained that expenses were \$8,160, 3% lower than 2013. He noted that the FC Operating Fund is expected to generate \$170,000 to fund the Capital Reserve Fund and since this is not occurring the Township will transfer \$292,454 from the GF to the FC made up of \$100,000 annual contribution, \$25,000 to offset Senior Center expenses, and \$167,454 to smooth the debt.

Mr. Wolfe provided a summary of the FC's membership chart noting that it continues to increase membership. He noted that annual memberships have lagged with health care memberships making up a larger portion of the memberships. He noted that these have increased substantially since 2008.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the LPTA operating revenues were \$3,636,697 and expenditures were \$2,367,057 producing a net gain of \$681,577. He noted that capital expenditures were \$588,063 as the Authority is tasked with an aggressive Infiltration and Inflow (I&I) Program to replace a significant portion of the sanitary sewer facilities in the Township. He noted that this program did not operate over the winter months and there were no expenses in the first quarter. He noted in the 1st quarter, the Authority borrowed \$25 million the continuation of the multi-year I&I Program.

Mr. Wolfe noted that completed his summary of the Key Indicator Report.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Wolfe provides a complete analysis of the Township's revenues and expenditures.

NEW BUSINESS

Preliminary/final subdivision plan for The Beaufort Hunt, Inc.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has received a plan that proposes to subdivide the existing lot #35-072-019 into two (2) lots located at 6660 Union Deposit Road. He noted that residential lot 1 will contain 50.95 acres on the east side of Union Deposit Road and Lot 2 will

contain 2.01 acres. He noted that the area on the west side of Union Deposit Road contains 39.29 acres.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the property is located east and west of Union Deposit Road and south of Copperstone Road and is zoned AR, Agricultural Residential District, and is served by private on-lot sewage system and private well. He noted that the property is improved with several attached dwellings, a barn and block garage with the newly created lot containing the existing barn and block garage.

Mr. Wolfe explained the applicant received a variance from the minimum side yard setback requirement on January 30, 2014 via Docket Number #1350, and a variance from the minimum lot area of a kennel and minimum setback from a residential lot line on April 24, 2014 via Docket Number 1355.

Mr. Wolfe noted that this plan was approved by the Planning Commission during its May 7, 2014 meeting.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the applicant has requested the following waivers: 1) Waiver of the requirement to provide a preliminary plan; 2) Waiver of the requirement to provide a final Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan; 3) Waiver of the requirement to provide a Stormwater Management Drainage Plan; 4) Waiver of the requirement to provide sidewalk along the frontage of Union Deposit Road; and 5) Waiver of the requirement to provide curbing and road widening along the frontage of Union Deposit Road. He noted that staff supports the five waivers. He noted that there are also two site specific conditions; four general conditions and two staff comments.

Mr. Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering explained that he prepared the subdivision plan for Beaufort Hunt. He noted that they have been renting the land and using the facility for 29 years. He explained that the purpose of the kennel is to house the fox hounds. He noted that they

currently have 11 hounds although sometimes they have as many as 20 hounds. He noted that the Beaufort Hunt Kennel Club felt that it was time to purchase the building and accompanying ground. He noted that they are not proposing any public or private improvements; it is simply a land transfer.

Mr. Staub explained that they appeared before the Zoning Hearing Board twice, having to do with lot requirements and both were granted. He noted that the five waivers all have to do with widening of Union Deposit Road, curbs and sidewalk and those sorts of things. He noted that the Planning Commission and staff recommend the waivers to be approved.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Staub if he could speak for the applicant. Mr. Staub answered yes.

Mr. Crissman noted that there were five waivers and staff supports all five waivers, noting that no earth disturbance is being proposed and there is no impervious coverage proposed.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Staub if he could meet the two site specific conditions. Mr. Staub answered yes.

Mr. Crissman noted that there are four general conditions and he questioned if Mr. Staub can meet those to include the HRG ten comments dated June 13, 2014. Mr. Staub noted he can with one exception, noting in the HRG June 13, 2014 memo, comment two under Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance which states adding the appropriate wetland certification to the plan. He noted that he wanted to talk to Township staff in regards to this as he had a wetland delineation completed many years ago by a wetland biologist. He explained that he would not want to spend the money at this time to have the study redone as they are only good for three years and the wetland biologist is reluctant to sign a certification to a study that was completed many years ago. He noted that the Cassel Farm is well over 80 acres and there are many wetlands on the property, mostly along Beaver Creek which is far removed from where this

subdivision is located. He noted that he would like to put a note on the plan stating if there is any additional development or proposed development on the site that a wetland certification would be provided. Mr. Wolfe noted that would be acceptable to staff.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Staub could meet the two staff comments. Mr. Staub answered yes.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the preliminary/final subdivision plan for Beaufort Hunt Inc with the following waivers and conditions: 1) Waiver of the requirement to provide a preliminary plan; 2) Waiver of the requirement to provide a final Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan; 3) Waiver of the requirement to provide a Stormwater Management Drainage Plan; 4) Waiver of the requirement to provide sidewalk along the frontage of Union Deposit Road; 5) Waiver of the requirement to provide curbing and road widening along the frontage of Union Deposit Road; 6) Plan approval shall be subject to the payment of fee-in-lieu of \$2320 for the newly created lot; 7) Upon approval, the Dauphin County Tax Assessment office will need to be notified of the subdivision in order to acquire parcel numbers for the new lots. The new parcel numbers shall be identified on the cover sheet of the plan to comply with plan recording procedures; 8) Plan approval shall be subject to providing original seals and signatures; 9) Plan approval shall be subject to the payment of engineering review fees; 10) Plan approval shall be subject to the establishment of an automatically renewable improvement guarantee for the proposed site improvements; 11) Plan approval shall be subject to addressing the comments of HRG's memorandum dated June 13, 2014; with a note to be attached to the plan regarding the certification of the wetlands to be completed at a later date if needed; 12) A street/storm sewer construction permit is required and 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 in conjunction with the

Conservation District meeting; and 13) When submitting revised plans, please respond in writing to all individual comments including Township, HRG and County.

Mr. Seeds seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Improvement Guarantee

Mr. Hawk noted that there was one Stormwater Improvement Guarantee to approve.

Thomas W. and Lisa M. Zimmerman

A new escrow with Lower Paxton Township in the amount of \$7,800.00, with an expiration date of June 17, 2015.

Mr. Hornung questioned why HRG made a request for this to be a lump sum. Mr. Wolfe explained that it is a stormwater management plan for a swimming pool and it is easier for property owner's to use the Township as a third-party escrow as opposed to securing a bond. Mr. Hornung questioned if the Township requires this. Mr. Wolfe answered that the property owner has an option to do a bond, letter of credit or escrow. Mr. Hornung questioned why Mr. Fleming recommended a lump sum of \$7,800. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Fleming was recommending what the total amount for the guarantee should be and it is the property owner's choice for how they would secure the guarantee.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the one stormwater improvement guarantee as listed. Mrs. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

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.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William L. Hornung
Township Secretary