

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held Tuesday, November 18, 2008

A business meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 7:31 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; Lori Wissler, Community Development Department Manager; and Mark Coakley, Triple Crown Corporation.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Seeds noted a correction to the October 7, 2008 minutes. He stated, on page 15, paragraph four, sentence three, it should read, "...noting that it is used for traffic calming and also uses *less* pervious areas..." Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the minutes from the business meeting held October 7, 2008 with the noted correction. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously approved.

Public Comment

None was presented.

Chairman and Board Member's Comments

None was presented.

Manager's Report

Mr. Wolfe noted that the annual Tree Lighting Ceremony will be held on Friday, December 5, 2008 at 7 p.m. at the Friendship Center. Music will be provided by the Lower Paxton Township Variety Band and Santa Claus will make an appearance.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Breakfast with Santa will occur on Saturday, December 13th, 2008, starting at 9 a.m. A fee is charged for this event and pre-registration is required.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Board of Supervisors met previously with staff to start the budget process for the 2009 fiscal year. He noted that an additional meeting is scheduled for November 25, 2008 at 4 p.m., and the public is invited to attend.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the 2009 fiscal budget was advertised for review, and he explained that it is scheduled to be adopted during the Tuesday, December 16, 2008 Board business meeting. He noted that the Board is wrestling with the tough economic times in making decisions as it prepares the budget for the 2009 fiscal year. He noted that the Township has not been immune from the current economic condition affecting the financial institutions and development community. He noted that the Township has not received the anticipated revenues that it expected for the 2008 fiscal year, and next year, a similar occurrence is projected. He noted that it is a challenge to balance both the 2008 and 2009 fiscal years' budgets.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Action on agreement with the Humane Society of Harrisburg Area, Inc. for 2009 municipal domestic animal protective services

Mr. Wolfe explained that this is the second year for this type of municipal agreement with the Humane Society of Harrisburg, noting that it provides for domestic animal collection

services in the amount of \$39,532.89. He explained that the amount could be more in the year 2009 if the number of cats and dogs dropped off to the Humane Society exceeds what is projected. He noted that the contract possesses an increase of 3% that is reasonable; however, the Humane Society more than doubled its costs for services to the Township in the 2008 fiscal year. He noted that the agreement is very similar to the one executed in 2008, and is ready for Board action.

Mr. Crissman noted that the document indicates two methods of payment, one lump sum or two installments. He questioned what the Township's preference was. Mr. Wolfe noted that, typically, the payment would be made in one installment, but since there was no interest penalty, the payment would be paid in two installments.

Mr. Seeds quoted the last paragraph of the document, "This contract does not preclude the society from charging any resident of the Municipality fees for adoptions, euthanasia, cage/trap rentals, or any other service offered by the Society. The law deems animals as personal property; therefore, all costs incurred are the responsibility of the owner." He noted that even though the Township pays the fee for the collection of stray animals, it does not preclude the responsibility of the individual resident to take proper care of their pets. He noted that he did not want residents to think that they can just drop of their pets, free of charge.

Mr. Hawk noted that point eight offers the option for emergency services at a charge of \$75.00 per call. He questioned if the Township would want this service. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Township needs this service in the event it has an injured animal. Mr. Seeds noted that this would be an additional charge billed to the Township. Mr. Wolfe noted that the contract price is the minimum price that the Township would pay for services.

Mr. Hawk noted that Section II, paragraph one, states, " In the event that the Society temporarily shuts down , the Society will make every effort to assist the Municipality by

providing food, bowls, and other supplies to the Municipality, however, the Municipality will not be entitled to any financial recovery.” Mr. Hawk questioned what the Township would do in this situation. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Township has a kennel located at the Public Works Department that currently accommodates animals overnight or weekends.

Mr. Blain explained that the contract is determined by reviewing the number of animals that are brought to the Humane Society every three years, and from that total, a new rate is set. He noted that Lt. Johnson was very diligent, in the past, in reviewing the bills, and found many mistakes in charges. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township still experiences the same issues. He noted that if anyone takes an animal to the facility, stating that they are from Lower Paxton Township, and explains that they found the animal along the side the road, the Humane Society will charge the Township regardless of where the animal was found. Mr. Blain noted that it would be good to continue to challenge the Humane Society on their collection bills. Mr. Wolfe noted that Lt. Johnson continues to do this. Mr. Seeds suggested that some people may take their own animals to deposit at the Facility, and charge the fee to the Township.

Mr. Blain noted that the contract is expensive, but he noted that he personally knows the Executive Director, the Board President, and the Treasurer, and they are very reputable people. He suggested that the organization is being fiscally managed well.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve action on the agreement with the Humane Society of Harrisburg Area, Inc., for the 2009 municipal domestic animal protective services in the amount of \$39,532.89. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

Ordinance 08-14; Amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow a car wash as a special exception in the Commercial Neighborhood District

Ms. Wissler noted that the Township received a proposed text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance regarding Article 3 Districts, Section 306.B.2 Allowed Uses in Primarily Business

Zoning Districts. The request was to allow a car wash as a permitted by-right use in the CN, Commercial Neighborhood District. She noted that a car wash is not currently permitted in the CN District, only the Commercial General District.

Ms. Wissler noted that the applicant also proposed to amend Article 4, Additional Requirements for Specific Uses, Section 402.A.14 Additional Requirements for Specific Principal Uses, Car Wash. The request was as follows: 1) To reduce the minimum lot area in the CN District to one-half of one acre. Currently, five acres are required, which can be reduced to one acre if the applicant proves that most of the water used in the operation would be recycled on-site; and 2) To require a car wash that is located in the CN District to have a street-facing facade(s) display at least 50% masonry, stone, or other decorative finish.

Ms. Wissler noted that the text amendment was reviewed by the Planning Commission at its September Meeting, and made the following changes: 1) Paragraph I, make it a Special Exception in the CN, District, instead of permitted by- right; 2) Paragraph II.14f(1), remove the words “In a district other than CN, Neighborhood Commercial District” and change the one acre to one-half acre, if the applicant could prove that most of the water used in the operation would be recycled on-site; 3) Paragraph II.14.f(2) be deleted; and 4) Paragraph II.14.g, the words “or other decorative finish” be amended with a better wording to reflect the intent to be aesthetically pleasing and compatible to the neighborhood.

Ms. Wissler noted that the revised amendment was reviewed at the Planning Commission’s October Meeting and recommended for approval.

Ms. Wissler noted that the Dauphin County Planning Commission (DCPC) reviewed the original request at their September 2, 2008, meeting and recommended against the text amendment. The County reviewed the revised amendment at their October 6, 2008 meeting and concurred with the proposed amendment.

Ms. Wissler noted that on October 29, 2008 and November 5, 2008, a public notice appeared in The Paxton Herald, indicating that the Board would conduct a public hearing and consider the enactment of Ordinance 08-14 on November 18, 2008.

Ms. Wissler noted that Mr. Mark Coakley, from Triple Crown Corporation (TCC), is present to represent the plan.

Ms. Wissler noted that it would be appropriate for Mr. Stine to conduct a public hearing for consideration of Ordinance 08-14 at this time.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Special Exception was permitted since the letter from the DCPC dated October 6, 2008, states that the car wash is now being allowed as a special exception. He noted that they are incorrect in stating that. Ms. Wissler noted that it is not permitted at this time. Mr. Seeds questioned if they knew what they were recommending since they thought it was now allowed. Mr. Hawk noted that the next sentence in that letter notes that it should be appropriate that proper safeguards be provided to the existing dwellings. He questioned if that was occurring with the text amendments. Ms. Wissler answered that the text amendments concern the wording on the type of façade to be used, and also reducing the use to one-half acre in the CN since it was that for the CG if the water is recycled on-site.

Mr. Hawk questioned where the car wash was located that was shown in the handout. Mr. Blain answered that it was located off of Briarsdale Road, near the McDonalds. Mr. Seeds noted that it is located in an area with a hotel and other businesses.

Mr. Stine noted that it was the time and date set for the public hearing on Ordinance 2008-14, which would amend the zoning ordinance to allow a car wash as a special exception in the commercial neighborhood district. He questioned if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this topic.

Mr. Mark Coakley, Triple Crown Corporation, explained that Mr. John DiSanto was unable to attend the meeting due to another commitment.

Mr. Coakley noted, that he and Mr. DiSanto, attended the August workshop meeting to discuss the concept of a car wash on the property on Mountain Road, and it was recommended to him that if it was to be considered, it should be approached by way of a text amendment. He noted that he moved forward with the text amendment process with the Township Planning Commission, and they did not agree that it should be an allowed use by-right, and suggested that it would be more appropriate to be a special exception. He noted that he reworked the amendment and presented it to the Planning Commission a second time, and they recommended the special exception request. He noted that his intent would be, provided the Board approved the special exception text amendment, to apply for a special exception before the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Coakley noted that he has several presentations that he made at the Planning Commission meetings, and he brought them to this meeting to use, if requested. He respectfully requested the approval of the text amendment by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Stine questioned if anyone else desired to be heard on Ordinance 2008-14. He noted that seeing no further response, it would be in order to close the public hearing on 2008-14, and the Board may take action if it so desires.

Mr. Hawk noted that he had two letters from the Dauphin County Planning Commission, dated September 2, 2008, stating that they were not in favor of the text amendment; however, the October 6, 2008 letter states that the Planning Commission concurs with the proposed amendment. Mr. Seeds noted that the Planning Commission changed the amendment from a permitted use to a special exception, and they added that the façade had to be of stone or a masonry material. Mr. Seeds noted that the Planning Commission states that it would be

permitted as a special exception, but that has not been approved yet. Ms. Wissler noted that the confusion is that it is a special exception in the CG but not a CN District.

Mr. Seeds noted that he appreciates that TCC has cleaned up the property as it has been a tremendous eyesore for years. He noted that the tanks have been removed and the soil has been cleaned and tested by DEP. He noted that he was not sure if a car wash was fitting in a CN district, noting that since the Comprehensive Plan has been adopted, many zoning and text amendments have been made. He suggested that the Board has been shooting holes in the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the Neighborhood Commercial's intent is "To promote redevelopment or investment in small scale existing or planned commercial services; small scale office/retail uses that emulate traditional Main Street character." He noted that a half-acre is too small for a car wash, and noted that the Marysville Bank opened a branch next door, and it is a nice use in a neighborhood. He noted that he did not think that a car wash was fitting in the CN and it goes against what was approved in the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that it should remain a one-acre minimum and hopefully up to five acres.

Mr. Hawk noted that the Board recently approved a car wash for the Giant Food Stores on Union Deposit Road, that was under an acre, in a different zoning district. Mr. Seeds noted that it fit in much better at that location. Mr. Blain noted that Giant originally wanted to install a car wash, but pulled it from the plan, noting that it only installed gas pumps. He noted that that lot is probably a one-half acre lot. Mr. Seeds noted that they could not fit the car wash on the plan with the gas pumps.

Mr. Hornung noted that there was a proposed car wash six or seven years ago, by the driving range on Linglestown Road. Ms. Wissler noted that the Shuler's car wash is still there, and that the owner only wanted to add on to his existing building, but he had trouble with setbacks. He questioned what the setback would be for a one-half acre lot, and the restrictions for

impervious coverage. Ms. Wissler answered that the requirement was 75% impervious coverage. He questioned if you could put a car wash on the 75% area that is within one-half acre. Mr. Coakley explained that Mark Tyndale owns the car wash on Union Deposit Road, and all he does is build car washes. He noted that Mr. Tyndale stated that he could build a small car wash on a one-half acre lot and he did not understand the logic for the one-acre minimum lot. He noted that car washes are built in different sizes depending on the amount of bays. He noted that he did not want to build a large car wash at this location on Mountain Road as it would not be very appropriate. He noted that it was determined that there was a market for a small car wash. He explained that Mr. Tyndale and Mr. Fisher, from R. J. Fisher, designed a plan and they have no concerns about meeting the Township's requirements.

Mr. Hornung questioned if they could meet the 25% requirement for impervious coverage. Mr. Coakley answered that the plan should meet all the subdivision and land development ordinance requirements. Mr. Hornung noted that he would not want to provide approval for a special exception to find the developer coming back with a list of waivers to fit the building on the plan. Mr. Coakley noted that these items would come up during the land development approval process, and he understands the concern of the Board members. He noted that he could not guarantee that there would never be a request for a waiver, but he noted that the car wash expert and engineer have reviewed the design and they stated that the plan would work.

Mr. Hornung noted that there are several areas on Mountain Road that are not the most aesthetically pleasing. He noted that the Township is going to spend \$3 million to beautify the Village of Linglestown, and he questioned if it was the right move to build a car wash along the main entrance to the Village. He noted that he has concerns as to how it would fit in. He noted that he would feel better if there was a more fitting type business, but he stated that the current site was detestable, and this would be an improvement over that. He questioned, if down the

road, would this development add to the Community or detract from the Community. He noted that it is an item that would receive a lot of use and abuse, and if it was not maintained, it could become an eyesore. He noted that there is language in the amendment to ensure that the car wash not appear as a car wash from the road by means of using certain building materials, but he noted that it is hard to write that language into an ordinance to allow car washes that do not look like car washes. He noted that he did not know how to alleviate his concerns as to whether this would be an enhancement to the Community, but he stated, if the developer comes back to the Township with less than 25% impervious cover, he would be very upset. He noted that it is very important to the aesthetics of the project.

Mr. Coakley distributed a three-page exhibit that showed what the car wash would look like if it was built on the location. He noted that it also showed all the buildings on both sides of Mountain Road. Mr. Seeds noted that the map only shows what is present now, and does not depict what the Board would like to see in the future. He noted that there are many different types of businesses located along Mountain Road, as well as some residences.

Mr. Seeds explained that the existing ordinance reads that if a residence is located within 250 feet of the car wash, the hours of operation of the car wash would be limited. He noted that TCC proposed no change to this section of the ordinance.

Mr. Seeds noted that the picture does not show any vehicles on the premises. He noted that the building looks very nice, but it would open the door to others who could request a special exception. Mr. Coakley noted that that is why the Planning Commission requested that it be a special exception and not a permitted use, noting that each individual developer would have to plead their case. Mr. Seeds noted that this would make more work for the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Seeds noted that no portion of any car wash shall be within 100 feet of the centerline of a perennial waterway. He noted that a waterway is located to the north of the property, and although it is not a perennial waterway, anytime it rains, the swale fills up. He noted that there is always the possibility that products from the car wash would get into the stream that flows when it rains. He noted that it is a concern that the contaminated water could move downstream into the Susquehanna River. Mr. Coakley noted that the water is 100% recycled on site. He noted that it would be an improvement to what is there now.

Mr. Hawk noted that the car wash is certainly an improvement over what was in that location, however, he questioned if the vehicles would enter the building from the front or the back. Mr. Coakley answered that the concept design is to have vehicles enter the car wash from the back of the property and exit through the front facing the street. Mr. Hawk questioned if there would be a stacking problem on Mountain Road. Mr. Coakley answered that the design features were reviewed by the engineer and car wash expert, noting their stacking amounts, and he was told that it would not be a concern.

Mr. Coakley noted that Mark and John DiSanto are Lower Paxton Township residents, and John's in-laws own a business right off the square, and he explained that part of the impetus to build the car wash was to clean up an aesthetic problem, not necessarily to make a huge profit.

Mr. Seeds noted that he appreciates their concern and effort, but he questioned if something more pleasing could be put in this location, such as an office building. He noted that it would open the door to other type uses as it changes the ordinance.

Mr. Coakley noted that Neighborhood Commercial is a light commercial use designed to meet the needs of the neighbors. He noted that people live in the neighborhood, and own cars and need to wash the cars.

Mr. Seeds questioned where the 25% impervious area would be located. He noted that, very rarely, does the Board receive a plan that does not request a variance or a waiver. Mr. Coakley noted that he could not speak for the engineer if there would be a need for a waiver.

Mr. Hornung noted that it is tough to make a text amendment noting that there could be some other areas where it may not be appropriate. He noted that he wanted to be insured that there was enough rhetoric to provide the governing body the authority to say no, even though it may meet the conditions. He noted that he would not want to take away the power to decipher that one location may be a better one than another. He noted that he wanted to make sure that there was enough rhetoric in the text amendment that if the Zoning Hearing Board were to decide that it doesn't fit in the proposed area; there could be a means to provide some leeway. Mr. Stine noted that special exceptions are like conditional uses, in that you meet the criteria applicable to the use, it has to be granted. He noted that he did not know what the criterion was for a car wash, but if it met it, it would have to be granted. He noted that the Zoning Hearing Board could not deny a special exception because it doesn't really fit.

Mr. Hornung noted that he might tend to agree with TCC that the use is an appropriate one for the area, but his concern would be if the developer would do a nice job and be responsible. He noted that TCC has provided good work in the past. He noted that he would like to provide the Zoning Hearing Board as much levity to overlook the rhetoric if they decide that it is not an appropriate use, even if they meet all the requirements. He noted that, prior to the meeting, he was against the plan, but now he is willing to vote for it, but he would like to wait to make sure the Zoning Hearing Board has enough weight to make a proper decision. He noted that in the past, there were times that he had to approve conditional uses, even though he knew it was not the right location for it. He noted, at one point, the Board stopped granting conditional uses as it was getting out of hand.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Stine stated that it would almost be a by-right to grant the special exception. He noted that the Zoning Hearing Board would probably feel that since the Board granted the text amendment, then it was in favor of the special exception. He noted that the Zoning Hearing Board can do what they want to do, and he would not want to put them in a position, thinking that the Board would like to see a car wash on any half-acre tract that recycles its own water. He noted that he hoped that something else would be developed on that lot as he did not think that it was appropriate for that area.

Mr. Hornung noted that he would like to approve the text amendment as soon as possible, but he wanted to make sure that staff reviewed the amendment one more time. He noted that he would not want this request to have to go back to the Planning Commission and the Dauphin County Planning Commission. He explained that he is not against the project.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the Board delayed the vote, would it have to conduct another public hearing. Mr. Stine answered no, as long as a decision is made within 60-days, noting that Ms. Wissler would have to publish a new notice of proposed enactment. Mr. Wolfe questioned what would happen if changes were made to the amendment. Mr. Stine noted that it would have to go through the entire process all over again, and be reviewed by both Planning Commissions. Mr. Seeds suggested that the text amendment was written for this property and use. He noted that he did not know what changes could be made that would allow the use at this location. Ms. Wissler noted that text amendment changes would have to wait until the January Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Blain noted that he understood where Mr. Seeds and Mr. Hornung were coming from with the concern that it is a car wash in the Linglestown area, but he noted that the property next door, which is a bank, is not the most attractive building. He noted that directly across the street is a garage that has many junk vehicles, and a comment was made that the Township has too

many banks, but he noted that this seems like a means to regulate how many car washes are allowed in the Township.

Mr. Seeds noted that this not only has to do with this particular property, but with commercial neighborhoods. He noted that this is not the only area in the Township that is zoned Commercial Neighborhood, noting that the Board needs to look at those areas too. He noted that the ordinance changes the requirement from one acre to a half acre for where you could build a car wash if you recycle a large percentage of the water. He noted that this change would impact the entire Township. He suggested that it would create many requests for waivers to cram a business on a half acre lot. He noted that he disagrees with changing it from one acre to a half acre.

Mr. Hawk noted that it is a condition of the amendment for the applicant to prove that most of the water would be recycled. He noted that the developer must meet this condition as well. Ms. Wissler noted that if the developer does not meet the impervious coverage, it would require a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there were any restrictions in the Ordinance, that in the event the equipment did not function properly or was not maintained properly, that something could be done. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Township had a similar situation with a conditional use where the occupant did not completely follow the rules in regard to operation and the end results were not good for the Township. He noted that problems would be enforced as a violation of the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Coakley suggested that DEP would beat the Township to the punch on enforcement if there would be any problems. Mr. Hornung noted that there have been situations where DEP was not very helpful.

Mr. Seeds noted, if it text amendment is passed, and the plan passes the Zoning Hearing Board, then the Board would have to vote on the land development plan. He noted that the Zoning Hearing Board would hear the variances for the special exception.

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Coakley is well aware of the Board's opinion in granting any waivers for the plan.

Mr. Crissman made a recommendation to approve Ordinance 08-14; amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow a car wash as a special exception in the Commercial Neighborhood District. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a roll call vote: Mr. Blain, aye; Mr. Crissman, aye; Mr. Hornung, aye; Mr. Seeds, nay; and Mr. Hawk, aye.

Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Wolfe if there was a need to revisit this Ordinance to see if the Board has provided the Zoning Hearing Board the ability to say no if possible. Mr. Wolfe answered that he felt that the Ordinance was sufficient.

Ordinance 08-16; Amending Chapter 137 of the Codified Ordinance
as it relates to Peddlers and Solicitors

Mr. Wolfe explained that this Ordinance makes minor amendments to the existing codified ordinance as they relate to Peddlers and Solicitors. He noted that it provides that every person desiring to engage in the activity of soliciting in the Township has to make application to the Township for a license. He noted that it states the information that is required for the license, however, the fee, would be established, from time to time, by the Board of Supervisors through a Resolution. He noted that it states the term of a license and instructs the Public Safety Director to maintain a log of licenses, but the suspension and revocation of the licenses of a solicitor would be made by the Township Manager. He noted that the Ordinance is complete for public review.

Mr. Hornung questioned why the revisions came about. Mr. Wolfe explained that the current peddlers and solicitors license had some inconsistencies when compared to the transient

merchant license, and was needed to improve the efficiency in the Police Department. Mr. Hornung questioned if there were any particular problems. Mr. Wolfe answered no.

Mr. Seeds noted that this did not relate to the transient merchants, noting that there is one stand that was only open on the weekend, but is now open during the week. Mr. Wolfe noted that transient merchants are permitted to solicit over a period time. Mr. Seeds questioned if this Ordinance affected non-profit organizations. Mr. Wolfe answered no.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Ordinance 08-16; amending Chapter 137 of the Codified Ordinance that relates to Peddlers and Solicitors. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

Improvement Guarantees

Mr. Hawk noted that there were three improvement guarantees for consideration.

Tuscan Villas at the Estates of Forest Hills

A reduction in a letter of credit with PNC Bank, in the amount of \$104,654.11, with an expiration date of October 7, 2009.

New One Story Office Building

An extension and 10% increase in a letter of credit with Lebanon Valley Farmers Bank, in the amount of \$19,260.90, with an expiration date of November 18, 2009.

Amber Fields, Phase III

An extension and 10% increase in a letter of credit with Sovereign Bank, in the amount of \$16,129.18, with an expiration date of November 18, 2009.

Ms. Wissler noted that there was a correction to the second improvement guarantee in that Lebanon Valley Farmers Bank was acquired by Fulton Bank, and they now hold the letter of credit for the New One Story Office Building.

Mr. Blain made a motion to approve the three listed improvement guarantees with the noted correction presented by Ms. Wissler. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and the three improvement guarantees were unanimously approved.

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. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary