

**EAST MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
JANUARY 8, 2008**

Present: Chairman Steven H. Gross, Jr., Vice-Chair David L. Naylor, Supervisor Barry E. Rudisill, Township Secretary/Treasurer/Manager Terry R. Gingerich, Engineer Byron Trout, Attorney Andrew Miller, and Zoning & Codes Enforcement Officer Katrina Rife

At a regular meeting held at the township building, Steven H. Gross, Jr. called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

The Pledge of Allegiance was given to the Flag of the United States of America.

The minutes from the 12/11/07 were approved with a motion from David L. Naylor, seconded by Barry E. Rudisill and carried unanimously.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. disclosed that the Board met in Executive session on 1/4/08 for personnel reviews and on 1/7/08 after reorganization meeting.

Public Hearing

Agricultural Security Hearing for property at 520 Codorus Furnace Road map MJ parcel 4 containing approximately 123 acres as requested by Jessica George.

Attorney Andrew Miller - posting requirements by Terry R. Gingerich who confirmed the hearing information was posted and advertised.

Attorney Andrew Miller gave a brief overview of Agricultural Security and explained that the township has other lands that have been placed in Ag Security. The main benefits to the owner is land protection from future ordinances which could impact the ability to farm or provide some protection against eminent domain. This is a voluntary program and after 7 years, it can be removed by owner. The township Agriculture Security Board and York County Planning Commission have recommended approval.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. opened the hearing at 7:05 pm and asked for public comment - opposed-none, testimony in favor-none

He added that this follows with the township's comprehensive plan.

Hearing closed 7:07pm

Resolution 2008-4 adding the property to the Agriculture Security area was adopted per motion by David L. Naylor, seconded by Barry E. Rudisill and carried unanimously.

Jessica thanked all involved.

Public Comments

Residents - Ken Dunbar, resident and member of the Recreation Board addressed the Board regarding his receipt of a letter from the Board regarding the Manchester Park playground program policy of closing the park during playground hours. Would like to discuss and persuade the Board, this is a policy they feel very strongly about and we have all the staff of the playground here and thank them for coming.

I'd like to start off by saying that we are very fortunate in having 4 of 5 staff members that are professional educators. They are the ones that had initially asked for a policy like this and the joint board discussed it and brought this forward. I'm going to turn it over to Donna Burns who is our Director and she has several points that she would like to bring to the Board regarding this policy.

Donna – I'm a teacher at the high school but I also have been running the playground program for Manchester for 8 years and prior to that I ran the Dover program for 10; so I have extensive experience with playground programs. What I did was created a list of the reasons or justifications for why we created the policy initially. You can read those on your own: Fees, allow one.... you must allow all, Policy, Safety Abduction risk, other parks, other programs

The policy was created for safety. In the years that I've been at the program we've gone from averaging from about 25 children a day to about 100. The program has flourished, grown, gotten better, the facilities –we've added equipment for the kids that have allowed us to have more kids at the playground and because we have had such a high number of kids we've changed multiple safety measures. We've changed the registration form to include such safety measures such as: can they walk, can they be picked up, if they can be picked up who can pick them up; we've changed our parking policy so it is safer environment for loading and unloading from the cars, so we've created allot of safety measures to ensure that when the kids are with us for the 3 hours a day the parents know that they are safe and we are doing the best that we can to ensure that.

We also, years ago had problems with people being at the park (it wasn't a mother and a child that we had trouble with) we had trouble with teenagers that were there swearing, and smoking, and we would ask them (we didn't have a policy then) to please watch their language with kids around and working with teenagers and you may know as well as I do, that doesn't always work with just asking them. We also had drug deals that were going on down by the swing set and had to have the police come on multiple occasions because there were illegal activities going on. So this inspired this policy.

So for the reasons I've stated there briefly and you can read through them, we charge children a fee to come (\$15.00-\$25.00 to attend), so we open the park without mandating that the park is closed and that anyone can come that eliminates that fact that people pay a fee to enjoy the program. We are charging a fee so that we can buy supplies and have materials there, so if we disregard those that pay and register it's kind of a slap in the face to them that anyone can come to the program at same time while they are allowed to be there. I think the point is if we allow one, if we allow the mother and child and say that they can come we can't say the drug dealers can't. So we are opening the policy, we're opening it to everybody and we are back to having teenagers smoking and swearing, and possibly any other illegal activities occurring again, this is our big concern – we have children 6 years old to 12 years old. That is very young, very impressionable, we are trying to keep them in a very positive environment for 3 hours a day but if we remove this policy we are not only saying essentially anyone can come again we are back to putting our children at risk. If we have people bring kids that are not registered for the program; they don't have a registration form, they don't have emergency contact numbers, so if a kid gets hurt at our playground and are not one of our children I can't help them, I can't call their parents, I can't get them to a doctor. They hurt one of our kids then we are liable for the kids that are registered to be safe with us; that's another issue having non-registered participants at our playground when we have our children there.

Safety – There are over 100 kids and if you have other children running around, and if you have other kids under 6 they are at risk of being hurt by our older children. So there's just as much risk to our children being hurt as other children that are not part of our program running around helter skelter just being wherever they want to be. Keeping our children isolated is a lot easier for us to monitor the program and the activities than if we allow anyone to be there.

Abduction Risk – This is one of the biggest fears. If we restrict access and an adult comes onto the playground we can immediately stop them because they don't belong there. If we open this policy and have random people on the playground, I and my staff can't see any type of stranger that might be there and the abduction risk increases because our sensitivity to who's on our playground decreases significantly. By having our closed session and by knowing our kids and having the adults there we know who is where and where they belong, but if we are having multiple community members there, my staff can no longer discern who's immediately and it causes a much greater risk for a child to be snatched or wonder off or anything like that without us knowing a thing.

There are other playgrounds, we are so fortunate in this area that we have the Manchester playground, Mt. Wolf Park, the Dauberton recreation area, and every elementary school has children's facilities. So for 3 hours a day from 9:00am to 12:00, while we have children at our program while our program is closed they could very easily travel to another facility within a mile or two and attend another park for those 3 brief hours. So it's not that they don't have any other options, they actually have multiple options compared to other areas.

As I mentioned I worked with Dover, Dover restricts public use during their playground hours, they have 4 playgrounds all are restricted during use 9:00 to 12:00. Springettsbury has approximately 9 playgrounds – all restricted during playground hours, that's 5 hours a day (9:00 to 12:00 and 6:00 to 8:00). And the Manchester Township which is at Cousler Park – they have a very big area and don't close the entire park but the area where the playground program is run is restricted. So 3 other programs have the same policy we have.

I've done this for 18 years and over the years all we've done is institute safer ways for kids to enjoy the summer. Kids spend too much time spent indoors isolated playing video games and we are giving them an opportunity to come out and socialize in an education experience, a safe experience and we should be doing all that we can to keep it safe not removing policies that keep them safe. We want to do what we can to ensure their safety and removing a policy does anything but that. I simply ask (and I don't have children) but if I had a 6-year old child and I ask if you had children would you put your child (your grandchildren) in that risk? Would you drop your child off at a place that once had a safety blanket and now you are removing it and saying well anyone can come to this playground because it is open to the public and knowing that we've had problems in the past. It's not the mothers and children that we are worried about, it's the problems that we've had in the past that we are trying to keep the kids safe from.

I have included several letters from parents of kids that are in our program that have sent me statements and asked that I would deliver them to us expressing their feelings on rescinding this policy. Hopefully, you will get a chance to read them as well.

All of our staff is here and Lori Riddle the co-coordinator, Greg Zirkle, Laura, Christy, and Jeremy Burkhardt who are all associate directors and they can answer any questions about safety and have seen how things have changed

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – how long has this policy been in effect?

Lori- Formally, this past year.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. -The Board did receive (and I understand you are making your case for it) we received complaints the other way and that's what brought the issue to head.

Lori – And I know that there are complaints from mothers with children who again I assume have the ability to drive to one of the other parks – it's not that we don't have another option for them, but they're not the ones that I'm overly concerned about

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – that's ok, I just wanted to know how long it was in effect and I wanted

to explain to you why we came to you.

Lori – I'm aware that people have called both the township and the borough. We tried to enact policy several years ago, it was formally debated at the recreation board prior to this past summer so it would have been Fall 2006 policy voted Recreation Board posted signs this year.

Ken - I'd like to interject and I mean no offense, I just wanted to have an opportunity for the staff who are very enthusiastic. I feel they have a very good point and want to have it presented to the Board for your consideration. To me it's just common sense to take these 100 children for a short period of time (6 weeks out of the year) I don't feel it's a policy - a hindrance at all

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – Do you think the Borough also received complaints?

Lori – I don't know, you'll have to ask Judy Hilliard – I know that she did receive calls asking if it was a policy. Many of the people we've contact at the playground, we've explained to them, almost all have been fine and would come back after 12:00

Lori Riddle – I'm one of the playground directors as well and I just wanted to add a couple of things – if you think about the playground staff who are involved 6 weeks over the summer yet every one of us is here, I hope you see we take this playground with utmost of respect and to come here and support this, I think it speaks highly of the program we have. It's our off season, to show up and support something that we feel so strongly about.

I do have 2 children of my own – 11-year old and 14-year old and part of why I became involved in the program when we moved to this area is because I know it was a safe program and I felt very strongly about it. I also was involved in the Dover program as well and believe in that policy. I believe that for a few hours it is worth to have 100 children be safe than to have one or two persons inconvenienced for a little while.

I'm usually the one when people come to the playground who are not registered and I've talked to dozens of people in the last 3 years and I've really not had anybody (with the exception of one or two times) ever be bothered with our policy when I've explained the logic behind it. There are 100 children here and a few of us that can supervise. It makes sense to us, most people walk away and completely agree and support what we do. There have been a few I've encountered and I've reminded them to please consider that while you may be pushing an infant on a swing, our children are throwing footballs and basketballs, I would be devastated if that ball flew over and hit your baby in the head. How do you explain that, how do you justify that's ok?

We are in an internet age, if you pull up on the web, there are people that live in York County within these areas that have a past that we are not so fond of. Here someone printed out, there are about 12 with known sex offender charges against them. It is impossible for 5 of us to know who's walking up to that playground that really has a child there or who's walking up to do something that might not be the right thing to do. I don't know that answer, I don't know the perfect solution, it would be wonderful if we could keep everybody happy, if we could let the others come and play, if we could keep our children safe. I don't know if today we can and I don't know if the parents that entrust us with their children want us to take that chance. It's hard to get to know 100 children in 6 weeks, so if I see one leave the playground with somebody, am I going to remember it's their mom or aunt, I might not. We don't let our students leave before 12:00, they are there 9:00 to 12:00, we don't let them leave unless something happens or a parent tells us ahead of time.

If people are allow to come and go at will we lose control, we have no way to realize if people are supposed to be leaving or not.

I hope you stick with the policy, I think inconveniencing one or two people is less of a burden than taking away funding for a fantastic program that has done so much the last couple of years.

David L. Naylor – do you have a number cut-off?

Donna - not presently, we've discussed it because of facility size, that is something we want to discuss for the upcoming summer

David L. Naylor – ok, cause that would make a difference to me in my opinion, because if you allow all those that want to come in that's one thing but if you have a cut-off and those people that are out there looking in

Donna – right, we haven't because our numbers have been around 100 and we've created a way to do that. We do crafts and such in age shifts. I've done playground since I was a kid, it's everything to me and I would never want to say to a kid sorry you can't come. If anything I'm looking at ways to expand the program, not restrict it.

Lori – last year the Recreation Board added 6th staff person for 135 registered participants

David L. Naylor – Is 20 kids per director manageable?

Donna – It is, we have kids to help us and Jeremy can speak to that. He entered the program starting as a student, a Jr. volunteer at 12, a volunteer at 15, and now an assistant director – he's a lifer. The volunteers are extra eyes, extra ears, they are out playing with the kids, so there's never an area where there is not an adult or volunteer there. We try and make sure there are enough adults.

Jeremy confirmed how he has personally seen how the program grow and the advantage of having this program to get the kids out of the house over the summer thought,

David L. Naylor – you've gotta understand some of the complaints we've received. I'll give you a scenario; a grandmother has her grandchild for the day, they come from out-of-state only in for the day and want to go to the park for the morning and they can't

Donna- can they go to Mt. Wolf. Park?

David L. Naylor – yeah, but's that not the point for her, it's a public park

Donna; - but would she want her grandchild there ...cut-off

Steven H. Gross, Jr. –we're not going to go tit for tat; Ken asked you to come and explain the policy to the Board. Any other questions? We will review what you've given us, there is allot of information and it gives us the other side of scenario because as I stated earlier we got the other side and that was the reason to bring it to discussion, we will review it.

Jean Leisher commented that her children have gone for 2 years and if this policy is rescinded it would be really sad if they could not go because she couldn't trust their safety while they are there

Ken thanked the Board for hearing this and asked they contact him for anything further

Steven H. Gross, Jr. - pointed out there are several vacancies on recreation committee, asked for those interested to contact the township.

Non-resident

Scott Wagner, President of Penn Waste asked to address the issue of the Wednesday collection during snow. The areas of N. Sherman Street, Blossom Drive and Meeting House Road were unable to collect, majority of township was collected. One of their trucks was sideways on N. Sherman due to conditions of state road. Received calls from residents-pick up following week, most residents were satisfied. They service 52 municipalities. He was here to address this issue. After a conversation with Terry R. Gingerich, Scott felt it was appropriate to come to tonight's meeting. Most residents who

called in were satisfied with answers and results

The issue as to how to handle in future, circumstances did not allow pick-up.

Joel Klinedinst stated he understands safety is an issue but why not truck send one truck next day for the limited area instead of letting the garbage set out all week? Aesthetically, it make the township look crappy.

Scott – I'm prepared to address that - in a situation where there's a major snow storm we shift everybody. We are servicing 130,000 homes within a few collections so in reality our trucks were here that day ready to go and quite frankly it's physically impossible for us to come back next day because we are in other municipalities. We had 3 instances – 3 municipalities that we were unable to complete 100% of the collections. We understand what you are saying and we gave it our best effort and fortunately our recycling truck on N. Sherman Street didn't cause injury or property damage We try as much as we can to communicate with everybody –it would be nice if in this internet age we could email everybody and say this is the circumstance. I appreciate what you are saying, hopefully you appreciate, in the future, we are doing the best we can.

Joel added that the animals tear the bags apart and it becomes strewn all over the place which causes a health issue as well.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – There were residents who read the contract and were looking for the next day service. He reiterated that service is expected and in this day and age it is all about service. To not have service becomes more unacceptable all the time.

David L. Naylor – commented that he would not consider that snow storm in December a major snow storm

Scott answered that is it not considered a major snow storm, it was the truck sideways under the icy condition on N. Sherman Street, the reality that next morning they were out servicing ongoing contracts. An excess of 2000 customers are being serviced. 5 or 6 unsatisfied is small. They try the best they can to communicate.

David L. Naylor – in an isolated event where one part does not get collected, it would be appreciated to have a truck come back a day or two later and collect.

Cheryl Klinedinst questioned why a backup truck could not be sent next day.

Scott replied that they have plenty equipment, it is a manpower issue

Terry R. Gingerich mentioned that the biggest complaint heard was that the trash was not picked up the next day.

Scott updated on the facility being in a clean status and the recycling facility has received a certificate of occupancy.

Barry E. Rudisill – here to address complaints personally is recognized

Surprise visit from State representative Keith Gillespie who joined the meeting and was recognized by Steven H. Gross, Jr. to address an open forum.

He commented that he tries to stop by the meetings for the municipalities in his district.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. explained that the Township feels and residents comments are that do not get the snow and ice service that the area deserves especially N. Sherman Street Extd. Second issue of Saginaw Road in deteriorated condition.

Joel gave a description of the deteriorated state of the road between Saginaw Road and Gravel Hill Road.

Discussion continued.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. brought up the other issue of difficulty getting a traffic light at N. George Street and Meeting House Road.

Brief background-trouble getting light-developer will pay for light, been 4 years, seems like spinning wheels with PennDOT

Terry R. Gingerich added that the studies now meet 2 of 3 criteria

Byron Trout -site distance issue there also, light will solve that

Keith will take a look at with new district engineer - will give every effort

The 83/Canal Road exit was mentioned along with traffic concerns with Church Road back-up and truck traffic. Open discussion continued.

Terry R. Gingerich comment on snow removal trucks came from Yocumtown and Hellam we are last in either direction.

Joel added that the subcontractor for Long Road and Gravel Hill Road could not service N. Sherman Street, it was not in his contract although Chief Albright asked him to service it as a result of the shutdown.

Keith gave an update on bonus investigations are going on, fired 7 more people, possibly more indictments as a result of it to follow

Steven H. Gross, Jr. asked of property tax relief.

Keith answered that it seems to be finally getting lined up gambling will not be answer, best see \$150 in the form of a rebate but by then taxes will have gone up.

55 new members came in appears to be enough between House and Senate to get it moving. York County representatives are moving up.

Keith - thank you for job you do. Will research and get back to Terry R. Gingerich

Steven H. Gross, Jr. commented that they still want to have Keith and Senator Waugh go on a ride throughout the township.

Keith left informational materials for the public's taking.

Land Development/Subdivision plans

Phoenix Links Golf Course - PPL

Andrew Spear of PPL was present for the land development plan #D325529 dated 11-28-07 36 pages.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – I want to thank you for coming tonight but before you even start presenting your thing I have to tell you what the people have been telling me for the past 6 months. They basically think you are doing what the h-.. you want to down there, burying a lot of ash and you're ignoring the township, so that's why we told Barry Acker last month that we need to see you. There's a number of things that have been brought to the Board's attention that people don't think are quite the way they should be. We'd like to see this project wrapped up, the community was promised a golf course and the majority of the community thinks we have an ash dump. I know you are just the messenger, you can take that back to whomever, but the community is getting tired of that. The thing that really brought it to head is we have an ordinance that says you are not supposed to clear cut till you have your plan approved and I believe the whole one side of Board Road this fall was clear cut and bulldozed and different things. And I have to ask you are you going to do a reverse subdivision to combine those lots? That's another issue that keeps coming up, so your plan has been dragging out for years and I think there's allot of problems with it still and the people that put myself and the other three guys here are starting to really bend our ear about it, so now we got to bend yours. That's about as polite as I can be.

Andy – No, that's good

So maybe you could address some of those, maybe you could promise us for like the 10th time when the golf course is actually going to be a golf course, not a, but how much higher is the ground going to get, because I've heard comments from neighbors that now they've raised the ground and the storms come from different direction and wreck havoc on their property. It sounds funny but I think they might have a point.

Andy - all of it is true, and it is frustrating for us too because this golf course was first conceived in 1999 we had planned for 2000 and then I was brought in to review the plans and I didn't like them so I did them over again and brought them to you and received approval from the Planning Commission, preliminary approval from you guys and somewhere in there there was permission given to build a golf course or at least to bring ash up there, I honestly don't remember how that came about.

Terry R. Gingerich – that had to be through DEP

Andy – DEP allows us to take ash that is stabilized with lime and use it for pretty much anything. It's still a land development here in the township and we came before you guys to get plans approval and somewhere in there they said yeah well go ahead probably with the anticipation a final plan was going to come post haste. At that time we had transferred over the rights to the property Combustion Products Management, they were the ones developing it. I was coming to your meetings representing them at that time, then they ended up reneging on their mortgage. We paid them millions of dollars to do this, there had no body there, ended up getting all kinds of violations, so eventually we had to throw them out. That was about the same time I was before you with the driving range, went before the Zoning Hearing Board, got a special exception for that because it was tied into the golf course. Then I submitted plans to the township for the driving range and was told wait and submit it all at same time. Once again with the anticipation that well they'll be back in no time flat, well that was 2005, so what happened was it took us 2 years to get out from CPM. We didn't have the property, we couldn't come before you as the property owners and say we are doing to finish this development we are going to do this plan, so it wasn't till the beginning of 2007 that we finally got that resolved. The plan, the course had been built so much that the original plans (garbled) had new mounds that weren't on the original plan, so I had to get the course flown again to have mapping to develop a map and then come back to make the final plans. Went to building mounds while I'm trying to do the final plan, so even what I came up with this summer wasn't accurate, so we spent another 2-3 months trying to get these new mounds on and get everybody together on what new things were going to have to be done there. Now we are not taking any more ash up there on the golf course side, the intention is to use stabilfil for the driving range. The golf course side is not taking any more ash up there, there are a couple areas that need

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – make sure that's in the minutes – no more ash to the golf course side and that would be as I would be traveling on Board Road toward PPL you are referring to the left side of the property

Andy – that's right

David L. Naylor – you were saying however there are some areas

Andy – there are, there's a fairway right along Board Road that is all gunked up, I think we are going to use soil to repair that

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – you are going to continue to put flyash on the right side

Andy – yeah

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – on the second property line there, so that brings me to the issue which people that know the property have been bringing up, is that additional property all

part of your plan and all tied in? You're shaking your head yes and I would ask why you didn't do a reverse subdivision and combine the property.

Andy – I guess because it would be all ours, there would not be a reason to combine unless we were going to sell it.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – have to ask Byron – what's your opinion on it?

Byron Trout – my opinion as long as they are not putting any buildings on it across multiple property lines structures across multiple property lines, it is just grading I don't have a problem with it.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – even though a golf course is or a driving range is, you said buildings, it is not a building but it is something that is being built across property lines

Andy – and that question actually came up within PPL, too

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – why didn't they survey the property when they started, I think I read that somewhere.

Andy – It was surveyed, the outer boundary was surveyed when we sold the property to CPM by Biscon back in 2000. But for instance when we have it aerially flown we have a couple ground points where they use to adjust their elevations and everything but there's no survey done. PPL was not involved in that so I couldn't get our survey guys to stamp it – they refused. So I said thanks very much now I have to come back to your guys and try and please and get the ok not to have them stamped.

There is an issue with sewage, I guess you all know about the problem with the sewer authority that they are not meeting the effluent limits; however, the regulation that says that is not final so they are not sure whether they should enforce the new one or the old one. There's people that are suing the state because they don't have the resources, so we are stuck in the middle. We have our lawyers out of Harrisburg to help us and they'll be working with the sewer authority. There's a possibility we will take some of the treated sewage, the stuff that goes into the river and divert that to the irrigation to the golf course. That will save them some money because they won't have to upgrade the plant so much. So that's something we are looking at but is something I can't resolve now. We got Byron's letter on an issue with the parking lot, the infiltration there.

So those are the two outstanding issues

Steven H. Gross, Jr. asked for any other questions and if Byron reviewed everything and had any comments.

Byron Trout – yes, just the planning modules that has to do with the sanitary sewer and storm water management. The storm water management comments are minor but they need to be addressed.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – Do you have them addressed on the plan now?

Andy – no

Steven H. Gross, Jr. asked for the Board's wishes.

Barry E. Rudisill asked about the issue with the lane by the police building.

Andy – that was discussed at Planning Commission, we didn't intend on paving the driveway, we are planning on paving the parking area at the maintenance building. Since we are not paving the entire area around the maintenance building, I thought that maybe I could work with management on that paving, I'm still working on it. It makes sense to me, we are going to be using it to get to the maintenance building and it is already paved by the police building.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – let me get this clear – no more ash on that side but you do want to put the maintenance building and the clubhouse up

Andy – yeah, we will have to come back to the township for permits for that

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – but the footprint is accurate as to where it is going to go

Andy – yes, where it is going to go

Andy commented on the issue of lack of surveyor signature and seal. He understands that either the surveyor or engineer can sign.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – defer to Byron Trout on that

Byron Trout - My understanding is that as long as he is not certifying that they are changing property lines, he can sign it, but as soon as you start changing property lines, certifying that the perimeter is correct, then it has to be signed by a licensed land surveyor. Again , they are not changing any of the property lines.

Terry R. Gingerich – It says certification by a professional engineer or surveyor.

Byron Trout gave a brief overview of the storm water comments, mainly better management for the clubhouse which has been relocated since original plan submission. Ponds are there that can be used for discharge. Still under the old storm water ordinance, have DEP ok to not do infiltration. Additional discussion on proposed pond, building locations, and existing ponds

Before the plan is recorded, he will look at and approve.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. asked Planning Commission member Bob Nace if there were any issues brought up other than more on driveway

Andy - part of issue is that's not our property, there is an easement. I'm not sure whether I can commit to that. I would think the police department wouldn't have a problem with the paving.

Paving back to where you are building the maintenance building

Barry E. Rudisill –what I think are the issues, it looks like storm water can be resolved with Byron Trout approval

Andy – yes, it's really just extending the pipe

David L. Naylor – can I interject, and that can be done before the plan is recorded?

Byron Trout - absolutely, Kitty holds the plan until approved

Barry E. Rudisill – an approval is contingent upon him complying with the storm water requirements that Byron dictates, the portion of lane to that's not macadam to the maintenance building - note 11, 6-month sidewalk note for both sides of Board Road, and I believe monuments should be in place where feasible to be placed

Steven H. Gross, Jr. - glad to hear you are done raising the ground

Byron Trout – monuments are not indicated whether or not are found-some say existing, what we need to do is add a note on the title sheet all property monuments not found shall be concrete monuments in accordance with ordinance

Steven H. Gross, Jr. - The setback you are asking for in your letter?

Andy - grandfathered back don't need

Steven H. Gross, Jr. - do you want to commit to when actually have it done and have it open as part of this approval process

Andy- *jokingly* (my credibility has been destroyed – 2004), it will not be this year, they are planning to get management company to lease it and commit funds for buildings

Barry E. Rudisill motioned to approve as a final contingent on compliance of planning modules, stormwater compliance, macadam of the lane from police building to maintenance building pending property owner (police) approval, 6-month note on plan for sidewalks on both sides of Board Road, note on title page regarding concrete monuments will be installed where none are found. David L. Naylor seconded the motion

Discussion. Bob Nace commented on still a bit of concern about the width of lane and at the tie in with the macadam it is important to mention storm water towards Board Road.

Byron Trout indicated that according to the plan the current width of the blacktop beside the police building is 24' and tapers to about 22' and once past the police station it shows 11.5'. Barry E. Rudisill – the macadam should be wide enough for two vehicles to pass

It was determined that the sewer lines and water lines will be private back to the maintenance building.

Bob asked if PPL would be putting a sewer lateral in for the police station.

Andy – well hopefully

have to macadam where vehicles will be parked around maintenance building but not entire area-rest of it may remain stone

Barry E. Rudisill – Byron, does it make sense to have the macadam a minimum of 18' wide?

Byron Trout -yes at least 18'

Barry E. Rudisill – so I think Mr. Chairman that's short and the matter of it

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – do you think your motion covers it all

Barry E. Rudisill – I believe so, unless someone has or we overlooked something

David L. Naylor – and the 18' width is included in the motion

Agreed

David L. Naylor – and I seconded that motion

Steven H. Gross, Jr. – yes, I remember you seconded and to answer Bob's question – we agreed that the parking area for the employees around the maintenance building is what will be blacktopped the rest will be stone. Anything we missed on this plan Byron?

Byron Trout – no. You'll have to act on the waivers also

Barry E. Rudisill – their only request are the sidewalks and monuments and I think we addressed those issues

Andy – so we'll take those requests off and have the notes

The following waiver(s) were denied and/or modified:

The waiver of sidewalk requirements under SALDO s. 8.7.2.A and EMT Code s. 85-16(A) is granted with the following modification: The developer shall include a note on the plan that sidewalks shall be installed by the owner of the property within six-months of receiving notice to do the same from the Township in accordance with EMT Code s. 85-16(B).

The waiver of concrete monument requirements under SALDO s. 9.9 is granted with the following modification: The developer shall include a note on title page of the plans requiring that concrete monuments be installed where no existing markers are found. (See SALDO s.9.9)

After discussion and deliberation with consideration of prior comments and recommendations from township staff, Planning Commission, Township Engineer, York County Planning Commission, Sewer Authority, and public as well as applicant and/or applicant's representatives, the motion made by Barry E. Rudisill, seconded by David L. Naylor was carried unanimously

Special Requests – none

Solicitor's Report – Attorney Andrew Miller – no additional comments

Engineer's Report – Byron Trout

Surety reductions per recommendation from Gordon L. Brown & Associates

- § Dauberton partial reduction of \$18,917.64, Tyson Fence is as far as they could go till trees down. The check for Kinsley in the amount of \$6,435.00, which was previously approved is ready for signature. A motion by Barry E. Rudisill, seconded by David L. Naylor to approval the reduction was carried unanimously
- § Orchard Glen-not ready
- § Northern Heights phase 2 & 3 \$235,007.25 – Motion by TABLE by Steven H. Gross, Jr., seconded by Barry E. Rudisill and carried unanimously
- § Rentzel Heights – As instructed, a thorough check of improvements was made and a reduction in the amount of \$3,505,680.70 is for consideration. After discussion, and agreement that the development roads have not been used since there are only 3 homes so far, a motion by Steven H. Gross, Jr. to approve a reduction not to exceed 2 million was seconded by Barry E. Rudisill and carried unanimously. Note: Terry R. Gingerich mentioned the sewer lateral that was promised to be installed for the Troy Rentzel property in connection with this development needs completed.
- § Conewago Heights sewer –work to be done in Spring per Newberry Township.

Byron Trout and Dave Gentzler have prepared the updated highway list.

Correspondence - none

Manager's Report

Northeastern York County Sewer Authority – no questions

Zoning Officer – no questions

Junkyard license renewals for Cassell, Keister, and Klinefelter were approved per motion by Steven H. Gross, Jr. with the stipulation that Katrina Rife perform a satisfactory visual inspection. Motion seconded by Barry E. Rudisill and carried unanimously.

Public Works Director – David L. Naylor question the crew size on the call out for the 13th and 16th. Terry R. Gingerich explained that 2 men go out on each call.

A motion from David L. Naylor to contract with the SPCA for animal housing service was seconded by Barry E. Rudisill for \$955.00 a year. Motion carried unanimously.

Supervisors' Comments

Barry E. Rudisill

- Computer back-up server vs. thumb drive, Terry R. Gingerich will check in to
- school post prom party-nothing new
- Outdoor storage-procede to legal enforcement
- Van. Terry R. Gingerich license plate received today, take for service
- light at Meeting House & N George Street
- highway list updated
- code books-Terry R. Gingerich close to being done-gave more info
- Welding on new V-blade? Terry R. Gingerich is painted, David L. Naylor-needs repaired

-motion to draft letter to county requesting 2 new voting locations David L. Naylor seconded for discussion-not big enough, Lois H. agrees motion carried unanimously

David L. Naylor

-Dec minutes very good very complete
-remind zoning officer of Record Club site visit – sure to find violations

Steven H. Gross, Jr.

-fire companies study? - David L. Naylor reported that Harrisburg will do study overall Dean Fernsler will do study, thinking of moving on it with caveat that the Supervisors are not to take active roll in committee, rather see outsider and different citizens for input
-Thank for chair

Motion to pay all bills by Barry E. Rudisill, seconded by David L. Naylor and carried unanimously.

Terry R. Gingerich reported on the lighting for the reader board - Deitz & Nauman will be giving quote.

Public Comments - none

Steven H. Gross, Jr. motion to adjourn at 9:23pm

Respectfully submitted,

Terry R. Gingerich
Secretary/Treasurer/Manager