

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held March 10, 2015

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:07 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 Lindsey.

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Jack Dougherty, Friendship Center Operating Board; Brian Luetchford, Director Parks and Recreation; Steve Fleming, HRG, Inc.; Eric Kessler, Vanguard Realty Group; Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering Co., Martin Schoffstall, Schoffstall Farm LLC; Sam Robbins, Public Works Director; and Watson Fisher, SWAN

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

Mr. Mark DiSanto, Triple Crown Corporation (TCC) explained that he has been involved in continuing litigation regarding the Stray Winds Farm (SWF) development. He noted that he has had discussions with staff in regards to the issues and asked the Board to consider, as a result of the latest round of litigation which involves the Board's approval of the revised phasing plan for SWF, to direct Mr. Stine to do a brief or a letter-brief to outline the Township's position on this matter to the court. He noted, since it is part of the development plan that he is working with, he would reimburse the legal fees to be billed to his development account. He noted that his request is that Mr. Stine outline the Board's position in regard to the approval of the phasing plan.

Mr. Hornung questioned why the approval alone would not suffice as he is not sure what the letter would say other than the Board approved it. He questioned if it would stand since the fact is the Board approved it. Mr. DiSanto noted that would make sense, but the fact is that the opposing party has made the claim that it was not proper to do that. He noted if you look at the minutes from the Board meeting, Mr. Crissman asked Mr. Stine if this is how we do it, if this

should be done and the minutes reflected that. He noted that the Board's actions speak for themselves. He noted in this litigation, the Township is a party of interest, noting that you could have filed your own briefs and answer to the claims, but, typically, the Township leaves that to the two parties that are concerned, the developer and the opposing party. He noted that this is a little bit unusual in that they are questioning the way the Township took its action in this matter. He noted that he does not know what Mr. Stine would say, but he thinks, from the actions that were done, and how they were reviewed in the minutes, the Township as a party of interest, should be able to say, this is why we did it, this is our course of action, and how it was purported within the law.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there were any filings against the Township that we acted improperly, that we violated something. Mr. DiSanto answered that is what the opposing party is arguing in the brief about the phasing schedule, and he has to file a response in regards to their brief. He questioned if Mr. Stine could shed any more light on that. Mr. Stine answered that it is an appeal of the Board's decision to approve the phasing schedule; someone thinks that the Board should not have approved it.

Mr. DiSanto noted that the Board's actions are being challenged.

Mr. Crissman noted that the minutes already reflect what should occur, and he questioned if they can't be entered as part of Mr. DiSanto's plea before the court. Mr. DiSanto answered that he has filed the record and the minutes are part of his appeal but it does not say, it shows what you did, but it doesn't tell if the Board was authorized to do it. He noted that the minutes are factual in saying this is what happened.

Mr. Hawk noted that the original plan was approved at 374 units. Mr. DiSanto answered yes. Mr. Hawk noted that you wanted 449 units. Mr. DiSanto answered 448 units. Mr. Hawk noted that the plan is less 74 or 75 units, and that the number for the plan is still at 374 units. Mr. DiSanto noted that part of the litigation has been adjudicated in final form and it is 374 units. Mr. Hawk noted that you are asking that the phasing be changed. Mr. DiSanto answered that he requested that approximately a year or so ago and this Board reviewed the phasing plan and approved it. The new phasing schedule modified the time frame, the location and number of phases. He noted that is what is being challenged. He noted that it would be important for the Board, since it was its action, to weigh in on how that is supported by law on your behalf. He

noted that he is not here to tell the Board what position to take in this matter as we know what your action was; however, he wants to be clear that if you would authorize Mr. Stine to weigh in on this matter as it is the Board's action that is being challenged, and you are a party of interest. He noted that it is not unusual for a Township to make a position in this matter. He noted, since it involves his development, any costs that would be incurred by Mr. Stine in that matter would be billed to his development.

Mr. Hawk noted that 74 homes have been removed from the plan, but there is some opposition to the phasing request. Mr. DiSanto answered that the action has been challenged but he does not think that there is any legitimacy to the matter as this is one time the Township should weigh in on this matter.

Ms. Lindsey stated in her opinion that it should be between you and the other party. She noted that she does not think that the Township should get involved, the Board made its decision and it is in the minutes.

Mr. Hawk questioned what the major concern is from the opposition. Mr. DiSanto answered that it is fairly technical, part of what they are saying is the original plan that was approved shows the 448 units. He noted that case was finally decided and there will only be 374 units. He noted that it happens all the time in the Township that developers come in to change phases noting that they have single-family homes and now want to build townhomes or the opposite. He noted throughout the history of this Board's approval process through the Planning Commission's preliminary plan phasing changes, the number of units change and so forth. He noted that one of the challenges is that he should go back and redo the entire preliminary plan back to 374 units. He noted that is what the court decided. He explained, when he redid the phasing plan, he knows that his preliminary plan shows 448 units but Mr. Wolfe and Mr. Stine made it very clear it is only for 374 units. He noted that is where he has to stop development. He noted that he can take anyone of those phases that would have 60 to 70 homes and say it is one single-family lot. He noted that the phasing plan will change as he proceeds through the process.

Mr. Hornung questioned why Mr. DiSanto doesn't modify the future plans so that the entire plan shows 374 units. Mr. DiSanto answered that he will do that as he goes through phases and he finds out what the market is most interested in, large or small single-family homes. He questioned why would he spend \$100,000 to engineer the plan only to get to that phase and it

might not be what he wants to do anyway. He noted that he would address the final phasing to comport the final number when he has better marketing intelligence and he knows exactly what he is going to do.

Mr. Hawk noted that you are at 374 units and you are not arguing the types of homes. Mr. DiSanto answered that Phase I is approved and recorded and he is building it right now. He noted that when he gets to Phase 2, if the townhouses are doing better, he may want to change a portion to show townhouses and delete some single-family homes. He noted that happens all the time from preliminary plans to final plans with phase changes. He noted that Phase 1 is being developed as approved. He noted from what he is seeing, his expectations is that Phase 2 will be developed as approved and he will probably make the final adjustment between Phases 8 and 9, the final two phases.

Mr. Crissman questioned what do you want Mr. Stine to write in the brief, and if the Board's approves this, we would only instruct him to do it since it is an abrogation of what has already been filed. He questioned if the brief will be accepted as review. Mr. DiSanto answered that Mr. Stine would write a brief that would support the Board's actions. Mr. Crissman noted that it is an abrogation of exactly what the minutes reflect. Mr. DiSanto noted that there is a very fine differential in that the minutes reflect facts, what occurred, but the brief would support, by law, stating this is why what the Board did was correct. He noted in the ordinance it states whatever, and the Municipal Planning Code states its own facts and the Plan Extension Act supports this. He noted that the minutes are factual, they are part of the record, but they do not explain why the Board took that action and why it was permitted. He noted that the court would accept a brief submitted by the Township because it was the Board's decision that was challenged as you are a party of interest. He noted that you have as much interest in that decision, and as much legal right to weigh in on that matter as he would.

Mr. Crissman questioned will it be an abrogation or as Mr. DiSanto states, more of a philosophical statement for why the Board did what it did. Mr. Stine answered that it would be both. Mr. DiSanto noted that it would be very helpful in putting all this litigation to rest and he would hope that the Board would be interested in sustaining their action, especially in light of the fact that it will not cost the Township or the taxpayer any money as he would pay the legal fees

as part of the development expenses, similar to the engineering costs for when Mr. Stine does a development agreement or improvement guarantee, they all get billed to the developer.

Mr. Hawk noted that there have been changes to the original plan that he looked at the other day. Mr. DiSanto answered that is correct. Mr. Hawk noted that you wanted to change the phasing noting that you may want to do Phase 2 next or move to Phase 5 or whatever, so that is the question really and there is opposition to you doing that. Mr. DiSanto answered that was correct.

Mr. Hawk noted that we won't take a vote this evening.

Mr. DiSanto noted since his briefs were filed over three weeks ago, if the Board could take action this evening it would be greatly appreciated. Mr. Hawk noted that we typically don't vote in a workshop session. Mr. DiSanto noted when he was speaking to staff in this matter, he was told that it is not something that Mr. Stine would do on his own, he would need direction from the Board to do this. He noted that it would be similar to investigating a bond sale, the Board needs to provide direction and say yeah, we will weigh in or not. He noted that some sort of vote to direct Mr. Stine is needed.

Ms. Lindsey questioned Mr. Stine if legally the Township could accept any money for anything like this. Mr. Stine noted that litigation would not be part of the review fees so the Township could not accept any payment.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the court is asking the Township for anything, we are not part of the litigation. Mr. Stine answered that technically we are a defendant, but we have chosen to do nothing because we have two opposing parties that are already representing all those interests, that is why it was determined that it was not necessary to get involved. He noted that the court has not asked the Township to file any paperwork.

Mr. Hawk noted that it doesn't hurt the Township to do this. Mr. Seeds noted that we would only be stating the facts for what occurred, the Board's approval for the phasing schedule. Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Stine stated that his letter would be in two parts, what the statutes indicate and an abrogation of the actions this Board has taken. He noted that he does not see that as any risk or open liability to the Board. Mr. Hawk agreed.

Mr. Crissman questioned, if the Board authorized Mr. Stine to draft a letter, are we setting any precedent as we go forth. He noted that he did not want to be in that position either.

Ms. Lindsey answered that she thinks we would be. Mr. Crissman noted that he does not see any harm in asking Mr. Stine to write a letter based on what Mr. Stine has said would be contained in the letter or brief. Mr. Stine answered that up to this point in time the Board has not done this when there were two opposing parties. He noted if you start doing this then you will probably be called upon to do it again.

Mr. DiSanto noted if he could distinguish that slightly, the Township is named as a party in this matter, and you have chosen to let TCC defend the matter, but there are times the Township stepped in for zoning matters when the Zoning Hearing Board made a decision that the Township did not like. He noted that you are a party of interest and you are able to oppose them if you don't like the action. He noted that a very routine, fundamental action of the Township is being challenged and he firmly believes that it is without merit. He noted that it would be very probative to the court to have the true party who made the action, stand in and say that it knows what it did, it did it legally, and this is our reason. He noted that it sometimes carries more weight than when you have the developer on one side and the resident on the other side. He noted that you are an impartial party stating what the reasoning was and this is our support for it. He noted that you don't have to do this every time, you can weigh in when you want or if you don't want, but it is very probative for this one matter. He noted throughout all this litigation he has never come to the Township to ask for help to step into this as he felt very strong in his presentation. He noted that this is important, specifically the actions of the Township.

Mr. Hornung noted that this has gone on for long enough and we need to get on with things, noting that you probably lost any profit for this development that you may have had. He noted that the one area that he is struggling with is the fact that he does not want developers to throw something on a plan, knowing that when they get to Phase 5, they will redo it. He noted that is what he struggles with, noting that he has a problem with that. He noted that you go in with your best plan, knowing that the Board has rules allowing it to be changed, but to start off knowing that something is wrong, he has a little bit of a problem with that.

Mr. DiSanto noted that he could bring clarity to that. He explained when we had the 448 units approved, the litigation started. He noted that it dragged out four or five years. He noted that plan was recorded, Phase 1, which was actually Phase 1, A, B, and C, had four parts to it. He

noted that when court findings made the final decision to 374 units, he modified the phases down to Phase I, A and B, and dropped what he thought won't be built out of that phase, but it wasn't willy-nilly. He spent a lot of time of working with the Stray Winds Area Neighbors (SWAN) and getting the plan approved. He noted that he went to seek the Zoning Hearing Board's approval and came up with a plan with the Township concerning the offsite improvements. He noted that he would still love to build the 448 units but he can't, so he came back with a modified phasing plan to get to the 374 units when he gets further into the development. He noted that this was not just done that we will do only 448 units and figure it out later. Mr. Hornung suggested that you will hold out one phase that has a larger density noting that you could back off on that density.

Mr. DiSanto noted the Zoning Hearing Board decision, getting all the approvals with the Board, but for this one litigant, this plan would not have gone through all of this as we all thought that we were doing the correct thing. He noted that the final decision is that the maximum units will be 374 so he modified the phasing plan to work within that and he will not build more than 374 units.

Mr. Hawk questioned what the advantage is for TCC to change the phasing. Mr. DiSanto answered, when the final decision for 374 units came down, he dropped Phase C out of the plan, looking to make future changes in the plan to get it down to 374 units. He noted that it is the typical adjustment of phases that normally occurs in the development process.

Mr. Hawk noted that TCC has to remove roughly 74 to 75 homes from the phases. Mr. DiSanto noted that he has developed different sections from what was originally proposed in the initial phases.

Mr. Hornung noted that he does not see any issue with changing the phasing but the issue is that you have an approved plan that is not in compliance with the court ruling. He noted, as Mr. DiSanto sells homes and is provided some income, he will redo the phasing schedule. He noted that it will be several years until he gets to the various phases as the market will have changed by then, noting that the plan will only allow Mr. DiSanto to build 374 units. He noted that we have the safety net provided by the courts; however the challenge provided by the litigant is that the plan does not meet what is required by the court. He noted that he is not feeling confident for why you can't modify the plan as he doubts that it would cost \$100,000 to do it as you don't have to do that much engineering. Mr. DiSanto answered that it would be that amount

of money to redo the plan. Mr. Hornung questioned just for the segment that would get you down under 374. Mr. DiSanto noted that depending on that process, and when it happens, if we do that ten years from now, there may be different zoning requirements, NPDES requirements, and he will deal with them in the future, but to just go in there now, noting that five or ten years from now, housing designs, market sizes will change, so if we go in and say that we will put in 60 more townhouses and reduce it by 75 units but five years from now, the market may call for single-family housing. He noted that it is wasteful and inefficient. He noted that he has a completely valid plan for all requirements design, setbacks, NPDES permits and County Conservation, Township ordinances, nothing in his plans violates anything for construction and it never will because 374 is the number. He noted if we try to go into a phase where we show 375, it's not going to be approved but we can build phases one through seven with no problem and every part of that plan meets every requirement of the ordinance. He noted when we get to the final phasing we will be down to 374 units.

Mr. Hornung noted that the issue the Board has at this point in time is that the Board does not want to do this as staff recommended that we stay out of this. He noted that is what will probably happen at this point as he knows that Ms. Lindsey is not in favor of this. Ms. Lindsey agreed. Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Seeds what he thinks. Mr. Seeds noted that he is concerned about setting a precedent and there will be additional work on Mr. Stine's part which costs some money noting that we can't charge Mr. DiSanto for that. He noted that Mr. Stine does not need more things to do. Mr. Seeds stated that he would not agree to do this. Mr. Crissman noted that he is struggling with the merits and the precedent as he does not see that there is any damage or harm to the Board. He noted that he is on the fence to ask Mr. Stine to write it and if the courts will accept the brief and read it. He noted that it does not hurt the Township in any way; however it would set a precedent. He noted that he could go either way. Mr. Hawk noted that he does not see any harm to the Township in doing this and he can support writing the letter. Mr. Crissman noted that based on what he has heard tonight, he would say that he has no problem with having Mr. Stine write a letter. Mr. Hornung noted that he would agree to have Mr. Stine write the letter. He noted that would be three yes's for a letter.

Mr. DiSanto questioned if there would be a motion. Mr. Hornung suggested that it is not necessary and questioned what Mr. Wolfe thought. Mr. Wolfe questioned Mr. Stine if he needed

official direction. Mr. Stine answered no, he does not need a motion to write a letter. Mr. DiSanto thanked the Board for its time and support.

Mr. Crissman noted that he would like to hear from Mr. Stine, one more time that this letter will consist of the statutes and the actions that we have taken, so it is an abrogation of everything that is legal for what this Board has done and that is what will be in the brief. Mr. Hornung explained that it is not a brief, it is a letter. Mr. Stine noted that he will be writing a letter.

Mr. Hornung explained the last thing that he wants is developers that come in with seven phases and they just willy-nilly put in what is in the sixth and seventh phase because they are not sure what the conditions will be like when they get there. He noted that he has a problem with that. Mr. DiSanto noted that he hears Mr. Hornung loud and clear. Mr. Hornung noted that he would like to see the phasing schedule amended sooner than later. Mr. DiSanto noted that he would be happy to review that with the Board at a later date.

Oath of Office to Fire Police Officer

Mr. Hawk provided the oath of office to Melvin Baber for the position of Fire Police. Mr. George Byerly provided him with the official vest and the Board members congratulated Mr. Baber on his volunteerism.

Status report regarding the priority project to modify building space within the Friendship Center

Mr. Jack Dougherty, Chairman of the Friendship Center Operating, (FCOB) noted that he met with the Board about a month ago to discuss the priority projects, the last of which was the building renovations. He explained that he provided what ideas the FCOB had come up with and based on the recommendations from staff he would like to flesh that out a little bit more. He noted that Mr. Luetchford distributed to the Board a list of items that we are looking to do along with a rough floor plan. He noted in considering the renovations, he is looking how to monetize unused and underutilized space and to renovate areas that will make the FC more competitive with more revenue generating demographics. He noted that these are the preliminary ideas that the FCOB has been talking about based on recommendations from staff. He noted that there is a strong interest in adding a component of a rock climbing wall area but we are not sure if it would

fit into an area of the functioning fitness area or if it is something we can put in the gym. He noted that we are exploring options and if it meets with the Board's approval we will ask permission to move forward in meeting with the Township engineers to move the project ahead. He noted at this time he would like to turn the presentation over to Mr. Luetchford.

Mr. Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director, distributed the list of building renovations that will go with the floor graphic that is displayed on the screen.

Mr. Luetchford noted that these are the specifics that came out of the concepts that were discussed a month ago. He noted that the FCOB is looking for permission from the Board of Supervisors to discuss these options with the Township Engineer for design work. He noted that the first location involves the north end of the fitness center between the pool area and the gym area, changing it to make it more of a functional fitness area. He noted that it would be more than treadmills and TRX machines, it is open-space, boxes that you jump up and down from, things that you can do other than using the standard or traditional machines that we have had in the past. He noted that those machines will remain but we also want to follow the latest fitness trends in an effort to have the FC become self-sufficient or as close to that as possible.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the consultant has recognized that these are the kind of fitness areas we need to expand into or change into in order to maximize revenues by both memberships and programs. He explained in the north end of the fitness center, we are looking to install a floor to ceiling glass wall with doors at the south end of the rubber floor area, as well as at the east side opening between the rubber floor area and the gym. He noted where the current half wall is located between the fitness center and the gym he would like to add additional height to control traffic and noise. He noted that these activities will generate noise as they use music. He noted where the curtain is hanging between the fitness center and the gym, that area would be converted to a wall allowing an area the size of 40 feet long and 30 feet wide.

Mr. Luetchford noted that he would move all the equipment to the south into what is currently the social hall and remove one wall and relocate it two pillars down to roughly ten feet to the north of the existing TV stand and service desk. He noted that there would be a seating area to watch TV or sit and talk having a ten foot wall with a low wall between the social hall and the hallway in front of the vending machines.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the area that was formally the senior center, Rooms 112 and 115 to the southeast of the building have three partitions dividing the rooms into four rooms. He noted that the spinning classes are currently conducted in this area but he would like to make this into a functional fitness area, having a rubberized floor to maximize the space for fitness. He noted that members could use this area to workout. He noted that the yellow shows where a permanent wall would be added, because there is a noise with the spinning that permeates out into the hallway. He noted that the music motivates the people to work out and it travels into other parts of the building, therefore the need for sound deadening treatments. He noted that we would have two functional fitness areas, one to the north and one to the south.

Mr. Luetchford noted that we would like to remove the existing TV stand at the service desk as it blocks the service desk view of the social hall and activities behind them. He noted that he would like to install audio-visual equipment in Rooms 112 and 115 and remove some of the cabinets in Room 115 to provide more space. He explained that this is what the FCOB would like to do but it needs to research the costs and things associated with designing the areas to know what the concepts would entail.

Ms. Lindsey noted that she has asked this before and she will ask it again, is there funds to take care of this. Mr. Luetchford answered that there is money to do building improvements as it was discussed as a possibility to use for renovations. He noted that it was originally for other projects but there are funds to consider using for these projects.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Luetchford if he was going to remove the one kitchen that was used by the seniors. Mr. Luetchford answered that it has already been removed as it was moved to the East Annex so there is no need for a second one. He noted that the room is divided with one half used for storage and a laundry room and the other half is for the senior van service. He noted that he does not intend to remove that room at this time.

Mr. Seeds noted that you are talking about installing a wall from the ceiling to the floor that would divide the back area on the north side where the rubber matting is located. He suggested that glass would not be a good idea. Mr. Luetchford noted that is what we currently have between the fitness center and social hall. Mr. Seeds suggested that the uses that will be going on in that area could have issues for using an all glass wall. Mr. Luetchford answered that he did not believe so as he does not plan on having flying exercise equipment so it should not be

any different than what is going on between the current fitness center and the social hall. Mr. Seeds questioned if there would be any other uses that could cause a problem with the glass. Mr. Luetchford answered, not to his knowledge.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there is an estimated cost for all of this. Mr. Luetchford answered no, that is what they want to proceed with to look at potential design services to discuss those things. Mr. Wolfe noted that putting a cost estimate is well beyond staff's ability as we know what we think needs done, but we don't know the proper way to do it or how much it would cost. He noted that staff would start with our own engineer to determine if they can put together a cost estimate and if not, move on with a RFP for limited architectural services.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there will be a small area to watch television. Mr. Luetchford answered that there would, noting under the fitness center expansion, they have discussed removing a low cabinet between the pillar and the wall and adding a potential wall going north/south from the pillar near the front access door. He noted that it would provide more space for sitting and social activities providing for two small areas, one by the TV and the other to the right side where you enter the building. He noted that he would move the tables to make small seating areas near the vending machines, and the social hall would be expanded. Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Luetchford if he would be able to accommodate all the various classes that you hold now by making the changes in those rooms and putting in a permanent wall. Mr. Luetchford answered that the changes have a dedicated fitness area where there wasn't one before, noting that there was a spinning room, but it will provide for another classroom, so it would affect the classes that go on in the other classrooms. He noted that we are making a shift, it is not simply adding fitness, we are shifting somewhat, but we don't have the exact number figured out yet. He noted that future trending for programs is constantly in motion. He noted, having the same number of preschool classes or Yoga classes or other ones we had before may have to be altered as some programs may replace other programs shifting to programs that make more money and are more popular.

Mr. Crissman noted that you are increasing your space for usage for programs, therefore it should increase the space for additional programing and increase memberships as people will come to take advantage of the programs provided. Mr. Luetchford stated that the Brailsford

Report indicated if staff expanded into these areas we could add as many as 100 new memberships in addition to additional programs. He noted that is the motivation behind this.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the functions, such as the Christmas tree lighting, that were held in the social area would occur in the gym. Mr. Luetchford answered that is correct.

Mr. Crissman noted if the Board provides the approval to move forward, does the FCOB have a time-schedule for what happens beyond tonight. Mr. Luetchford answered, as Mr. Wolfe was explaining, that the plan is to move to design to look at potential design services. He noted that he is only looking for approval of the concept to move forward. Mr. Doughty noted if this would meet with the Board's approval, the next step would be to meet with the engineers to discuss design. He noted that it would have to be determined if there was a need for architectural services.

Mr. Hawk questioned if any of the grant funds would go towards design services. Mr. Luetchford answered that there is no grant that has been requested for this piece.

Mr. Hornung noted as you go through the design and construction, he asked that you keep in mind that ten years from now, the walls may have to come down because of something new. He noted that he would like to see the renovations be as flexible in order to make trendy changes in the future to stay current. He noted that it is an ever changing area of fitness and we need to react to that. He noted that he is very excited about this as the FCOB has managed to make the FC survive so this is long overdue. He noted that he is excited to see the results and it will be very beneficial for the financial operation of the FC.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the FCOB may have a plan that it could present to the Board within a month. He questioned if the first engineering review would be with the Township engineer. Mr. Luetchford answered that is the current plan at this time. Mr. Fleming answered that he would do his best. Mr. Crissman noted that you have done some excellent planning, structuring, and organizing and he wishes the FCOB well as it ventures into the next stage. He noted that he would appreciate being kept up to date so that is why he is pushing for one month.

Mr. Seeds noted that the consensus is to move forward. Mr. Hawk suggested that he heard that from the Board members comments.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if Mr. Luetchford has noticed an increase in business due to the on-line registration. Mr. Luetchford answered that Monday was the first full day so he is waiting

to hear back. He noted that he has yet to see a full outcome or report, it is too early. He noted that he will bring those statistics back to the Board as soon as he gets them.

Ms. Lindsey noted they were awarded the grant funds for the senior's floor, and she was wondering where that is going. Mr. Dougherty answered that staff has come up with a product that they think would meet the criteria that they were looking for. He noted that we are trying to contact contractors to get an estimate to determine if we need to bid it. He noted what we are looking at exceeds the amount of the grant, so we are trying to be competitive as far as trying to drive the costs down to see where we can come up with additional money. Ms. Lindsey questioned if the seniors would be donating money for the floor. Mr. Dougherty answered that they would be contributing some funds, about \$1,000. Ms. Lindsey stated that she thought it would be more than that.

Ms. Lindsey questioned what type of floor you may be looking at. Mr. Dougherty answered that he is not sure of the product name but it is a flexible flooring. He noted that the seniors are concerned about how sticky the floors are now so there is a coefficient of friction which is beyond his expertise. He noted that they have been looking at it in that context and apparently the product that they are coming up with meets the coefficient of friction that would make it less sticky and still usable. Ms. Lindsey questioned Mr. Luetchford if the seniors have any type of input with this. Mr. Luetchford answered yes. Ms. Lindsey noted that there was an issue with the walkers that some people couldn't come to the facility as they can't slide. She noted that they couldn't do the line dancing.

Action on the preliminary/final land development plan for Meadowview Village, Lot 1B

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has received a plan to develop an unimproved lot (1B) at the Meadowview Village site. He noted that the property is zoned IN, Institutional District and consists of 1.7431 acres and it proposes the construction of twelve independent living units in four separate buildings. He explained that the property is located on the south side of Union Deposit Road, west of the intersection of Union Deposit Road and Newside Road, and it will be served by public sewer and public water.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Planning Commission approved the plan to move forward to the Board of Supervisors at its January 7, 2015. He noted that the plan was granted the following

variances by the Zoning Hearing Board on October 23, 2014: 1) Requirement of 20% of the total community lands to be active or passive common open space; 2) Requirement that common open space shall at a minimum include landscaped trails that are ADA accessible; 3) Additional requirements of the Residential Retirement District, setbacks; and 4) use variance permitting the use of townhomes in the Residential Retirement District.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the applicant has requested the following waiver: The applicant is requesting a waiver for the requirement to provide a preliminary plan and this is supported by staff. He noted that there are five site specific conditions and ten general conditions.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Jeff Staub of Dauphin Engineering Co, is present to represent the plan for the applicant.

Mr. Jeff Staub noted that he prepared the plan for the Meadowview Village project. He noted that this is the last piece of the development as it sits on 1.7 acres and he is proposing 12 residential retirement living units. He noted from west to east he has two three unit buildings, a four unit building and a two unit building. He noted that he received the comments from Ms. Zerbe and Mr. Fleming and all those comments are relatively minor in nature and if we haven't already addressed them, we will address them.

Mr. Seeds noted that he is concerned about stormwater management noting that there was a retention pond on the northwest frontage of the lot and it is no longer there. He questioned if it was moved and do we have enough facilities to handle the stormwater. Mr. Staub answered that the last plan that the Board approved for this involved two medical office building and associated parking for that and that plan had some onsite stormwater facilities. He noted that the plan that is under consideration this evening has significantly less impervious coverage and he was able to design the stormwater collection system for this plan, noting that it will go into the existing large basin that is east of Meadowview Drive. Mr. Seeds noted that there was a basin facility, a small one, on the very northwest corner. Mr. Staub answered that it had to do with stormwater infiltration as it was not a basin. He noted with this plan, he is taking care of the infiltration in the existing basin as he made modifications to it. He noted that it is in the process of being approved by Dauphin County Conservation District concerning the NPDES permit. He noted that Mr. Fleming can speak to this as he signed off on this plan.

Mr. Seeds noted that obviously there will be sidewalks along Union Deposit Road. Mr. Staub answered that the sidewalk requirement was waived by the Board many years ago. Mr. Wolfe noted that it was waived as part of the original approval of the entire land development plan. Mr. Staub noted that the only waiver is for the requirement of the preliminary plan.

Mr. Seeds questioned if you meet all the parking requirements. Mr. Staub answered yes noting that he has two or three additional spaces over what is required. He noted that the rest of the Meadowview Village has an issue with lack of parking. He noted that this phase has additional parking.

Ms. Lindsey questioned what kind of landscaping would be along Union Deposit Road. Mr. Staub answered that there will be a small berm a few feet high and a mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees and shrubs.

Mr. Seeds noted that there is a problem with making a left turn out of the development but this phase does not address that issue. Mr. Staub answered no. Mr. Seeds noted that you almost can't make a left out of the development as you have to go right to go left. Mr. Staub answered that he travels Union Deposit Road in the morning and evening and during the peak hours it is difficult to make a left turn out of the development. Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Wolfe if this had any requirements for the traffic because we had an approved plan from years ago. Mr. Wolfe answered that this plan would have less traffic than the original plan that was approved.

Mr. Hawk noted when you exit the development to make a left turn you have a reasonable site distance from there to Twin Lakes Drive which is the next left. Mr. Seeds answered that you do but there is a lot of traffic on the road. Ms. Lindsey noted that it is not the site, it is the traffic at certain hours of the day. She suggested that it will be a nice addition to finish off the Meadowview Village.

Mr. Crissman questioned if we are going to take action this evening. Mr. Wolfe answered yes as it was an item that was scheduled for the business meeting that was cancelled due to the weather from last week. He noted that the Board is in public session and can take action this evening. He noted that it is a holdover from the last meeting and it would be appropriate to act this evening.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Staub was able to speak for the applicant. Mr. Staub answered yes.

Mr. Crissman noted that four variances were requested and you are in agreement that they had been completed or will be completed in accord with the Township staff. Mr. Staub answered yes. He noted that the variances were already granted.

Mr. Crissman noted that there is one waiver request that Mr. Staub is in agreement with as staff is supporting that waiver. Mr. Staub answered yes.

Mr. Crissman noted that there are five site specific conditions and he questioned if they are completed or will be completed in a timely fashion acceptable to staff. Mr. Staub answered yes.

Mr. Crissman noted that there are ten general conditions and specifically he will address number ten which is the letter from Steve Fleming with his 11 comments from HRG noting that they are completed or will be completed in a timely fashion acceptable to staff. Mr. Staub answered yes. Mr. Seeds noted that it would include the comments from GHD. Mr. Crissman agreed that it is part of his question.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the preliminary/final land development plan for Meadowview Village, Lot 1B with the four approved variances by the Zoning Hearing Board on October 23, 2014 and the following waivers and conditions: 1) A waiver for the requirement to provide a preliminary plan; 2) Provide a thickness for the concrete slab/stone base on the retaining wall detail. Also, it is recommended that the optional label on the drain pipe behind the wall be removed as it should be required; 3) Lighting fixtures should be provided at the intersection of Union Deposit Road/Meadowview Drive and at the defined crossings of the proposed walking path; 4) Address pedestrian access to the walking path along Eric Drive from Units; It is recommended that the walking path along Eric Drive be placed behind the curb and separated from the street by a 4' wide vegetated strip; 5) Address why the curb terminus locations to the west of Drive B were chosen and curb was not provided around the radius of Eric Drive to the access drive to Lots 102 and 103; 6) List all waivers on the coversheet that were approved in prior phases that are being carried over to this plan; 7) Plan approval shall be subject to providing original seals and signatures; 8) Plan approval shall be subject to the payment of engineering review fees; 9) Plan approval shall be subject to the establishment of an automatically renewable improvement guarantee for the proposed site improvements; 10) Plan approval shall be subject to the Dauphin County Conservation District's review and approval of

the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan; 11) Zoning Permit will be required prior to the erection of the proposed multi-unit dwellings; 12) Plan approval shall be subject to the recreational fee-in-lieu payment of \$,2320 for 12 units; 13) Administrative items to be completed prior to plan approval and recording: 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. 14) Once approved, final plan submissions shall include a scanned, full size (.pdf) copy and an electronic file of the complete plan set and any other technical plans on a compact disk (CD). The digital file shall comply with the requirements in Article 3, § 180-308. Digital Plan Requirements; and 15) Plan approval shall be subject to addressing all 11 comments of Steve Fleming, HRG, Inc. memo dated December 8, 2014 and Melissa Tomich Smith, GHD memo dated October 1, 2014. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Presentation by Martin Schoffstall regarding proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance as it pertains to Farm-Related Businesses

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Schoffstall is here this evening to discuss the Zoning Ordinance, specifically a section that relates to farm-related businesses. He noted that he provided a copy of the farm-related business section of the Zoning Ordinance. He noted the items to be deleted are in red ink and those to be added are in blue ink. He noted that this is the information that he has gained in discussions with Mr. Schoffstall for what he would like to eventually propose to the Board as potential amendments to the Township's Zoning Ordinance. He noted that Mr. Schoffstall has a presentation to make to the Board at this time.

Mr. Martin Schoffstall, owner of Spring Gate Vineyard, noted that he is not asking for any action at this time. He explained that he is asking the Board to take some time with him over the next few months to openly discuss some important changes. He noted what he is asking for at the highest level is a process to make a market alignment for the present and future to be competitive. He noted that the Farm-Related Business ordinances are dated and he suggested that some items should be removed and some should be added.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that agriculture has pre-emptive rights. He noted that agriculture law and use pre-dates municipalities, municipal zoning, and ordinances noting that there are grandfathering issues. He noted that it has immunity from township ordinances on nuisances and he is completely immune from suits from neighbors with regard to agricultural practices. He noted that PA 953, the Right to Farm Act states that: "Every municipality shall encourage the continuity, development and viability of agricultural operations within its jurisdiction."

Mr. Schoffstall noted that the two largest Pennsylvania industries are agriculture and tourism, noting that one out of six employees in the state is from agriculture and one in eight for tourism. He noted that they are well represented in Dauphin County but under represented in Lower Paxton Township. He noted that the Township borders two giants, HERCO and Hollywood Casino. He explained that artisan/craft wine and beer represent the merger of these two industries and they represent a high grown portion of both.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that some of the success stories elsewhere are Napa in California, Finger Lakes in New York and Central and Northern Virginia. He noted that there are many more and instead of taking farm land and converting it into residential housing, the corn and cows become grapes and hops and artisan/craft wine and beer. He noted that it is more of a skilled trade than a minimum wage retain model, and that it is happening throughout Central Pennsylvania, noting that as a state we are following New York and Virginia.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that a warning from a Penn State Report is as follows: "Local ordinances often prevent farmers from changing or expanding their operations, despite the prohibitions of state law. Since it is frequently necessary for farmers to expand their operations in order to generate sufficient income or provide opportunities for the next generation, ordinances that prevent expansion may constitute the fatal blow for many family farms." He noted that this property, under European management since 1750 predated the Township. He noted that it has been managed by three families of which he knew one other than his own.

Ms. Schoffstall noted that he had submitted for approval to the Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB) in February to have a brewpub on the farm in addition to a brewery, noting that both of these are Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (PLCB) terms. He noted that the brewpub allows him to glass artisan beer on site but required some minimal food, a hotdog, which no one will by.

He noted that the request led to a vocal minority to protest everything from beer to the building of houses, to the curves in the road.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that the PLCB has now ruled on breweries which he is permitted to have on his property. He noted that they will allow onsite glassing of artisan beers, and they will probably remove brewpubs as an issue of law. He noted that they know that their naming is bad and causes issues as per his discussion with them this past Tuesday.

Ms. Schoffstall noted that one of the discussion that came out of the ZHB meeting was the guests at these kinds of facilities. He noted that there was a group of people, a vocal minority, who constructed a scenario that is not what he experienced in that past year or the industry has experienced at all. He noted that artisan/craft winery-breweries tend to have upper middle class, one to two glass date night guests, that carry away wine and beer for home consumption. He noted that the wine or beer is not cheap and the environment tends to be more romantic/aesthetics. He noted that the average age is between 35-65 years of age and 50% to 70% are women. He noted that beer is the small tail on the big dog which is the wine.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that his goal is to move forward with the agricultural tourism and amend the Farm-Related Business Ordinance so that there are three to four Spring Gates winery/breweries in the Township. He noted that it would be subject to minimum acreages and lower impact on everything from water runoff to surge traffic. He noted that the traffic flow to these facilities is asymmetrical, the opposite of normal traffic flows. He noted that he would like to be able to provide additional capabilities in the Agricultural/Tourism.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that there is broad usage and support in the Township for what he is doing noting that the artisan/craft producers and sellers are not bars, and they are not Olive Gardens or Starbucks. He note that Township citizens flock to Spring Gate and other similar sites and there is broad support for them. He noted that saving land and historical sites, and having access to these sites are all part of what people are interested in and what communities want to be known for.

Mr. Schoffstall noted under Pennsylvania law, once you cross the perimeter of ten acres and \$10,000 you are agricultural land no matter what the zoning is. He noted that the minimum for state law is ten acres but from his perspective for the ordinance, ten acres have to be planted, and can be planted in a combination of things, wine grapes, hops or wheat. He noted that you can

spend tens of thousands of dollar to plant an acre of grapes and wait five years, noting that it is not exactly economic to remove the grapes in year five. He noted that his proposal would be required 25 acres of total holdings of which a minimum of ten acres must be planted. He noted that more acreage above the 25 acres would provide the operators more options.

Mr. Schoffstall questioned what relates to the Farm-Related Businesses noting that the wine, grapes, and hops are farm businesses. He noted if you accept those as agricultural businesses, what pairs with it. He suggested that it would be education, food, music, art, bed and breakfast, pizza and coffee. He noted education might sound strange until you are contacted by Harrisburg Area Community College (HACC) every semester, noting that they have people going through their viniculture program who want to be food scientists and they are looking for places that are close for interns. He noted that education becomes a component because of the proximity to HACC. He noted in terms of the community, everything from birthday, anniversary, retirement parties, wedding and wedding showers, baby showers and worship events are all things that can occur at this site. He noted that he can't stop them, noting when seven people show up with a cake who are in their 40's and they want to have a little birthday celebration, he goes up to them and says that he has a special regulation that they can't have the cake unless he gets a piece. He noted that these are what people think in terms of pairing with artisan/craft wine or beers.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that additions or options for the agricultural related businesses would be a small bed and breakfast, small restaurant or coffee house, medium size meeting facilities (6,000 square feet) or employee housing.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that he has been converting the buildings, some of which are historic, into these kinds of facilities. He noted that the hill barn became a winery, the tractor barn became a brewery, the 250-year old farm house becomes something and the 180-year old school house become a coffee shop. He noted that the five-acre site overlooking the vineyard as a meeting space. He noted that the advantages to the Township is an area of tax growth for at least Earned Income Tax (EIT), permanent township employment, natural water runoff management, improved values for adjacent homes, and being well known for something highly aesthetic instead of Costco's. He noted that some of his neighbors have thanked him, but no one has had a house overlooking the Napa area to find that the vineyard was a bad thing for them.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Schoffstall has a beautiful place and he would rather see some of these uses than 200 homes being built. He explained that he was not in attendance of either hearings, noting that the ZHB approves some uses at the earlier hearing but not at the second hearing. Mr. Seeds questioned what approvals he received from the first ZHB hearing. Mr. Schoffstall answered that the approval was to do large outside weddings. Mr. Seeds questioned if it was the second hearing that he lost, having something to do with a restaurant. Mr. Schoffstall answered their perception was that it was a restaurant issue. Mr. Seeds noted that the concerns of the residents basically from what he heard and what phone calls that he received, seemed to be a lot of concerns in regards to traffic. He noted that the intersection is a difficult one. He noted if we look at some of the uses, we need to look at how they can be corrected so that it does not create a problem for the safety of the intersection. He noted that it is a beautiful site for what he wants to do with it but there are some problems. He noted that we need to look at how to improve those concerns to make it more acceptable. He noted that there are a lot of things to look at to make it work. Mr. Schoffstall agreed and that is why he viewed that this conversation will go on for a long time.

Mr. Schoffstall explained that he discussed changing that intersection with the Township back in 1997 when he came with an engineering study for the whole place and the desire was not to change it by the Township. He noted that was then, but now it will be more difficult to make changes as PPL has made a massive investment of additional infrastructure at that intersection. He noted that the church has made much more masonry investments on the corner so it has become even more complex.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that what he is asking for, except for one thing, has next to no impact on that intersection. He noted that he has a farm house that goes back to 1750 and has five bedrooms. He noted that three would be appropriate for two people and two would be appropriate for one person. He noted that you couldn't find six people in the traffic that already appear to be coming and going. He questioned how many people a small restaurant would compare to the number who come to drink wine and beer, maybe 5 %. He noted that the only ones that are potentially large events are the meetings. He noted that he has five egresses to his property off of Devonshire and Devonshire Heights Roads, and he uses four of them every year, the fifth from time-to-time. He noted that almost all of them "T" off of other roads. He noted that

a medium size meeting facility which would be two and a half times the size of two houses, probably one would be one of those other events that you normally don't see. He noted that it should be engineered as appropriate, and that the rest of the things that he is talking about are probably pretty small.

Mr. Seeds noted he knew the owners of wineries in neighboring townships and they do have activities there, wine drinking and sometimes entertainment and they are very restricted for the hours that they can have events during the week because of noise and things like that. He noted that they have had difficult times with approvals and acceptance into the communities. Mr. Schoffstall questioned if he was speaking about the Hershey Winery. Mr. Seeds noted that the one he is speaking about is in West Hanover Township that is a small parcel that has similar activities and there have been difficulties out there. Ms. Schoffstall noted that this is a 60-acre estate, almost nothing in terms of noise escapes in any way. He noted that he has not had any complaints about music or noises, but he has had events in the last 20 years, he has had a dozen events with 500 plus people and he has never had any complaints.

Ms. Lindsey questioned where they all park when you have 500 people there. Mr. Schoffstall answered that he has multiple parking lots but on the grass. Ms. Lindsey noted that it is one way in and one way out and that is her concern. Mr. Schoffstall answered that he has two ways out. Ms. Lindsey questioned where is the other way to get out when you go in off of Devonshire Road. Mr. Schoffstall answered that technically you go in from Devonshire Heights Road at the T, his driveway is Devonshire Road circa 1967. He noted that it goes all the way out to Devonshire Road on the other side and we use it. Ms. Lindsey questioned if it is open as she has never seen it open before on the other end. Mr. Schoffstall answered that it definitely has been opened and closed. Ms. Lindsey questioned if there is a closure there. Mr. Schoffstall noted that his neighbors use it, generally using it for motorcycles, bike, buggies, and walking. Ms. Lindsey questioned when you have the 500 people there, are both entrances open, can they come in and go out both ways. Mr. Schoffstall noted that has not been the case so far in 20 years. Ms. Lindsey noted that she was born and raised out there when it was the Smith farm and it is a real bad intersection. She noted that the people coming out from the property find it difficult because you are looking in all directions, she questioned if there are statistics for how many accidents have occurred at that intersection. She noted that there will be an increase in traffic to add all of

these different things. She explained that she got a call from a resident that there are tour buses that have come back to your place. Mr. Schoffstall answered that is not true, maybe a small limousine. Ms. Lindsey noted that the increase for the usage, she had a call from a gentleman on Devonshire Road because of the dumpster, they are picking the trash up at 5:15 a.m. in the morning as it backs up to the property and she questioned will there be more constant disposing of the garbage. Mr. Schoffstall noted that it is an interesting position you took there. He noted that he would like to see the factual basis of that. He noted that he has a meeting Monday morning when the trash is picked up at 8 something... Ms. Lindsey explained that she is only telling him what the resident told her...Mr. Schoffstall noted if they did come at 5:15, it would be a breaking of their contract with him and the Township. Ms. Lindsey noted that we are having problems with that in the Township as they are picking up at 5 o'clock and we are trying to take care of that. Mr. Schoffstall noted that it is possible that once that happened, or twice, but generally he sees them every Monday morning come into the property after 8 a.m.

Mr. Hawk noted that there is an old saying, that the camel puts his nose under the tent. He noted that all of a sudden the tent becomes a motel and a hotel and that would be his concern. He noted that he would not want a brew house to turn into a Budweiser brewery. Mr. Schoffstall answered, neither would he. Mr. Hawk noted you mentioned a coffee house and all of a sudden you have a Starbucks and where does it stop. Mr. Schoffstall answered that is what the ordinances are about, what are the parameters for those things. He noted now, in the current ordinance, he can have 300 or 400 parked vehicles that he is working on to do welding work on. He noted that he could be like Meineke on Route 22 which parks almost on the sidewalk. He noted that the ordinances need to be amended to remove certain things at a minimum, but what he is trying to do is to add what he thinks are low impact things. He noted that the brewery and the winery are protected under law and they are approved under the context of the law within the ordinances. He noted that is the big dog, people will come for that. He noted that what entrance or exit that they take is subject to some reasonability on his part, noting that he has a plan for that and believes that the Township would agree with his plan for that protected operation.

Ms. Schoffstall noted that last year according to his numbers, 9,000 unique people showed up at the farm, whether that is a good number or bad number from the Township's perspective, he does not know, but that is the factual basis. He noted that anything related to

three or four rooms or ten tables is probably going to be lost in those kinds of numbers. He noted that it will not have an impact. He noted that the question for the Board is the Township looking at the tax numbers for the Township for the last ten years and new home starts in terms of permits, the Township is down from 2007, 50% and EIT is down for the first time by \$200,000 which had steady growth. He noted that the Township's focus on the model of retail which is being killed by Amazon and building homes in the future is what he is bringing up. He noted that HERCO, the State of Pennsylvania, and Hollywood Casino are spending tens of millions of dollars to bring people into West Hanover Township, into Hershey, and we are at the border of that, so do we want to participate in that, do you want to encourage people to bring in these kind of facilities on 50 or 60 acres and put down \$20 million and build these kind of facilities subject to a set of ordinances versus turning this into residential homes that in his case, he mitigates the water of the people surrounding him. He noted that he is the sponge for all the houses surrounding him, and has been wiped out by building poorly designed detention ponds. He noted for him it is better to have an agricultural component in the town moving forward from the perspective of growth opportunity than a whole bunch of other issues.

Mr. Seeds noted that he agrees that Mr. Schoffstall is a sponge noting that he would sooner see what Mr. Schoffstall is trying to do over development as it would create more storm water issues and we are aware of all of those problems in the Township, especially with the 500-year storm issue. He questioned how we handle the traffic and conditions. He noted that sometimes instead of having the minimums you need to look at changing or adding something noting that you should have to have a certain amount to allow what you are attempting to do. He noted that the big issue would be the road condition. He noted that we need to work to address that. He questioned how you would do that. Ms. Schoffstall answered that he may have misstated this rather poorly, the acreage things is what you just said, it is you can't do it unless you have a lot of acreage, that was the point he was trying to make. Mr. Seeds noted that he was reading things of three to five acres, so he would not want anyone with five acres to try to do what you are trying to do. Mr. Hornung noted that is the way it is written, you have to have a minimum of 25 acres, and if you wanted to put a bed and breakfast, you would have to have another five acres then it would be 30 acres. He noted that it is not that you can have five acres only to run a bed and breakfast. He noted that it would have to be 30 acres. Mr. Seeds questioned if you would

have to add those altogether. Mr. Hornung answered that is correct, you have to start with 25 acres as a base in order to add on.

Mr. Seeds questioned how many acres would Mr. Schoffstall have to have to do all that he wants to do. Mr. Hornung answered that he does not know what he wants to do but if wanted to add a coffee house he may have to have an additional ten acres over the base 25 acres. He noted that we have the ability to write the numbers into the ordinance. He noted that Mr. Schoffstall is looking more for the concept. He noted, if for example, we say that he can have a restaurant or a coffee house, we don't want a Starbucks, so how do we write the ordinance so you can have a small coffee house but not a Starbucks. He noted that you limit it so it stays within reason. Mr. Seeds questioned if that would be constitutional, noting that he would have to ask the solicitor. Mr. Hornung noted that he should not have used the word Starbucks, so that it does not turn into a large commercial chain. Mr. Seeds noted that we don't want an ACE Hardware. Mr. Hornung noted that is correct. He noted that right now he could move his work of repairing tractors and mowers from his business on Mountain Road to Mr. Schoffstall's place. He noted that he could move that operation over to his farm. He noted that he shouldn't have used the word Starbucks, the key is that it not be a large commercial operation, but a small commercial business that would enhance it, so it should not be a coffee house that you would go to for only coffee, but rather an extension of the wine tasting.

Mr. Seeds questioned what we do about the traffic. Mr. Hornung noted that has to be worked out. He noted that he already stated that he has 9,000 people coming and going for what is already permitted, he may have another 500 or 1,000, and he agreed that there should be some effort on his part for traffic solutions. Mr. Seeds noted if the land was developed, that would be another number for traffic, but there is a traffic condition due to the nasty intersection.

Mr. Hawk noted that the entire ordinance needs to be looked at. Mr. Seeds suggested that we should get the neighbors involved as it has worked in the past noting that they need to talk about what is best for the community.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that beyond him, the last facility that went in was called Wyndridge Farms in York County and they invested \$20 million. He suggested that the last \$20 million investment in the Township was Costco. He noted that you would want three or four of these wineries in the town, to tap into the tens of millions of dollars that are being spent in marketing

to bring people into the region. He noted that you could place them wherever you want to place them but you need ordinances that encourage people to make these investments. He noted that the retail investments are getting more and more difficult as Amazon is much more powerful than it was ten years ago. He noted that creating things that are providing local products, in the local setting is the future, whether you are 30, 50 or 60 years of age as it is what people seem to want to be able to do. He noted that he can't do anything about the traffic in terms of that intersection as it is an incredible complex place. He noted that getting PPL to move their equipment at that location would probably take ten years to make it happen. He noted that the church's investment at that intersection is great. He noted that he will be putting up a sign on his property in a week or two to alert people to the traffic laws.

Mr. Crissman noted that there are two issues, the first being the ordinance in that we have to address it not from a standpoint for what is best for Mr. Schoffstall, but what is best for the Township. He noted that would be his first priority. He noted that the second comment is in regard to the concept, noting that wineries are very popular. He explained that he has an acquaintance who is directly involved and someone who is involved with one in another county in Pennsylvania, both owning farms, and they have had difficulty making a profit. He noted that they converted part of their farms into wineries, and one in particular is contiguous with a brand new housing development where traffic was a major issue. He noted that the entrance to the farm is in the development so the people living there were very much concerned, however that has eased considerably since the people who live in the development will walk over to the winery and bring their own food. He noted that they are very pleased but he questioned if they would be pleased if there was a restaurant there, probably not as it would increase traffic. He noted that the other location that he is familiar with, they do have access from a road, but they are not allowed to have a restaurant. He noted that part of the concept that Mr. Schoffstall introduced to the Board is viable and it would be nice for the community to have. He noted at this point in time, he is not sure if he is ready to move to the next piece which is the restaurant piece. He noted that whatever we do here has to be based upon the best interest of the community. He noted that we should continue with the discussions. Mr. Seeds questioned if we should discuss this in two months. Mr. Crissman noted that the Board has to determine how it wants to address the ordinance and how it should be changed to meet the needs of the community.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that under the Right to Farm Act the Board should encourage the continuity of agriculture for viability. He noted what he heard at the last meeting was “shut you down” which was opposite from some of parties present. He noted that he has a son that wants to continue with the farm which is a goal. He noted that his family has been in the Township since the 1940’s, he lived here in the 1960’s and back again in the 1990’s. He noted that he is invested locally, so he is not intending to move once he is done. He explained that he does not plan to build residential houses and moving out of town, he wants to live here with his neighbors.

Mr. Hawk noted that he is intrigued with the concept and it can work if we work out the necessary parameters. He noted that he is familiar with the wineries from Clover Hill to Vine Crest and to ones in Halifax and Erie, none of them sell food. Mr. Schoffstall explained that the Hershey winery was approved by Londonderry Township to sell food. He suggested that ultimately, many will be approved for food as there is a desire by certain places to become competitive. He noted that he is not competitive now; will it shut him down, no, but if the Township wants to recruit the next three people to invest \$20 million you will have to construct a competitive scenario for them.

Mr. Hawk noted that his concern is very similar to Mr. Crissman’s as he does not want to see people after church stating, “Let’s go to Schoffstall’s for lunch”. Mr. Schoffstall responded that he does not want a big restaurant kind of thing. Mr. Hawk noted that we need to take some time to look at the ordinance.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Wolfe if he has some suggestions for where to go from here. Mr. Wolfe answered if the Board provides him direction he can put it on paper.

Mr. Dick Stottlemeyer, 96 Eric Drive, questioned where the Devonshire Road property is located. He questioned if it was where the Republican Party held its event with Lynn Swan. Mr. Schoffstall answered yes, but prior to that it was where the Democratic Party held its event. Mr. Stottlemeyer noted that he had no problems getting in or out of the place and wanted to verify that is where it was as no one explained where it was located.

Mr. Crissman noted as far as the winery piece, you have already been doing that. Mr. Schoffstall answered yes as he has been doing it for 51 weeks and the brewery will start up in another four to six weeks. He noted that he has been doing large events, political events, and weddings for 20 years. He noted that there has been a lot of traffic in and out in the past. Mr.

Seeds noted that technically, some of those events were illegal. Mr. Schoffstall suggested that illegal might be a little strong, noting that having an event at your home and having the Township decide what you can or cannot have may be a constitutional issue. He noted that he did not think that he broke any ordinances or did anything illegal by having the young people of Devonshire Church have their parties at his place for the last 20 years. Mr. Hawk noted that church is right across the street from your farm. He noted that he did not think that he broke any ordinances when the church had some really large funerals and he let them park on his property. He noted that he did not think that he broke any laws yet as that would be his position.

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Schoffstall has been doing the wine, it is within the statutes and limitations of the law currently. Mr. Schoffstall answered that he thinks so as he hasn't had any complaints per say about those issues.

Mr. Hornung noted that he thinks Mr. Schoffstall is looking to acquire some additional ancillary type operations to add to but are not in themselves as a standalone business. He suggested if the Board is okay with it he has an idea of what Mr. Schoffstall wants to achieve, he would like to structure an ordinance to provide an idea for what Mr. Schoffstall wants. He noted that a winery and a brew tasting is borderline depending on the amount of business as it is a fair weather business so you still have some down time where you don't have any business, so it is a difficult business at best. He suggested that Mr. Schoffstall is looking at other means to attract business in the winter time during the down time. He noted that he would structure an ordinance and then review it.

Mr. Hawk noted if you are willing to take a first crack at it, as he reads the ordinance, we have red lines through it and it doesn't mean anything to him. He noted what we need to do is exactly what you are talking about, is to make it in such a way that it provides specific direction. Mr. Crissman noted what he thought we were looking at was the ordinance and that Mr. Schoffstall and Mr. Wolfe met and we have the red that was crossed out and anything that was to be added was in blue. He suggested that the next step, if the Board agrees that it wants to look at the ordinance, would be to start to go through it and have Mr. Schoffstall explain why we have the blue and the red. He noted that Mr. Schoffstall is asking the Board to look at the current ordinance that we have, as well as the adds, changes and deletes. He suggested that it will take time to go through it. He noted that we need to keep in mind that it is not solely for Mr.

Schoffstall but for what is in the best interest in the Township. Mr. Hornung noted that he has also thought of some additional items that he may want to look at, such as a tobacco room. He noted that Mr. Schoffstall may not want to do it but someone else may.

Mr. Hawk questioned for farm or vehicle repair, he wondered why Mr. Schoffstall crossed that out of the ordinance. Mr. Hornung noted that he does not want to see a farm-related business where you have a repair shop with welding and hammering and those types of things going on; where you are repairing tractors as a business noting that it could be done. He suggested that it needs to be removed. He noted that it may be okay to do that in the middle of Bedford but we don't have any areas in the Township where we would want to have farm related equipment repaired as a business as a frequent thing. He noted when he looked at the ordinance, he was interested in reviewing it knowing that some uses need to be removed.

Mr. Crissman noted that we have some farms in the Township who probably sell produce and other things which they are allowed to do. and sooner or later we will need some input from them as well.

Mr. Seeds noted that this all sounds really good but we are not addressing the traffic issues.

Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Schoffstall if he grows grapes on his farm. Mr. Schoffstall answered yes. Mr. Hawk questioned how he harvested the grapes. Mr. Schoffstall answered that he does it by hand. Mr. Hawk noted that a large commercial vineyard that grows a lot of grapes has a machine harvester. Mr. Schoffstall noted that it depends on what type of grape it is. He noted if it is a Concord or Niagara grapes that are grown in the Erie area it is mechanical harvesting, but for a Cabernet Sauvignon or Merlot it is very rare in the East Coast. Mr. Hawk suggested if Mr. Schoffstall would be getting into those kinds of grapes he may need the opportunity to repair something. Mr. Schoffstall noted as he understands the ordinances what that strikeout means is that he would be able to repair his equipment but he would not be allowed to drag in everyone else's equipment to repair it. He noted as a farmer, under the Agricultural Act in the State of Pennsylvania, he is permitted to repair his own equipment similar to anyone being allowed to repair their own car in their garage.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that he would like to come back to the bed and breakfast option, noting that it is the number one request he gets after beer. He explained that he met with the State

Association of Bed and Breakfasts and there are 173 Bed and Breakfasts in Lancaster County and only one in Dauphin County. He noted when he and his wife visits these places such as the Finger Lakes or Northern Virginia, they stay at Bed and Breakfasts, as he not looking for a hotel experience. He noted that there are many places in this Township that would make great Bed and Breakfasts locations, noting that the Township has an ordinance that covers it. He noted that it is an interesting request that he gets. He questioned if it would be bad if the Township had two or three artisan/craft beer places and they encouraged the conversion of some homes, subject to the ordinances, especially historic houses in the Township, whether it is Linglestown, Colonial Park, or Paxtonia into Bed and Breakfasts. He suggested that it would be a good thing. He noted that there are a number of places in the Township that would make great Bed and Breakfasts.

Ms. Lindsey noted if we change the zoning ordinance then it would allow Mr. Schoffstall to do what the Zoning Hearing Board said that he could not do and what the 50 or 60 people that were present at the Zoning Hearing Board meeting were against. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would depend on what the amendment would say. He noted what Mr. Schoffstall applied for was the right to serve food in regard to the agricultural operation. He noted that it was denied by the Zoning Hearing Board as it was viewed as a restaurant activity. He noted if the Township amends the zoning ordinance to include the farm-related business having a restaurant activity by right, then it would negate the need for the Zoning Hearing Board on that item.

Mr. Schoffstall noted that he has other ways of selling food on the farm that are legal. He explained that he raises chickens and he can make chicken and egg sandwiches and it would be very difficult for the Township to make the case that he could not sell them. He noted that he is going through the process to do what is the norm of the industry versus chasing chickens and making chicken salad sandwiches. He noted that the norm of the industry is to take frozen hot dogs, as it is a restaurant use, and never take them out of the freezer as the PLCB only wants you to have the ability to sell food, not to actually do it. He noted, in his letter to the Township to Mr. Wolfe, he has committed to doing no more than frozen hot dogs for the brewpub using a \$55 microwave oven. He noted that sent a message to a lot of people around the area in terms of people who invest. He noted that it was not the perfect message to send. He noted when he told this to litigating lawyers who work for the other wineries and breweries they asked him if he was

kidding. He noted that they have never seen this in the State of Pennsylvania as the Township is unique.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Hornung offered to take a crack at revising the ordinance. Mr. Hornung noted that Mr. Crissman would prefer that we go over the ordinance and sit down with Mr. Schoffstall to discuss his proposal and work our way through it. Mr. Crissman noted that we could add more ideas to the proposal. Mr. Seeds noted that we could do it as part of a workshop session and the public can come and make comments

Mr. Schoffstall noted that the Board could say that I can't add anything but it should remove some things that are currently in the ordinance because he has a problem with people who have agricultural land that wanted to set up a car business beside him. He noted that is not what he would want either. He noted that he has tried to be careful with his dumpster, noting that he has had one since he bought the property 1995. He noted that he just heard two weeks ago that he has a problem. He noted that the dumpsters in the back of the Township's parking lot are probably about 45 feet from adjacent houses, while his are more like 1,200 feet.

Mr. Seeds noted that there are people who love parks but when we go to put up a new park or add to it, they object to it as they don't want it in their back yard. He noted that they want it but not in their back yard. He noted that they don't want a shopping center or stores on Route 22 but they love the convenience of being able to drive there in five minutes. He noted that it is the same thing for a winery, they want to go there but they don't want it in their back yard. Mr. Schoffstall noted of the 50 or 60 people who were at the Zoning Hearing Board meeting, there were ten people who had complaints, it was not 50 or 60. He noted as an entrepreneur, everything he has ever done since 1982 has been in opposition to the way things were done in the past.

Mr. Seeds noted that there have been a lot of good comments and Mr. Hawk noted that he would not want to see it twirl into something that is endless and commercial. He noted that the traffic is a concern for him and many others and he does not know how to address that.

Mr. Hawk noted if you go to the Finger Lakes, try the Trimmer House in Penn Yan as the owner teaches hospitality at Utica College.

Mr. Crissman noted in trying to bring this to closure, we need to decide if we want to address this ordinance in workshop and if so, should we address it as it has been submitted and

review it. He noted that it would take some time to do it. He questioned do we want to address it. Mr. Hawk noted that we have come this far and he thinks the Board wants to address this. Mr. Crissman noted that he is in favor of addressing it. Ms. Lindsey noted that she has a lot of questions. Mr. Crissman noted that we need to set aside time in the Workshop and begin to go through it. He noted that he has many questions as well as there are many adds, changes and deletes to the copy.

Mr. Hawk noted that we should discuss it. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would put it on the agenda for the April 14th workshop meeting. Mr. Crissman suggested that we should subdivide it into sections to work through it or should we require a special meeting just to work on it. Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Wolfe could determine that based upon how busy the schedule is for the workshop meeting. Mr. Seeds stated, let's start the discussion at the April 14th meeting.

Mr. Schoffstall thanked the Board for its time and for staff's time as well.

Change Orders No. 4 through 7 to the contract with
Michael F. Ronca & Sons, Inc., for the 2014 Storm sewer project

Mr. Robbins noted that Change Orders 4 through 7 were part of the 2014 Storm Sewer project that is ongoing at this point. He noted that the Pearl Street Change Order Number 4 involved replacing an upstream headwall. He noted that was a very simple project as the cross pipe was in very good shape as the endwall had pulled away from the pipe and it was a safety issue in the legal right-of-way that had to be addressed. He noted during the construction period it was discovered that there was an inlet on the downstream side into the pipe that we did not know was as it was covered with eight inches of decomposed leaves and asphalt. He noted when the contractor pulled that material off, it was discovered that the inlet was in very poor shape and staff began looking at the constructability of the inlet and how it was tied to the existing pipe. He noted that it was found that the last pipe section was pulling away from the inlet. He noted that it was not a standard inlet where a pipe comes in one side and goes out the other. He noted since we had a significant investment on the other side of the road he asked Mr. Fleming to prepare a change order to have the pipe removed, stabilize the outfall, and reinstall a new downstream endwall.

Ms. Lindsey questioned, in regard to the downstream, it stated that to remove and replace a mailbox cost \$1,000. She noted when the snowplow hits a mailbox we only provide \$50 for a

replacement. Mr. Robbins answered that it was a cluster of mailboxes. Ms. Lindsey noted that the change order only reads for one. Mr. Robbins answered that he did not know what we paid for the mailbox but he knows that there were a cluster of three mailboxes. Ms. Lindsey noted that it only states one mailbox with a unit price of \$1,000. Mr. Robbins noted that he will verify what that expense was for.

Mr. Robbins noted Change Order Number 5 involved temporary paving. He noted that he tried to minimize the amount of temporary paving to control costs and through the course of the contract several of the projects, the three that are listed, Bradford, Tee and Marblehead Streets were delayed for weather related issues and or utility relocation. He noted that there was an extensive amount of utility relocations in these projects. He noted that the projects were delayed too far into the paving season and the contractor was unable to perform the final restoration work. He noted that the trenches could not be left open over the winter time due to the plowing necessitating the change order to do the temporary paving to keep the roads in good repair until the final restoration work was completed in 2015. Ms. Lindsey questioned if Mr. Robbins had a hard time with the temporary paving and the plowing on those road. Mr. Robbins answered that he did not as he spent the money to restore them in a proper temporary fashion.

Mr. Robbins noted that the engineer approached him on the onset of the program concerning the guide rail replacement eastbound on Earl Drive. He explained that he tries to keep a storm project a storm project instead of it growing into a guide rail or a curb or a sidewalk project. He noted that it was a widening project, where we lined a pipe underneath Earl Drive since it could not be replaced. He noted when the project was completed, he had installed several hundred feet of new guiderail on the north side of the road. He noted after the guiderail was installed, it was realized how non-compliant it was on the south side of the roadway. He noted that it was unsafe, as the guiderail has to be 32 to 37 inches above the roadway and the guiderail was about 18 to 20 inches high. He noted, at that height, it would not stop a car as it is designed. He noted when we looked to replace the guiderail, one of the things that came into play was the end treatment that was existing, there was a new and improve end treatment that HRG's traffic department had recommended that we take the guide rail further off the road and tie it into the bank which would prevent a car coming from the eastbound getting behind the guiderail and

ending up in the culvert. He noted that we replaced 166 feet of guiderail and tied it into the bank to prevent a car from getting behind the guiderail.

Mr. Robbins noted that change order number seven concerns the Marblehead Street work. He noted that there was a pipe at the end of Marblehead Street at Dartmouth that ran from an existing box to an existing box north to south across the roadway. He noted when the contractor was installing the pipe that was scheduled under the contract, he discovered that the cross bite was not in as good of shape as he thought it was and we discussed replacing the pipe. He noted from a construction standpoint, it is a very simple process as we planned to replace 40 to 45 feet of pipe but it was a little bit more of a challenge in that they had tried to tie it into an existing box, taking corrugated metal pipe out which has an outside diameter and installed a new plastic pipe, so there was a little bit of work for the contractor to get the pipe installed into the two existing structures.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the total amount of the change order is \$103,781.00. He noted that the Township Engineer has also reviewed them and found them to be acceptable and has reviewed the submissions from the contractor. He noted that this was an item that was scheduled for the last business meeting that was carried forward due to the cancellation of that meeting.

Mr. Hawk questioned if they are reasonable amounts. Mr. Fleming answered that he can address some of the questions regarding the mailbox and other items. He noted that the change order is not always broken down into further detail as the contractors put project costs into items that are not necessary related so the unit price might appear to be inflated for that one particular item but it might actually cover something that is not necessarily listed in that change order. He noted that a mailbox replaced for \$1,000 might actually cover some part of mobilization or another item that was not broken out separately. He noted that often times when he reviews a change order he will see prices that are a little higher than if you have a very detailed breakout. He noted that he hopes that it helps to explain why one or two of those items seem higher. He noted that the Marblehead pipe unit prices were higher than you would typically see for that diameter of pipe but it was a single line item change order, so it took care of taking the old pipe out, modifying the existing boxes, installing the new pipe, backfilling and restoring the trench so there were several operations that were included in that one item.

Mr. Seeds noted that you could probably find some documentation noting that it would have been a wall or multi-mailboxes or some sort of explanation for the cost. Mr. Seeds requested Mr. Fleming to get a good explanation of the \$1,000 cost for the mailbox replacement. Mr. Fleming answered that he would. Mr. Crissman noted that he assumed that it was one of those multi-unit mailboxes that has 25 boxes on it. Mr. Seeds noted that we have some in neighborhoods, especially in Forest Hills, that are big brick mailboxes that could cost a lot more than that. Ms. Lindsey noted if it would have been in Forest Hills she would not have questioned it.

Mr. Seeds noted if one of the equipment operators hits a mailbox and it is proven that they struck it, then the Township pays \$50 to replace it. He noted that is why \$1,000 sounds like a lot of money.

Mr. Fleming noted that he would be happy to provide additional explanation for that cost.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Board has expressed this with the Sewer Authority that change orders have to come down. He noted that we have a lot going on and that is why we have to write some of them off, and that is why they are such large amounts of money. He noted that he does not want to be known for being a Township where the contractors know that they can bid low and get change orders. He noted that it is scary when you see replacement of a mailbox for \$1,000. He noted that looking at some of their line items that are listed as \$5,000, why is it not \$4,630. He noted that worries him when he see those kinds of numbers, as they are rounded up or rounded down; normally things get rounded up and not down. He noted that he does not want them to play a game to state that mobilization is \$9,683, but when he sees a whole list of items like that, there are a lot of zero's and too many zero's for one change order in his book. He noted that the whole thing concerns him and the fact that we are getting more change orders than normal, but it may not be normal since we did a huge amount of work last year, more than the Township has ever done before, so it may just be relative and it is not that great of a percentage, but it is starting to worry him.

Mr. Fleming noted as Mr. Robbins indicated, we also limit what we authorized under a change order as there is always more work to be done, and the contractor is always looking for more opportunities to do work. He noted that he evaluated each project before the bid and picked stuff and when you get into construction, sometimes the stop point that you thought that you

were going to go to during construction does not seem like the best project. Mr. Hornung questioned if it can be done to project potential problems ahead of time and if this is encountered, he would like to have a bid price for it, knowing that it may or may not be an issue. He suggested that it should be stipulated in the bid that it would be a potential concern and that they must supply a price if it comes up. Mr. Fleming noted that we could bid alternates, like a temporary paving line item. He explained that he anticipated that the project would be completed before the paving deadline this year, but we had a delay due to the utility relocation on several of the projects that we couldn't get in and finish the work in time. He noted that it was a justified delay to the contractor and something that was not anticipated. He noted in the future, he will add that to the bid as an alternate or as a smaller quantity so he has a price in the event that it would go over the winter for completion.

Mr. Robbins noted that the only risk in doing what you are suggesting, is that it is another line item for a contractor to bury costs. He noted that HRG does a good job with that but you have to be very careful. Mr. Hornung noted that he did not understand. Mr. Robbins explained when a contractor fills out the bid tabulations, he is putting money in one item versus another. He noted that he may put money into the pipe because he got a good cost for pavement or restoration. He noted that it is a potential for the contractor to find another place to hide the costs. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is the unbalance bid item that you see in the sewer projects all the time where they load up their paving dollar amount knowing that Lower Paxton Township probably underestimated the amount of paving. He noted if you are not careful on your quantities and you have extra line items in the bid you can get yourself caught. He noted that we learned a hard lesson on the sewer projects and we are still adjusting that.

Mr. Robbins noted that he wished he had a dollar for everytime he told Mr. Ronca that we were not going to do what he wanted us to do. He noted that it is a constant battle and we tried very hard to keep our costs in control with what we were doing in the contract. He noted that it is very easy for a contractor to suggest what they want to do and he tried very hard to stay with what he wanted to accomplish.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would need a motion to approve the change orders.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Change Orders 4 through 7 in the amount of \$103,781 as presented by Mr. Wolfe and staff. Mr. Seeds second the motion. Mr. Hornung noted

that he would like to get a definition of the mailbox issue before approving the change orders. He asked Mr. Fleming to explain it in more detail for what it is for. He noted that he would vote no for that reason. Mr. Crissman noted with that discussion he would be more than happy to withdraw the motion at this time until we have further clarification. Mr. Wolfe noted that we will get an answer on the mailbox and put the actual change orders on the next meeting agenda.

Resolution 15-07; authorizing the submission of a Green Light Go grant application to PennDOT for traffic signal improvements at the intersection of U.S. 22 and Devonshire Road

Mr. Robbins noted that the Green Light Go program has two legs, one that is funded through the Act 89 Highway Transportation Bill and the other is through PennDOT projects that are designed for critical corridors. He noted that Route 22 is a critical corridor. He explained that the Green Light Go program requires a 50% match for whatever project you are proposing. He noted that staff decided to apply for the Devonshire Road and Route 22 intersection which involves taking the span wire intersection and replacing it with mast arms. He noted that the intersection has span wires that are aging, noting that many of the signal heads have been replaced last year, taking down the heavy metal ones and replacing them with poly signals to reduce the strain on the existing span wire. He noted that the cabinet was replaced this year as part of the adaptive program and the control was replaced in 2013. He noted if we were to get this funding, roughly a \$300,000 project, with the Township's match of about \$150,000 or \$160,000, it would basically be like new. He noted that it will also be rewired.

Mr. Crissman questioned what the Township's competition would be for receiving the grant. Mr. Robbins answered that he did not know the answer to that question. Mr. Wolfe noted that we are vying with many other municipalities but you are also in a very high volume corridor, dealing with a signal equipment that needs to be upgraded; it should be very competitive.

Mr. Robbins suggested this should be to the Township's benefit as it would make the intersection safer, reduce overall maintenance over the life of the intersection and provide better visibility for the motoring public.

Mr. Crissman suggested that the issues that were addressed should help to move our project high in the priority of projects. Mr. Wolfe noted as long as funds are available under this program, we plan on submitting a grant application every year to upgrade a worthy candidate as

we have many of them. He noted that this item was on last week's agenda for approval that needs official action by way of a resolution.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Resolution 15-07 to submit an application to the Green Light Go program with PennDOT. Mr. Hornung seconded the motion. Ms. Lindsey questioned what the turn around after applying for the grant is. Mr. Wolfe suggested that we should have notice in June, after which the project would have to be engineered. He suggested that the work would be done next year. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Review of the CAP COG Stormwater Program to prepare
a regional Chesapeake Bay Pollutant Reduction Plan

Mr. Robbins wanted to explain why this is required and then get into the meat and potatoes of one of the items. He noted that the Township is a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Community operating under an Act 13 Permit. He noted that one of the stipulations under that permit is for the Township to develop and implement a Chesapeake Bay Pollutant Reduction Plan (CBPRP). He noted that the objective of the CBPRP is to ultimately show tangible improvements to what you are discharging to the waters of the Commonwealth, ultimately the Chesapeake Bay. He noted that is why the plan is required. He noted that these plans are technically challenging, very time consuming and expensive. He noted the reason we want to do this through the CAP COG is to save some money by not having a duplication of effort.

Mr. Robbins noted in September of last year the COG advertised a Request for Qualifications, and received seven or nine proposals. He noted that Mr. Wolfe asked him to be on the selection committee and they narrowed the choices to four different firms and selected Pennoni Associates to write the plan. He noted that Pennoni was very active in the York County Plan that has now been approved. He noted that the firm is required to do a lot of things, but in the end the engineer has to bring a plan that Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) would implement. He noted that DEP has input through the entire process. He noted that the Township's plan would be stamped approved and we would follow what is outlined in the plan. He noted if West Hanover Township would be in the plan, they would follow their plan.

Mr. Robbins noted that the scope of services was narrowed down to four tasks and he would like to focus on the second task which is the physical development of the pollution reduction plan. He noted that it consists of the gathering and collection of data that will happen in a quick time period. He noted that Pennoni will develop a spreadsheet that would have data that would include the Township's MS4 status, land use, stream miles, and other data. He noted that the sewer and stormwater projects could buy some potential credit for the Township. He noted that we are doing a lot of that and it needs to be included in the process. He explained that Green Infrastructure, (GI), is something that they would want to consider. He noted that Environment Site Design, (ESD) would also be things that they would consider. He noted that they would use this data in step one and plug it into one of two models. He suggested that they will use the Chesapeake Bay Assessment Scenario tool (CAST).

Mr. Robbins noted that the model would predict what the loading requirements would be for watersheds. He noted, based upon the loading, they will tell the Township what it has to do to take it out of the waters. He noted that it is a simple process but there may be some people in the process who may feel that the model is not the way to go; however, York County did it and they seem to be very confident with both the models as they work very well. He noted in step four they would take what the model puts out for the amount of pollution that we would have to remove and establish a gauge and then they would identify projects that would be Best Management Practices (BMP) related. He noted that they would review existing resources such as watershed plans and what hasn't been done that would reduce stream loading. He noted that they would conduct yield assessments to identify potential future BMP locations such as stormwater retrofit, recharging infiltration, and repairing buffers, such as what was done on Dowhower Road. He noted that planting trees along streams is very effective in keeping streams from causing further stream degradation. He noted that other items include impervious disconnection stream restoration and a whole list of items.

Mr. Robbins noted that the model would come out of this and they would derive different types of BMP protocols that would help the Township achieve what you need to do as part of the plan. He noted in the final phase, they would take the plan and finalize it with DEP's blessing and the Township would have a CBPRP that has been done through a collaborative effort in order to save the Township some money.

Mr. Hawk noted that the letter was addressed to Ms. Simonetti, Deputy Director of the CAPCOP and when he got to the price of \$119,500 he questioned if that price would be split with other municipalities. Mr. Robbins answered that the cost per municipality is going to depend on the size of the municipality, stream miles. Mr. Seeds noted that the COG is hoping to get 12 to participate as it would put the price to roughly \$10,000 each. He noted that next Monday, the COG will be taking a vote and he will have to indicate if the Township will participate in it. He noted the more that participate in the project, the cheaper it will be. Mr. Robbins noted that the total cost of the plan will be divided by the number of participants. He questioned if a larger municipality should pay more than someone like Hummelstown. He suggested that the answer is yes.

Mr. Hornung questioned what would happen if everyone voted no. Mr. Robbins answered that he will tell you if that happens. He noted that he has heard anywhere from 12 to 20 may participate or less than 12 who may vote to participate. Mr. Seeds noted that the decision for how to split up the cost has not been made and if we were the only one who voted to participate that we would not have to sign to pay \$119,000.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board is not being asked to approve a contract but to indicate by consensus if it wants to participate in the CAPCOG program. Mr. Crissman noted that he endorses the concept. Mr. Wolfe questioned if it was okay for him to let the COG know that the Township is willing to participate under the parameters set forth by Mr. Robbins. Mr. Seeds noted that is the motion. Mr. Crissman made that motion and Mr. Seeds seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Review of HRG proposal to perform site engineering in
regard to the proposed expansion of the Public Works building

Mr. Wolfe noted that we have a conceptual plan to design and construct an addition to the Public Works Building as well as move a baseball field, and potentially construct on Township land by Dauphin County a Magisterial District Justice Office. He noted in the discussions with the sports organizations that are involved in using the ball field, the Township pledged to them that we would begin to move forward on the site grading and finish it in the early fall of this year so that the ball field could be playable in the spring of 2016. He noted with

that in mind, he asked Mr. Fleming to provide the Board with a cost proposal to do the civil engineering work for site that would involve not only the pad location for the addition to the Public Works Building, but also the relocated baseball field and the pad location for the Magisterial District Judge Office. He noted that it would also include utility considerations.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township does not have an agreement with Dauphin County for the Magisterial District Judge office so he is not sure we can move forward with this proposal at this time. He noted that he wanted the Board to know that we have a proposal, and if you like it, we can move forward with the proposal when the Board is in a position to do so. He noted that Mr. Fleming is present to explain his proposal.

Mr. Fleming noted that there are several components to the proposal. He noted that he will go through each task to summarize them to prepare the construction drawings for this project. He noted that he did not assume that the project would have to go through a formal land development process since it is a project for the Township but he will be undertaking a topographic survey of the site from the Locust Lane frontage to about 150 feet beyond the existing Public Works Building to ensure we have good topographic information for construction including existing utility information. He noted that he will finalize the sketch plan with the Township to make sure we have all the details correct with the project shareholders since he was not involved in the original sketch planning. He noted that some details may still be under discussion. He explained that he will prepare a construction plan, a land development plan with the level of detail necessary for a contractor to build the project. He noted that he would include stormwater design and those types of details.

Mr. Fleming explained that the Erosion and Sedimentation (E&S) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting requirements have changed over the past couple of years. He noted that this plan will require a NPDES permit from the Dauphin County Conservation District and PA DEP, and in order to do that permit application, we will have to prepare some level of geotechnical investigation, E&S design, and NPDES permitting applications to the level that the project requires. Mr. Fleming noted that the total cost is estimated for this project on a time and materials basis of \$42,800.

Mr. Wolfe noted if we move forward with this project as set forth on the schematic design, Dauphin County would be responsible for their portion of the site design for the

Magisterial District Judge office. He noted that it would be an arrangement that we would have to negotiate with Dauphin County. He noted that HRG's relationship for this work would be totally with the Township.

Mr. Seeds noted that we should move ahead regardless of Dauphin County at this time. Mr. Wolfe noted that he can't say to do that because even though it is a time sensitive matter, but if we wait much longer we will not be in a position to meet the commitment to the sports organizations; He noted that we do not have a definite commitment on the Magisterial District Judge (MDJ) office.

Mr. Fleming noted that the long lead item in this project is the NPDES permit. He noted that they take several months to get through the permitting process so if we started today, we will be under a tight deadline to get the ball field project ready to go. He noted that we would not want to wait too much longer to get started on that.

Mr. Hawk noted that he has been in contact with the people from Dauphin County and it is out of their hands at this point as it is up to the Industrial Development Authority (IDA).

Mr. Seeds questioned if the IDA is in reference to the District Justice Office. Mr. Hawk answered yes as it is their money that they are putting up to pay for it.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there is anything, as part of this proposal that we would have to do anyway such as the topography map of the site that regardless if the MDJ office is built or not. Mr. Fleming answered if you would not be a party to the MDJ office at the front of the site, he could shrink each one of the scope items slightly. He noted that we would not need topography out there so it would save a couple of hours with the survey group. He noted that you would not need the geo-technical testing at that site, but you would have to do it for the ball field and the public works expansion areas. He noted that each item would be a smaller amount to the overall project costs. He noted that the components for the project are still the same.

Ms. Lindsey suggested that we need to get in touch with Dauphin County again to tell them that the project is time sensitive and we have to know. Mr. Hawk noted that we can't tell the IDA what to do. Ms. Lindsey noted that it has been two months since we gave them the Memorandum of Understanding for the baseball field.

Mr. Hornung noted that he feels we should start to move forward as it is more about kids being able to play on a ball field. He noted if there is a risk that we lose the extra money if the

MDJ office is not built, then there is also a chance that they will build it so he suggested that the Board should proceed. He noted when it gets to the point where it is more than a couple of hours here or there then we need to halt until we get the definitive opinion from the IDA.

Mr. Fleming noted that we will be working through the scope over the next several months; therefore, as soon as you have an answer, especially if the MDJ office is not part of the project, all uncompleted scope items would be deleted from that project forward. Mr. Crissman agreed that we should move forward now.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Fleming knows to move forward with this and he will put this on the agenda for the next meeting for official action. Mr. Seeds questioned if we could approve it tonight. Mr. Wolfe answered that you could. He noted that he was only asking the Board to take action on items that were scheduled for the business meeting last week. He noted that the Board can act on any item it wants to.

Mr. Hawk noted that he will be with a Dauphin County Commissioner tomorrow night and he will take it up with him. Ms. Lindsey suggested that they are not involved with it at this point. She asked Mr. Wolfe when the last time he spoke with anyone on this issue was. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Hornung made the last phone call about two or three weeks ago. He noted that the Board asked him to make the call and Mr. Hornung called him and stated that he wanted to make the call. Mr. Hornung noted that the phone call was pretty affirmative but he could not say 100%. He noted that he was surprised that they did not get back to us yet. Mr. Hawk noted that he received the same indication but no formal information.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we could vote on this now. Mr. Stine answered yes as it is a public meeting. Ms. Lindsey noted that we should take care of it now so Mr. Fleming could start the work tomorrow.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to accept the proposal from HRG to provide site engineering in regard to the proposed expansion of the Public Works building in the amount of \$42,800. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Review of HRG proposal to provide engineering services for the replacement of lights within the fitness center and natatorium at the Friendship Center

Mr. Luetchford noted that this project concerns the lighting in the fitness center at the Friendship Center (FC). He noted that the FC has undergone a variety of energy efficiency projects over the years by insulating the gymnasium, replacing lights in the gymnasium and social hall and other places. He noted that there have been some HVAC improvements and as he started to go through the process of phasing in energy improvements throughout the building. He noted that one of the projects that was listed as HRG's energy efficiency report from about five years ago that was started was the process to replace the lighting in the fitness center and the natatorium. He noted that currently he has two different grants to do projects in both of those locations, one a DCNR grant that is associated with the Heroes Grove project that requires matching funds of \$20,000 to replace lights in the fitness center, most probably with LED lighting. He suggested that he can replace half the lights with those funds. He noted that there is a Local Share Gaming Grant in the amount of \$20,000 to replace a limited number of lights in the natatorium, the lights that are hard to get to that are directly over the pool. He explained that he is looking to replace those lights first and phase the entire project in over time. He requested HRG to provide a proposal to provide design and product services for lights. He noted that he would like to have the planning done in preparation for the maintenance week to be held August 31, 2015 and he would like to get both projects done at the same time.

Mr. Fleming noted that the electrical design proposal for the lighting improvements has a couple different components. He noted that he will design a lighting layout for each one of the areas, and then design any rewiring efforts that would be needed to connect the new lights, and then put a bid package together for the project. He noted that it would include the bidding process, selecting a contractor, making a recommendation for a contractor and administering the contract through closeout for the successful completion of the project. He noted that the proposed fee is \$15,000 based on an anticipated level of effort of times and materials based on the retainer fee agreement.

Mr. Hornung noted in regards to the last proposal of \$15,000, it never ends up being \$15,000, and rather it is \$25,000. He noted that he did not see it as a Time and Material with a not to exceed figure proposal. Mr. Fleming noted that it is an estimated fee, but as always, if the

Board prefers that he come back and ask permission to exceed the estimates, he can do that. Mr. Hornung noted that is all he wanted to hear. Mr. Fleming noted that he would set the \$15,000 as a limit in that he would have to come back to seek permission to expend more funds. Mr. Hornung stated that should also apply for the previous proposal that we just approved for the Public Works Center work.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the estimated total cost of this is as he questioned if this is for all the lighting except for the gymnasium. Mr. Luetchford answered that it includes all the lighting in the fitness center and 10 to 12 lights in the natatorium that are locate directly over the water in the pools. He noted that would be about 1/3 of the lights in the natatorium. He noted that the total project estimated cost is from the HRG's five year old report about energy efficiency of about \$60,000. Mr. Seeds questioned if that included the \$15,000 for the engineering. Mr. Luetchford answered yes. Mr. Seeds noted that 25% of the costs is engineering. He suggested that it was pretty high.

Mr. Fleming explained that there is a certain amount of effort necessary to bid a project and administer a contract noting that it is pretty much consistent from project to project. He noted that it takes a certain number of hours to put the advertisements together, to put the bid packages together, receive and review the bids, write recommendation letters, hold the preconstruction meeting, and consult with the contractor on any question that he or she may have, observe the construction to make sure it is in conformance with the contract documents, review applications for payment, write the necessary recommendation letters, and then go through the necessary project close out to make sure it is done properly. He noted that 50% of cost is for the proposed effort and the other 50% is researching the type of lights that are available noting that recommendations were made in the preliminary study on different technology that was available at that time. He noted that his staff will have to revisit those recommendations, identify if it is the latest technology and revise the recommendation, as the industry changes so rapidly. He noted that a report that is a year old may have information that is somewhat stale and he would alter the recommendation to save the Township money or offer you a better product in the long run.

Mr. Seeds noted that we don't have an in-house engineer to review designs, although we have one in the Sewer Authority, to say that this is a good price, we have no one else to look at it

to say that it is a fair design price. He noted that 25% seems like a lot of money. Mr. Fleming noted that burden to bid a smaller project is unfairly represented with the engineering versus the construction dollars as the smaller the construction the higher the engineering becomes. He noted that it takes a certain number of hours to go through all those steps necessary to open and close a contract. Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Fleming if it was a normal kind of thing for that size of project. Mr. Fleming answered that it is as his process for bidding contracts for the Township is the same whether it is a million dollar sewer contract or a \$60,000 lighting contract. He noted that we have to follow the same laws and regulations. He noted that anything that Mr. Luetchford's team can help to save on our side will be a savings to the Township and if we get a good contractor that doesn't require a lot of hand holding it will save the Township some level of effort. He noted that is why he proposed the time and material format so if there is any savings to the Township you realize it.

Ms. Lindsey questioned, to come up with the \$15,000, do you bill per hour for whatever you are doing. She questioned how he came up with \$15,000, how did you put a dollar amount on it. Mr. Fleming answered that he puts a project plan together based upon the retainer agreement. He noted that we put a certain number of hours to each one of those tasks and there are some others based upon an anticipated level of effort for what we think we will get into. He noted that we give the Township a budget that we feel is a fair budget, something that we can commit to and live with.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the HRG proposal to provide engineering services for the replacement of lights within the fitness center and natatorium at the Friendship Center for a cost of \$15,000. Mr. Seeds requested that you add that Mr. Fleming must seek approval if he had to increase the cost. Mr. Crissman noted that he would be more than happy to add that as part of the motion. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Review of the HRG proposal to provide engineering for a proposed sidewalk project along Nyes Road at the Paxtonia Elementary School in conjunction with the Greenway Plan

Mr. Luetchford noted that seven years ago a Greenway Plan was adopted by the Board that had to do with greenways across the Township, to include walkways, bikeways and making

connections between destinations and sidewalk communities. He noted in order do that and fulfill the Greenway Plan was to look at sidewalk missed connections between locations and destinations or communities. He noted that the Greenway Committee went out and looked at some areas where sidewalks are missing. He explained that they are various sizes, but the one identified by the Greenway Committee in Paxtonia is important as it connects George Park to the Paxtonia Elementary School and also a crosswalk connects to other communities across the Nyes Road.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Greenway Committee had budgeted in 2015 \$10,000 to begin that work not knowing what kind of project they would consider at that time. He explained that this one bubbled to the top recently as they felt it was very important as they have received responses from the parents at Paxtonia Elementary School who indicated that it is a great idea, noting that we spoke to the principal and Mr. Tunney from the Central Dauphin School District who all endorse the idea.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the interest on the Greenway Committee's part is to have some planning and surveying done in order to consider doing this. He noted that he discussed the proposal with Mr. Fleming and he discussed the possibility of making this work within the current year's budget. He noted that he would like to propose this project to the Board for its approval for an HRG planning project involving many things that have to do with the State Right of Way issues.

Mr. Seeds noted that this is School District property and he did not think that they have any walkers that would use the sidewalk to get to school.

Mr. Crissman noted that we should also ask the School District to help in this project. Mr. Seeds noted that he knows that it needs to be done. Mr. Luetchford noted that the School District traditionally does not encouraged walkers at all. He noted that they encourage bus riders if at all possible. He noted that the long-term issue is to encourage walking and providing a safe area in certain instances. He noted that this is not just about children walking to school, it is about connecting a sidewalk to the school, to the park, and to the communities that follow. He noted that is the interest on the part of the Greenway Committee.

Mr. Seeds questioned if we got the School District involved, Dauphin Count Technical School might still have a shop that does concrete work. He questioned if they could get involved

in it as it would be a huge savings and provide some practice as well. He questioned if anyone has explored those items. Mr. Luetchford answered that we haven't gotten that far yet in the process as we are in the early stages of the planning process. He noted that the Committee wants to find out what it needs to do to get the project done.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the School District has every participated in a project before. Mr. Luetchford answered in his experience with Parks that is a yes. Mr. Crissman suggested that only very local students would walk to school. Ms. Lindsey suggested that the students are bussed from the Heatherfield development. Mr. Crissman suggested that they would have no need for sidewalks since the children have to be contained within the fenced areas of the playground.

Mr. Robbins questioned if we could ask Paxtonia Baseball Association to contribute towards the cost. He noted that the baseball field uses the doctor's office across the street to park and they have to cross the road, so there is a vested interest for them. Mr. Luetchford noted that the focus is not about school walkers as there might be some. He noted that the public would have use of the sidewalk consistently from one location to Paxtonia Elementary School and beyond that along Jonestown Road and to Nyes Road and to the park and the surrounding communities. He noted that we are not focused on school walkers, but public use in general

Ms. Lindsey questioned what the estimated cost of putting that piece of sidewalk in would be. Mr. Fleming answered that he did not know as his surveyors have looked into the approximate length but he has no project estimate.

Mr. Seeds noted that he read the minutes from the Greenway Committee and he suggested that Mr. Luetchford stated to the Committee that you gave a ball park figure of \$14 a linear foot for a 4 foot walk. He noted that 550 times that, he would know what that figure would be. He noted that proposal for engineering is more than what the sidewalk would cost.

Ms. Lindsey noted that the sidewalk would cost around \$8,000. Mr. Fleming answered for the concrete sidewalk only. Mr. Robbins questioned if PennDOT would require bonding for the work in the right-of-way. Mr. Fleming answered yes. Mr. Robbins noted that they may have to be the bonding party, to have the School District involved.

Mr. Fleming noted that his proposal involves a couple of different things since the sidewalk will be constructed in the State Right of Way so it would require a Highway Occupancy

Permit (HOP). He noted in order to do that, he would have to do a topographic survey so those two components have a certain amount of effort. He noted that a survey crew would have to do the field survey and courthouse research to prepare the plan to show where the right of way lines are and to ensure that we are proposing the sidewalk in the correct spot. He noted as part of the HOP process the Department requires the applicant, in this case, to post a bond. He noted in the past they have waived that requirement but PennDOT will no longer do that. He noted in order to do the project with your own forces or allow a volunteer effort to do the work you would have to post a bond.

Mr. Hawk noted that he is hearing a negative response from the Board members. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it could be placed on a road tour agenda to take a look at it. Mr. Crissman noted that was a good idea.

Review of and commitment to the TRPC Wireless Facilities Ordinance Program

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Capital Region Council of Governments and the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission have cooperatively proposed a program by which participating municipalities will have their zoning ordinances reviewed by the Cohen Law Group in regard to wireless facilities and how they regulate those. He noted that the Cohen Law Group will provide the Township with an analysis on deficiencies in regard to our ordinance as it currently exists written in 2006 and how the telecommunications industry has changed since that point in time requiring different types of regulatory measures.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there is no cost for the Township to receive this review of the ordinance; all that is required is a letter of participation sent by the Board to the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission. He noted if the Board so desires to receive this free analysis, he can let them know tomorrow. He noted that the second phase of this will come after we have the free analysis. He noted that all those municipalities that desire to participate thereafter will be on a cooperative basis, receive pricing from the Cohen Law Group to prepare amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to meet the deficiencies that they have identified.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Board wants to get a free analysis of the current zoning ordinance for wireless facilities, and if so, he would provide notice to the Tri-County Planning Commission and the CAPCOG. Ms. Lindsey noted that it is not too often that you receive free

services. Mr. Seeds noted that we are getting money for some of our traffic signals in the Township but we have to be careful where someone may want to put those things in. He noted that we need to have the proper coverage in our zoning ordinance.

Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Stine if this is something that he could do for a lower cost to rewrite the ordinance. Mr. Stine answered no to the extent that these people do it all the time as that is all they do, telecommunications work. He noted that he has not done very much in that area at all and the Township would be better off using their services.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the free analysis of the Wireless Facilities Ordinance Program. Ms. 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 the Lower Paxton Township Authority to include the payroll. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Improvement Guarantees, Development Agreements, Plan Reaffirmations, etc.

Resolution 15-08; acceptance of a road dedication for a portion of
Moline Lane in Phase II of the Old Iron Estates Development

and

Resolution 15-09; acceptance of a road dedication for a portion of
Farmcrest Lane in Phase II of the Old Iron Estates Development

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Resolution 15-08; acceptance of a road dedication for a portion of Moline Lane in Phase II of the Old Iron Estates Development, and Resolution 15-09; acceptance of a road dedication for a portion of Farmcrest Lane in Phase II of the Old Iron Estates Development. Mr. Hornung seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Adjournment

Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting and the meeting was adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William L. Hornung
Township Secretary