

North Middleton Township Board of Supervisors January 31, 2008

The workshop meeting of the North Middleton Township Board of Supervisors was held at the Township Municipal Building, 2051 Spring Road, Carlisle PA on January 31, 2008. Chairman Richard A. Bucher called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Board members present were Supervisor Robert H. Shearer, Supervisor Dennis E. Hurley, Supervisor Harry Kelso, Supervisor Robert Reisinger, Solicitor Mark Allshouse, Manager Deborah A. Ealer, Codes Enforcement Officer Paul Fegley and Recording Secretary Lori A. Coleman. Visitors: see attachment #1.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag opened the meeting.

Zoning Hearing Board Hearings

ZHB Solicitor Michael Rundle and members Jim Hare and Jim Bennett were present to answer some questions of the Board of Supervisors. Supervisor Bucher asked how communication from the BOS should be relayed to the ZHB. Solicitor Rundle stated the ZHB is a quasi judicial body. The Township can be a party in a zoning hearing. Simply sending a letter protesting the application signed by the board is not really appropriate since it cannot be cross examined by the applicant or his attorney. Solicitor Rundle pointed out the Codes Officer or Assistant Codes Officer can offer testimony under oath to the position of the Township and thus would be subject to cross examination as to why the Township is taking a contrary position. Solicitor Rundle noted the ZHB generally receives a variance or special exception request, and occasionally an appeal. In other townships, if the township takes a contrary position to an issue, they usually have their Solicitor and/or Supervisor present and actually will be a party in the hearing and participate in the cross examination. Special exceptions are the same as a conditional use hearing except the ZHB reviews the issue. Other townships have as part of their zoning ordinance that special exception requests have to go through their Planning Commission for a recommendation before it is reviewed by the ZHB. Unfortunately, NMT does not have this procedure in the ordinance. Solicitor Rundle felt the BOS may want to consider this procedure, since the PC minutes could be submitted as an exhibit for special exceptions. He added they were perfectly acceptable since they are an official record.

Supervisor Bucher verified the Solicitor, Supervisor or Codes Officer could offer testimony on the Township's behalf for a variance. As for a special exception, he suggested via ordinance having the case go before the Planning Commission first in which the Solicitor or Supervisor would not have to be present. Solicitor Allshouse questioned the issue of having a variance and special exception listed on the application. Solicitor Rundle noted sometimes the case may apply. Solicitor Allshouse verified an issue would not exist since the PC would only be reviewing the special exception item. Solicitor Allshouse asked how an application is handled that does not provide all the information as required for filing. Solicitor Rundle noted the Codes Officer reviews the application. If not complete, the application should not be accepted. Solicitor Allshouse referenced an application in which complete information was not provided and the codes officer cited the incompleteness in writing. The applicant insisted the application was complete and the hearing was scheduled. Solicitor Allshouse asked for a recommendation from Solicitor Rundle on how to handle the issue, and explained the current procedure in place. Solicitor Rundle noted the application is accepted once it is taken across the counter, fee retrieved, and signed by the codes officer. Then, the application has to go before the ZHB within 60 days. Supervisor Bucher felt there was two ways to handle the application. It could be accepted and note the fee and signature would

be taken after review. Solicitor Rundle noted it could be handled in that way. Mr. Hare asked if the policy could be handled in a manner in which the application and fee is accepted, and receipt is issued stating that acceptance of the application is subject to review by the zoning officer for completeness. Mr. Fegley stated he has handled applications in this manner. Mr. Fegley mentioned a policy of the Township of not having the checks stamped or lying around until the application is complete. Supervisor Reisinger asked if this was a situation unique to NMT. Supervisor Bucher noted many Townships handle the procedure differently. Solicitor Rundle noted Middlesex reviews the application on the spot.

Solicitor Allshouse discussed a scenario in which an application is accepted, and sent to the ZHB. A township representative is present at the hearing to note the application is incomplete. He questioned how this is handled. Solicitor Rundle noted the ZHB would start the hearing since they were under the 60 day requirement, take testimony, and stop the hearing until all the information is complete. Solicitor Allshouse pointed out the Supervisors could appear at a hearing to advise them that the application is incomplete. In addition, Solicitor Allshouse asked if Solicitor Rundle would prefer an entry of appearance prior to hearing if he or someone would be present on behalf of the Township. Solicitor Rundle said to just show up. Solicitor Rundle stressed it does not have to be a Supervisor just a Township representative.

Supervisor Reisinger asked if Solicitor Rundle was in favor of the BOS weighing in on any of the projects. Solicitor Rundle noted the Township can be a party like anyone else at any of the hearings. He stressed the ZHB follows the ordinances. Solicitor Allshouse pointed out the BOS has always reviewed the applications prior to the ZHB hearing. In addition, Solicitor Allshouse noted the board has to decide to either show up or not for an application since the Township is not submitting an official document from the Planning Commission. He noted the board would have to make the change if they would like to have the Planning Commission offer a recommendation on a special exception via the minutes. Mr. Fegley stated it would not happen because of the timing of the PC meeting. The PC minutes would not be officially approved. Overall, Supervisor Bucher asked if the board would like to have the ordinance changed so the PC would review the ZH application for special exceptions. He recommended the issue be added to the agenda for the next workshop meeting. Supervisor Kelso questioned how South Middleton reviewed their applications. Solicitor Allshouse noted they complete the same procedure as North Middleton. Supervisor Bucher asked if the process to accept applications should be changed. Solicitor Allshouse noted whether the application is accepted complete or incomplete a mechanism is in place at the time of the hearing to get a completed application. He noted Mr. Fegley would continue to accept the applications and do his best job to review the application for completeness. Supervisor Bucher verified that Solicitor Allshouse cannot attend any of the Zoning Hearing Board hearings due to a conflict. Solicitor Allshouse noted Solicitor Rundle is not requiring he be present. He added the Codes Officer can represent the Township and provide testimony. Supervisor Shearer noted Mr. Lao should be present when the ZHB applications are reviewed.

Myers Zoning Hearing Board Application

Solicitor Rundle noted the application did not have the plot of the existing mobile home included in the package. He did contact Mr. Lao and told him that it had to be included prior to the hearing. The application is a variance. The applicant wishes to build a new home, and the property lies in the Agricultural Holding Zone. Mr. Fegley noted the setbacks are very restrictive. The applicant would be seeking two variances, one for the garage and the other for the house. Supervisor Bucher verified the neighbors were notified, and Mr. Fegley stated the notification was mailed out two weeks ago.

Supervisor Kelso questioned the two variances. Supervisor Shearer noted the applicant was seeking variances but the information was not provided for review. Supervisor Bucher requested explanatory notes be provided for the variances. Overall, the board supported the application.

Rt. 34 Property

Greg Folk of Century 21 noted he was representing the owner of the Country Chef Restaurant and two adjoining properties. Supervisor Shearer asked if Mr. Folk had documentation to prove he was representing the property owner. Mr. Folk provided a copy of the listing contract. Solicitor Allshouse noted a real estate listing agreement allows a real estate agent to act on behalf of the potential property owner for the purposes of sale, discussions of sale, and potential use when dealing with banks, lawyers and municipalities with regard to zoning, liens, and other issues. Solicitor Allshouse noted his document makes him an agent of the owner. Mr. Folk was seeking direction from the Board. Mr. Folk pointed out the unusual zoning on the property. It has a pie shape cut out of the three properties. He mentioned approaching Middlesex and properly petitioned them to rezone the entire property which lies in Middlesex to village commercial. The only section left was the small pie shape section which is currently zoned residential. Mr. Folk felt the property would unlikely have a building on the small piece of property but noted it would be helpful if it was zoned highway commercial. He added it would be a good piece of property to have frontage. Mr. Folk asked the board to consider a zoning change request for the small section. Supervisor Bucher asked how much of the acreage was in NMT. Mr. Folk felt it was less than 5% of the total property. Solicitor Allshouse noted if all the property lied in NMT, it would not be an issue. He recommended Mr. Folk pay another attorney to review the code since it would be spot zoning. He added unless some exception existed he did not know how it could be rezoned since it is lined with the current residential zone. Overall, he recommended a second opinion on the spot zoning. Supervisor Reisinger felt it was the logical thing to do, but it was contingent on the legal concern. Mr. Folk thanked the board for their input.

Subdivisions / Land Development Plans

AC Kuhn – Lot 3&4 subdivision –extension request to 4/28/08

Mr. Fegley noted AC Kuhn was seeking a 60 day extension.

Stryker Brigade Land Development – extension request to 4/30/08

Mr. Fegley noted the Stryker Brigade was seeking a 90 day extension.

New Business

Brush Pick-up

Ms. Ealer mentioned the concern from the Public Works Director that the brush pick-up was being used for what it was not intended. She referenced Mr. Brickner's memo and photo's attached. Supervisor Shearer noted staff was to present a recommendation at the January meeting to the board. Ms. Ealer recommended going back to the original intent of the brush pick up. She noted the information would clearly be explained in the next newsletter. Ms. Ealer noted the practice has grown in the past few years and she would like to get back to what it used to be. Supervisor Kelso mentioned quantifying the amount. He felt it had to be clarified what is a reasonable amount. Ms. Ealer noted the information would be included in the next letter in which the verbiage would be presented to the board in advance for review. Supervisor Shearer recommended Mr. Brickner have input. Supervisor Kelso felt the abuse of the brush pickup should be explained. Supervisor Hurley felt the abuse portion could not be defined. He felt the program should be either eliminated or the resident should be billed for the time.

Hosting next joint meeting 3/5 or 3/11

The joint meeting between NMT, SMT, BOC and Middlesex was set for March 5th. Ms. Ealer requested all agenda items be forwarded to her.

CAPCOG Chesapeake Bay lawsuit

Ms. Ealer reviewed a memorandum from Perry Albert the Executive Director of the Capital Region COG. He outlines a strategy that the COG is exploring to join to together on a legal challenge to the DEP Chesapeake Bay Tributary Strategy. Several municipalities have discussed the issue and have approved joining. Others are still reviewing the information. NMA did discuss the issue and have decided to join the lawsuit. Supervisor Bucher questioned the fees. Ms. Ealer noted the fee was based upon population served. On behalf of the citizens, Supervisor Shearer felt the board should look into joining the lawsuit since it was a strong armed mandate on the citizens. Supervisor Reisinger suggested the Township participate. Ms. Ealer noted funding was available from the 2007 carryover. Supervisor Hurley questioned the determining factor if enough people don't participate. Ms. Ealer referenced the memo in which the details were outlined. The board decided to add the issue to the consent agenda.

NMA Rate Increase Ordinance

Supervisor Bucher noted the issue was discussed at the Reorganization meeting. Ms. Ealer noted a date and time for a public meeting was required to be scheduled.

Carlisle Events 2008 Briefing 2/13/08 @ 9:00am

Ms. Ealer and the codes department plan to attend the meeting and she would notify Chief Rudolph.

Softball Program

Ms. Ealer reported the girl's softball program will not be operating this year. Brian Morrow recently notified the Township that he would not be able to operate the program. An ad was placed in the local paper in which one response was received. After some discussion with Ms. Scharadin, Ms. Ealer recommended putting the program on hold. She added the Borough of Carlisle has a program available. The current program focused on skills whereas the Borough of Carlisle program was a little more competitive. Supervisor Bucher inquired if an increased charge would be applied for North Middleton participants. Ms. Ealer was unsure. Supervisor Bucher recommended advertising the position in the newsletter and on the website for next year. Ms. Ealer felt it was an excellent opportunity to work with the Borough on the program. Supervisor Shearer and Supervisor Bucher noted they would contact the Borough Recreation Department to discuss the issue.

Fire Company Revenue

Supervisor Bucher mentioned having an open dialogue with representatives of the Fire Company to discuss the Township's yearly donation to the fire company. He noted some municipalities have separate taxes to support the fire company. Supervisor Reisinger felt the present system works well for the fire company. Supervisor Bucher noted one concern was that the Fire Company solicits donations. He noted every citizen takes advantage of the need and questioned if every citizen should contribute to the need. Supervisor Kelso felt it wouldn't hurt to talk with them about their needs. Supervisor Reisinger felt they should be left as a separate entity. Supervisor Shearer recommended contacting the secretary of the Fire Department to set a meeting to discuss their funding needs. Supervisor Bucher and Supervisor Kelso agreed to attend the meeting.

Old Business**Task List**

Updates include:

--EIT/Captax- Ms. Ealer mentioned a meeting slated for February 13th in the evening. Another meeting concerning Act 511 is scheduled for February 11th. To make sure the board is on the same page, Supervisor Bucher mentioned the exploration of a future without Captax. He mentioned leveraging as many municipalities as possible and the school board for a life without Captax. Supervisor Reisinger mentioned getting all the tax revenue. Ms. Ealer added they were not following the law in reference to Act 511. Ms. Ealer mentioned a workshop on February 13th with presentations. Supervisor Kelso and Supervisor Shearer noted it would be nice if the school district goes along with the decision.

--Organic Recycling site- Ms. Ealer noted the grant was submitted this week. Supervisor Bucher mentioned negotiations with Middlesex for the organic recycling site to be located on Beagle Road. He wanted to verify that the board wanted to participate.

--Waste Contract – Supervisor Shearer volunteered to be on the waste contract committee. Mr. Kelso noted he would also be on the committee.

-- Pine Manor II- Mr. Fegley noted it was recorded.

PMRS Excess Interest Policy

The board decided to discuss the excess interest and the potential to set a policy. Ms. Ealer reviewed the choices available to the board. In the past, the excess interest was distributed evenly between the members and retirees. This year a new police officer was added and it would change the actuarial evaluation. Supervisor Bucher noted Chief Rudolph recommended keeping the policy distribution the same as in the past. Ms. Ealer pointed out the issue was a negotiable item for the police contract, and added putting the amount in the municipal account made the most sense from her perspective. Ms. Ealer noted the excess interest has only occurred in the past two years. Supervisor Reisinger thought the board decided to put the amount in the municipal account based upon contribution. Ms. Ealer noted the issue could be an agenda action item so if it comes up again it would be policy as stated which would be dispersed based on percentage of contribution. Supervisor Bucher verified it would be policy, but the board would also want to review the information.

SFTF Update discussion

Mr. Fegley reported the committee held a meeting on January 15th, and referenced his memorandum with key points. He added Mr. Hurley brought up the possibility that the Act 537 Plan may require the township to have a manual in place. Mr. Fegley noted he was researching the lengthy document to determine if a manual is required and if so, would the DEP manual be acceptable. Mr. Fegley reviewed Ordinance 97-2 and reviewed some of the changes recommended as outlined in large letters. Mr. Fegley pointed out an applicant would have to fail a perk site test before a SFTF could be utilized. Then, Mr. Fegley discussed the issue of having a preliminary and secondary site. If only one is located, a SFTF may be proposed as the backup system in the event the preliminary fails. Mr. Fegley noted the SFTF affect the surrounding soil and water table much less. Supervisor Shearer inquired if it required a direct discharge into a wet land or stream. Mr. Fegley pointed out the information was in the DEP manual for SFTF. Grant Marshall stated it could be a dry natural channel as long as a bed, bank or swale would phase the water to a stream. When this option is use, Mr. Marshall mentioned different criteria has to be followed versus a direct discharge to the Conodoguinet Creek. One issue that would have to be added to the planning module was to notify all the property owners from the discharge point to the stream. Supervisor Shearer asked if it went across his property, then would it be another recorded easement. Mr.

Marshall noted if it was a natural drainage channel then DEP does not require an easement. If pipe is being run across a neighbor's property, then DEP requires an easement. Supervisor Bucher noted he would not feel comfortable going across someone else's property.

Kurt Williams of Salzman and Hughes mentioned a client of his owning property in Kendor Summit which is not directly adjacent to the Conodoguinet. He noted the DEP manual envisions an easement being required by a landowner that needs to run a discharge to a perennial stream. Mr. Williams stated he would not shut the opportunity out for a land locked property owner. Supervisor Hurley stated that Kendor Summit has another unique situation which does not only involve the easement across the property but an easement across a public street. He questioned who would become responsible for the pipe across the street. Supervisor Shearer asked who would be responsible for a public street. Mr. Williams mentioned the possibility of an agreement in which the land owner would be responsible for the street. Supervisor Bucher mentioned escrowing. Solicitor Allshouse stated if the public street is going to be dug up or have something running under the street, then it would be a direct impact on the street just like in a land development in which an escrow or bond is used. Solicitor Allshouse noted it would add another layer to the entire SFTF ordinance. Or the ordinance could be passed as is with an exception stating that nothing can cross the public street and in the event it does, then it would require the permission of the Township. Grant Marshall added it would be listed on the deed. Solicitor Allshouse noted the restriction would show upon the property owner's title, etc.

Another significant change was the timing of the amount for the escrow for the application as listed under Section 13. "After the property owner has obtained sewage planning approval and the necessary permits from PaDEP for the SFSTF, they will apply for a permit from NMT. This permit will be obtained prior to issuance of a building/zoning permit for the construction of a new dwelling. This would be required for a system whether it is for new construction or in a repair situation." Mr. Fegley noted his only change would be for a permit for a "primary residential dwelling". Supervisor Hurley verified the escrow is based upon the permit for the system and not on the building of the home. Mr. Fegley noted he was correct. Mr. Marshall questioned if the specific permit should be clarified. Solicitor Allshouse noted he and Mr. Fegley would work on the language clarification at their meeting slated for next Thursday.

Solicitor Allshouse pointed out the note listed in Section 6 between subsections A & B in reference to isolation distance requirements. He stated they could use the information in the DEP manual. Supervisor Hurley noted it may not be possible to cross a street due to the isolation distances. Supervisor Shearer stated he would not vote for approval if it runs through a public street. Supervisor Kelso mentioned his concern with acreage and use of easements. Mr. Fegley discussed the usage of the DEP guidelines. Kurt Williams mentioned his concern with the minimum land area. Solicitor Allshouse noted he and Mr. Fegley would review the recommended changes.

As for easements and right of ways, Mr. Fegley noted the information was not added in the ordinance. Yet, the board could decide if they would like it added to make it more restrictive than the DEP manual. Grant Marshall noted if an easement is not included, DEP will not approve the module. Supervisor Bucher verified the DEP manual implies the acquisition of an easement. Supervisor Shearer noted he would like to see the easement added to the ordinance. Overall, Supervisor Bucher noted Solicitor Allshouse and Mr. Fegley would work on the verbiage. In the meantime, all the supervisors would review the DEP manual and the easement issue would be revisited at the next workshop meeting.

Supervisor Kelso voiced his concern for making it easy to get a SFTF which would defeat the purpose to hook up to sewer and water. He stressed the issue for acreage should be reviewed. Grant Marshall noted the lot size has nothing to do with the functionality of the system. Within the guidelines of DEP the system operates with 2000 gallons, so the most that could be permitted would be 5 lots if they are 3 bedroom homes. He did not foresee DEP changing the guidelines. Supervisor Reisinger felt the ordinance should remain as presented and review each case on an as needed basis. Mr. Fegley noted it would eliminate the township manual.

Supervisor Shearer noted a change should be made in regards to the deposit. Mr. Fegley suggested a note stating that the BOS has the ability to grant a waiver for unique situations. Supervisor Reisinger agreed with the ability to grant a waiver. In summary, Mr. Fegley reviewed some key points discussed: new lots will be a 3 acre minimum, change from 600 gallons to 2000 gallons per day, draft a resolution/ordinance that gives the BOS the right to grant a waiver on an as needed basis, timing of the escrow to be applied to the issuing of the permit from the Township, elimination of the Township manual and question about easements. Solicitor Allshouse recommended completing a draft and review the information again at the next workshop meeting.

Zoning Book Changes

Mr. Fegley reviewed his January 30th memorandum with the board. First, Mr. Fegley reported legislation was in the works at the state level which would address many issues related to kennels. The committee decided to leave the ordinance as established pending the outcome of the proposed legislation. If the legislation is passed, Mr. Fegley noted they would review the final document and then see if the code requires a change.

The second concern was related to residentially zoned or residentially occupied wording. Mr. Fegley noted throughout the Township many R-1 properties abut a highway commercial, I-1, I-2 or neighborhood commercial zone. The recommendation was offered to insert the wording "residentially occupied" to help determine if screening or buffering was required between a non-residential use and a residentially occupied lot. The committee felt that residentially occupied should not be inserted due to the fact that if the township wanted it residentially zoned then the township should zone it as such. Thus, the current wording would stand. The Newville Road area was mentioned in which Supervisor Kelso felt the residents should have some form of protection. Supervisor Reisinger added the board cannot make a zone comply with residential if it is an I-2 zone. Supervisor Bucher noted conditions can be set to protect residents with screening. The board discussed setbacks for buildings and structures. After some discussion concerning the addition of "residentially occupied", Solicitor Allshouse recommended the use of a clause that says, "As to any use in a proposed zone, the BOS may require screening and buffering to be placed between the use and a residentially occupied structure if the board believes it could have an adverse impact". Then the ordinance would not require a change, but rather adding another requirement to meeting the conditions even on a permitted use. He added then it would be a case by case basis.

As for Section 204-109A, the code book calls for a minimum of 300 foot of road frontage along an arterial road. The committee recognizes that the code does not state one way or the other if the road frontage needs to be continuous or contiguous. Solicitor Allshouse recommended the use of 'lot width'.

Section 164-29 addresses sewage system permit fees. The committee recommended this section be eliminated due to the fact that the fees listed in Section 164-29 A through K are outdated. It was felt that the Township Solicitor should review and possibly draft an ordinance or resolution so the BOS may change those fees from time to time without the added cost of inserting it into the codified code. Ms. Ealer recommended the fees be set by resolution. Solicitor Allshouse noted the other ordinances could be amended to set the fees by resolution. Supervisor Bucher noted the changes would be reviewed at the next workshop meeting.

Sound System

Supervisor Shearer reviewed three quotes on the sound system. He recommended the quote from Gelnett & Associates, LLC. Solicitor Allshouse recommended reviewing the equipment and follow-up with the contractor to see what type of guarantee / warranty will be offered. He suggested having a warranty that does not start until the system is fully operational. Supervisor Shearer noted the quotes were telephone quotes. If the board wanted specific equipment, then a request for proposal should be created. Supervisor Reisinger has no issue supporting Supervisor Shearer's recommendation.

Blighted Properties

Mr. Fegley reported he was composing a letter to site all the violations at 1126 Newville Road. He mentioned a mandated state procedure to follow through the UCC. As for the property on Calvary Street, Mr. Fegley noted gaining access to the property in which busted pipes and saturated floors were discovered. The Redevelopment Authority worked on an estimate for repair and determined it required more funding that they were willing to spend. If repaired, the balance would be the responsibility of the owner who was currently in a rehabilitation center. Once it is determined if the resident will be returning or not, then Mr. Fegley would proceed on determining if the property should be condemned. Thirdly, Mr. Lao has a court hearing with the owner on Moongale Drive for the rubbish on the outside of the home. Once the letter is composed, Mr. Fegley will then apply it to her for the inside of the home. Mr. Fegley added they were approached by a neighbor who volunteered to clean the inside of the home with other volunteers. Mr. Lao did indicate to the neighbor that a deadline would apply.

Spring Road Home Occupation

After reviewing the decision from the hearing in reference to Jerry's Towing, Mr. Fegley added the decision did not place any conditions on the operation of the business. Mr. Fegley noted it was a business under the R-1. He felt the next step was to pursue a nonconforming use of the property. Under 204-116, it cites that the ability to expand is limited. Section 180-86 states that a cut or fill grading will be a two to one slope. The Township could go out and measure the cut to make sure it is a two to one slope. He added a zoning permit has a 6 month window for completion.

Intermunicipal Agreement with Lower Frankford

Ms. Ealer presented the draft intermunicipal agreement with NMT and Lower Frankford Township regarding the UCC Appeals board. The agreement was reviewed by Solicitor Allshouse and herself in which they have no concerns. She recommended putting the item on the consent agenda. The board decided to add the item to the consent agenda.

Village Park

Supervisor Shearer mentioned completing a walkthrough of Village Park in reference to the concern of excessive dog feces in the park. He found no issues.

Police Department

Supervisor Shearer noted Chief Rudolph would be back to work on Monday.

Chronister property

Supervisor Shearer inquired when the property located on the Newville Road was converted to a real estate office. Mr. Fegley stated about 6 months ago.

Compensation Benefits for Supervisors

Supervisor Reisinger suggested the board consider adopting a policy in which supervisors can receive compensatory benefits. He noted other municipalities have adopted the policy, and felt it would be beneficial for the future. Supervisor Bucher added it was not in the personnel policy. Solicitor Allshouse noted it could be added via ordinance. Supervisor Shearer noted the addition may assist in attracting quality people for the various boards.

Current Public Hearings

Supervisor Shearer questioned if Ms. Ealer was required to attend the public hearings. Solicitor Allshouse pointed out Ms. Ealer is very well organized and can recap what needs to be done after each hearing. He stated someone would have to be designated to keep the information organized. The board decided to leave the issue to Ms. Ealer's discretion.

Cumberland County Planning Outreach meeting

Ms. Ealer noted it was slated for Monday, and Mr. Fegley was the Township representative.

In Lieu of Real Estate Taxes Update

Supervisor Bucher requested thank you letters be sent to the contributors.

Adjournment

Supervisor Shearer moved to adjourn the January 31, 2008 workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors at 9:15 p.m. Supervisor Kelso seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Ealer
Township Secretary

Lori A. Coleman
Recording Secretary