

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
BUDGET WORK SESSION #4**

**DECEMBER 23, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a 8:00 a.m. budget work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Randy Wachter, General Accountant  
Todd Grove, Murphy & Dittenhafer  
Vernon Fisher, Murphy & Dittenhafer  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called the meeting to order at 8 a.m. She stated that this was a general advertised meeting, the fourth in a series of Budget meetings of the Board of Supervisors. In addition to the agenda items, there was a need to attach one more item with regard to the farmhouse renovations. Representatives of Murphy & Dittenhafer were in attendance to answer some of the questions raised by the Board. Chairman Mitrick then turned meeting over to Paul Amic and Randy Wachter.

**2. BUDGET DISCUSSIONS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the purpose of this meeting was to see if there were any further comments from the Board of Supervisors and also to make any additional adjustment changes.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Wachter to point out any particular items to address.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that he would like to review the items that have changed since the last presentation. Under Miscellaneous Revenue \$1,500 had been removed for the Civil and Military Celebrations related to the Community Celebration. \$1,500 in revenue had been removed because no revenue was anticipated from the Community Celebration. Mr. Wachter stated that the Board added \$6,000 to Operating Supplies, and a 15<sup>th</sup> Firefighter would be added which would change the overtime with a savings of \$42,267.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop recalled an item changed under Retention.

- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter clarified that it was moved from Volunteer Retention to Volunteer Recruitment.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter reported that under Police Vehicles, a third vehicle had been added, resulting in an additional \$24,000.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the commentary still read “two” instead of “three”.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that the commentary was wrong; it had been changed to three.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked where the \$48,000 was noted.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated it was on the last line under Equipment Vehicles; it had been \$48,000 and now read \$72,000. Mr. Wachter indicated that Contract Services was \$28,000 and is now \$3,000. The final change to the General Fund Budget related to two vehicles and with the enforcement officer at \$22,000 one was removed.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether anything was added for refurbishing one of those police vehicles.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that \$3,000 had been placed in the Community Development budget.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that a 4-wheel drive was still indicated.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the Board agreed that prior to purchasing the vehicle there would be further discussion.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that our general discussion indicated to strike the 4-wheel drive so the wrong message wouldn’t be sent.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that in the Revenue section, that leaves a fund surplus of \$110,856 for 2000.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that the Board should be aware that, in addition to that there is a \$381,597 carryover. The Board of Supervisors likes to know what that is to determine where they might put it. If you did nothing today but pass the Ordinance or Resolutions you would have to add those together.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that the Board had this discussion that they act on the surplus of 1999 in 2000, and it was really not surplus.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated they had done that in the past basically during the first of January depending on the Board's wishes. Since we're still in December and the final number probably won't be known until January when the approvals would be made, it would actually be in February so at that time this \$381,597 will be a firm number. That's what was done in prior years. When the financial people confirm the surplus, then the Board can determine what to do with that. Mr. Amic stated that was the reason for delaying until January or February of last year and then we put that on the Agenda for the Board to make a decision on what to do.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that it was necessary for him to see if he received all the revenue by the end of February. The figure amounts to anything that related to 1999 that was received before 60 days into the new year.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that would not be something that could be calculated.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that historically there had been at least as much as was showing.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that there would be a change, but not a big one.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that some of the figures could be calculated with reasonable accuracy, but some could not.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to provide the Board with recommendations as to where the money might be placed, when that firm number becomes available.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the item would be placed on the Agenda. Some of the options might include Capital Expenditures, or Highway Reserve, and perhaps this year consideration might be focused on the construction of the Administration Building.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that he would like to start taking care of some of the highway problems especially anticipating the opening of the Home Depot; some additional funds will be necessary for highways.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick agreed with Mr. Pasch and stated that the Board should place that money on priority items.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated it would be on the instruction of the Board coming back in January, and there may be more focus on the Memory Lane problem.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the connection in between Mt. Zion and McCrory's should be reviewed.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he was pleased with the actions of the York County Planning Commission, who did an excellent job in speaking up for Windsor Township, York Township and Springettsbury Township to Penn Dot. Highways are a high priority in York County. Mr. Amic also commented that high on the list was Deininger Road. They realize that so we've got three or four major projects that Penn Dot now has realized the importance. We can look for some reasonably quick action, and that probably ties into our thinking about the community wide traffic condition.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that as the Prospect Road situation was solved, that resulted in more traffic in Springettsbury.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what high priority meant.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that Penn Dot would decide those items, which would go into design fairly quickly. High priority is not twelve years, it may appear on the twelve year plan, but once you get up into the top four or five there's a real good chance of getting it done in a short amount which is probably two to four years considering a year for design and property acquisitions and the next year construction.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that she could tell by looking at Mr. Pasch that it was not fast enough for him.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he understood that the design work and the property acquisition would be tough. There would be a lot of work to get the property that's required and that's not going to be easy and will be very expensive. There are a lot of people on some of these highways that are commercial establishments, and if 10 feet of their property is taken, they're out of business. It may be expensive today, but consider what it would be five or ten years from now.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked if there were any other questions on the budget.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he recalled that everything that was discussed had been corrected. He asked for Mr. Wachter's confirmation that there was nothing missing.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that with the exception of what Mr. Bishop found this morning everything had been included.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether he had taken off fees for Board of Supervisors. She had looked for it and it was gone.

**3. RESOLUTION 99-58:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the Board had any questions regarding Resolution 99-58. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT RESOLUTION 99-58 ADOPTING THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2000 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**4. RESOLUTION 99-59:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called for a motion regarding Resolution 99-59.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-59 FIXING THE TAX RATE FOR THE YEAR 2000 AT .627 MILS. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic mentioned that Solicitor Yost provided the prepared storm water agreements relating to St. Onge. Mr. Amic explained that these were the agreements that were reviewed at the last meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Amic and Mr. Wachter for doing a fine job taking us through it.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic thanked both Mr. Wachter and Mr. Madden and the Board for this budget.

**5. FARMHOUSE RENOVATIONS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the next item on the agenda related to the letter that the Board received from the Architect regarding the farmhouse renovations. Todd Grove and Vernon Fisher were in attendance to address questions.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that, for the record, Todd, Vernon and he met earlier during the week to discuss the matters in the letter. I think you probably have the letter dated December 20<sup>th</sup>. The matters in the letter were discussed, and we can move on from that point.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove asked Mr. Amic whether everyone had a chance to also see the other letter, the one that answered some of the change order questions.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that they low balled this bid and they admitted that at a staff meeting. Somebody from this Board, or somebody from this office told you to do that. Mr. Gurreri asked who told them to do that.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove asked Mr. Gurreri to clarify his question, i.e., to make the job low enough.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that if they had quoted the price at what it should have been the Board would not have spent \$100,000 on the farmhouse.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove stated that he was sorry, he was not sure he was following what was being said.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri responded with Rettew, the engineer.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated he was not sure what the answer might be

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that at least what she heard, is that in one of the meetings that you had with Paul and Andrew and possibly Ron is that someone at the meeting made the comment that they came in low for electrical quotes. They knew that there was a division of the Board over the future of this farmhouse building. That was simply what she had been told.

**FISHER** Mr. Vernon Fisher, the Construction Administration Field Representative, commented that Todd Grove hadn't been at the meeting. On the 10<sup>th</sup>, when we came down for a fire systems meeting, that's when Mr. Amic told us that we were to answers these questions. At that meeting Mr. Amic said something about the cost of the building being higher than the initial projected cost and that's when Kevin Klindedinst from Rettew who was here for the fire meeting made a statement that he was told to design the building with minimal changes. Mr. Fisher thought that was what was being referring to.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove added that he thought what Kevin was probably referring to was what he had been trying to outline in the letter that you all received that over the course of the last year in determining the price of the farm house that it was decided to continue to use it. We, meaning the board, ourselves, everyone involved, if we continue to use it, it would not be razed; it was being used by the Parks and Recreation that with some minimum work that everyone felt should be done to the exterior, we were going to have a new building here, a renovated existing building. There should be some cleaning up of the exterior and that there should be some carpet, some painting, some lighting of the first floor spaces and to also put in a handicapped bath and provide a way for someone to get into that first floor, a ramp.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Vernon had described the meeting fairly well. Mr. Amic provided the following explanation. I said at that time to the Rettew representative, I said to him; "Well, how would you get that impression?" He didn't answer back but I did say to him; "That's not an excuse". But you have a responsibility no matter what somebody told about keeping cost down, you have a responsibility to advise us in what we ought to do with this building. He didn't respond to that, he didn't follow up on his comment that he was told to put the bare minimum least cost into this building. Well, no matter who directed you to do that you must comply with the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. You should know something about that if you're going to get these contracts. I think something to that nature was said at that meeting. He would not be forthcoming, he felt he got that instruction after he made a mistake. Of course I think, Vernon, you and I were quite surprised by the comment. That's where it came from Mr. Gurreri, and we didn't get any follow up from Rettew at all but we did insist at that point, no matter who told you that you have a responsibility here and evidently you didn't do what you're supposed to do, comply with the Department of Labor and Industry requirements.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that, as far as the first part of it is concerned, Paul, there is no question in my mind that it's through all our discussions, the consensus of the Board was that we should do it for the least amount of money that was required. I think that everybody got that impression. You're right that there's things that must be done and must be brought out.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove added that that's the distinction. They tried to approach it that way, and perhaps that's what the person from Rettew was trying to say. The second letter with the change orders is where it starts to come out that as the contractor started to tear into things, there's no doubt that we found piping or other things that really should, while works is being done, be changed, be made better and some of the changes orders, and things that you've been presented to date are those kinds of items. There's an item, like the broken glass that, I regret we didn't see the extent of that broken glass, and if we had, we would have put it the drawings and I wish we would have. We didn't. The post that was discovered, those kind of things, some of that's got to be expected, and I'm not surprised that we found some of that. I felt on the L&I front we were very fortunate that the way L&I approached this they did not require us to go back through the entire building and change the stairway that doesn't comply, railings, treads, risers, the construction of the farm house or the fire ratings, the layout, the egress.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that you know what L&I requires and when they want you to put doors on it, you should have known that. I can't help but

say that this is lowball. There are a lot of things that need to be done to this house that are not being done but still, and I pointed some of these items out at a couple different meetings, one thing being insulation, you don't repair windows today you replace them, they should be replaced instead of repaired for \$800.00, new windows are not that expensive. We had things to do in the basement along with the old wiring. We want to know what its going to cost just to do these things and do it right because it would be for public use.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that it was being used, and as Mr. Pasch said, it was never understood that we going to go through and completely insulate and do all the replacement windows. You could even take that to the heating system or you could go on forever. This was never the scope of work that was understood.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that with regard to the December 20<sup>th</sup> memo maybe I didn't get the whole thing, but the first change was five items and then there's questions from those five items.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that those were the questions that were given to us to respond to as a result of the last meeting.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what was meant by the two responses.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated he had tried to answer some of the number 3 in the other letter.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked him if he had a copy of the other letter.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked him if he meant the December 17<sup>th</sup> letter.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that was correct.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested that Mr. Grove go through the letter that was written on the 20<sup>th</sup> and at least address those items. You've done it systematically so I think it will be a good approach so that the Board understands where we are today and how we got there.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that when the change orders start rolling in people wanted to know whether this is a small chunk of ice or the tip of an iceberg. He agreed. The Change Orders that were submitted to date were the ones on page two under item number one, Change Orders and Proposal Requests. By the contractor MPJ, the general construction contractor the L&I items were \$2,700, the Change Order #2, glass and posts at \$1,065, that's the \$3,773, that's the Change Orders that we're submitting and approved. We looked at the work, Vernon and I feel every one agreed it

had to be done. Shannon Smith the electrical contractor, in putting in the additional smoke detection systems and emergency lighting, you can see the total, \$4,627.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that those are the total of those two items are what I presented to the Board. Now at that point, that's what I personally approved.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that some of these were started already.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he had personally approved these only because they were L&I matters. The bottom item in there relates to matters with our fire chief. Mr. Amic indicated he looked at the letter, there are a lot things in this letter that we could talk about, but the only thing that's been approved at this point by my office is A. Mr. Amic indicated he was not saying these other things shouldn't be done as it moves along but wanted to let everybody know what we've done in administration and what may need to be done as staff recommendations follow.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove commented on item B, a proposal request submitted to MPJ, which that final pricing had not come back. There were some things that we found, a bad joist had to be repaired, we hoped to reuse some brick when we cut the new opening for the door to patch another opening. It turned out that the brick was not able to be reused, there was a small cost to get new brick instead. The porch decking on Mt. Zion Road was found not to be in good shape after we tore into it. One of the reasons this is unknown, there are also some other work items that were called to be done that now do not have to be done, credits are coming are coming back to you. So we're going both ways, back and forth.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it was a foregone conclusion that credits won't offset the expenses.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove commented that part of Vernon's job is daily looking at this information being submitted and asking whether it's fair. We ask for the cost and labor, for the material and labor of everything so we know what a new door cost or what it doesn't, and we can check and see that it is being done fairly.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove continued that regarding Item C were Change Orders/proposal request that came back with costs but that have not been approved change orders. The first item to Frey Lutz was a sanitary pipe that in the basement we were trying work with and reuse, and through the course of looking at it and the condition of the sump pump it made sense to spend \$719 extra to get the piping in the basement ceiling done in a way where it could take care of a sump pump problem, it could take care of a sag and a clog that

existed in the piping and that's what that type of thing is, and help us with code compliance too.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove continued with the Shannon Smith, the electrical contractor. Andrew and Ron Simmons, the staff went through the building looking at the electrical system in terms of what was or was not in compliance with the electric code and this list was, top to bottom, from basement to attic, all of the non-compliant electric items, whether it was the fixtures in the second floor bathrooms, again, on the second floor, there's no scope of work up there, we're not doing any renovations on the second floor other than the duct work threads through the building for the new mechanical air conditioning system. But, everything was identified on the list that you went through, bringing the entire building up to the current electric code. You can see the \$13,695.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether these items were something that we should have considered on the front end that we had to bring it up to code.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that Andrew Stern and he had spoken about this the other day. Perhaps at a minimum the first floor spaces - let's say we're planning to use the two first floors on a limited bases. After everything is cleared out, there's some electric boxes and things that were done over the years that I know I hadn't seen before, there was a post in the floor up under a desk. I would think, perhaps on the first floor we may want to consider bring at least those spaces where something be plugged into or used, maybe you do, if the budget permits, want to at least do that. Maybe other things can be looked at to do as you want to use the second floor in the future or do more work with the building if you ever come that you would do that as a later item.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there would be a higher risk if we do not comply.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove asked Mr. Stern whether it was that bad.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it was bad, including non-grounded outlets, knob and tube outlets non-grounded which the contractor was finding.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove continued that systems had been added to the fire safety to the building such as the new fire alarm system as part of the L&I work. Doors with closers on the stairs had been added to separate and help control smoke in the event of a fire, and emergency lighting would be put throughout the building.

- SHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Stern whether the electrical work was part of the normal course of building permit activity that would occur in that building.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that a Building Permit would have been required regardless of who owned the building. It is being renovated and there is work to be done to the electrical system. Electrical work is not something that our office takes lightly because it is a hazard to life and the fact that it is a fire hazard.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether this involved rewiring the whole house. He added that it did not sound like there was much good wiring left.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated it might be easier to just rewire the whole house.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that he had discussed a plan with Mr. Grove of perhaps the possibility of removing some of the stuff that doesn't comply if you are not using the separate floors and then putting in new, if and when you use those areas.
- SHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that his question was where did we fail to recognize that this is a building project and things like that should have been anticipated.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether this discovery had been made because it's being uncovered or because it would have been seen by just looking at it.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that his office had not been directly involved in the farmhouse until a later date. Once the Labor and Industry approved plans were received, Mr. Stern and his associates went through the farmhouse with plans and specs. At that time they had listed things that, in their opinion, were left out. Some of them were code items; some of them were common sense items.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that those were things were obvious.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri suggested to put new electrical in for the first floor and let the rest alone; if the remainder of the facility would be used, start there, rather than repairing the existing wiring.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he had not seen the detail of what had been proposed.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that the contractor was going off of existing lines.

- STERN** Mr. Stern asked whether the cost was for specific items or the “big picture.”
- FISHER** Mr. Fisher asked whether the bid requested that the electrical system be brought up to code. He asked what the township would like the scope of the electrical to be right now.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated he understood they were going to continue to use the building as it was. At the very minimum the electric work involved was part of the course of doing the other work that we did.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated his understanding was that one of the things that one relies upon an architect for would be to tell us the kinds of things that had to be done to get to where we wanted to be. Mr. Bishop indicated that he may not have heard statements from the architect indicating that we weren’t going to be doing any electrical work and that it may not pass our own codes.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that they had gone through the building and tried to develop a scope of work and an approach. Perhaps at that time they should have seen the potential to do more electric work or that they should have perhaps looked at the electrical work, but because it was being used now it was not an issue. It went too far the other way to just continue to use it, and it became an issue that the building needed to be brought more into code compliance.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that they are professionals and know what you should have done. You’ve had outside pressure not to do it and that’s another story. You know L&I is going to require certain things, such as wiring. You guys know it better than I do and I’m a layman, and I know that. It’s common sense things.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated that he was well aware of the new bill. They had gone to Labor and Industry and reviewed the items, and those items that are now included are L&I items.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether L&I went through and approved it without all these changes in the electrical.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove explained the scenario that through the summer months they met in Harrisburg and determined what was noncompliant and not in the code. They attempted to develop a strategy for applying for variances. All that was done as the final plans and the final scope of work were being developed. The variances were put together the end of July and were submitted on or about August 4<sup>th</sup>. Shortly after submitting that we learned that L&I would not be able to complete their review, and we were

not going to hear back from the state until September that they would approve these L&I items. The response was going to come in after the bids were due. Typically that was not how it works and normally we would know and be able to include that work in the bidding; we were not able to. The exact scope of work is generally not known until the variance board meets once a month and determines whether they would allow you to not do all this other work but instead add the smoke detectors and the closers for the doors and the things that are now in this change order. Mr. Grove expressed regret that those things had not been known.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that what was shown was all that L&I had requested and not the proposal for the township codes upgrades.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that L&I has a fire and panic act only at this point.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that what he wanted to get straightened out was that some of this is L&I and some of it is township saying we must meet the codes. In terms of meeting the codes we've got \$13,695 which is what we say we must do in order to meet code.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that would be the electric, - a complete new electric system, that's top to bottom.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the upstairs would be included from top to bottom.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that it would.

**FISHER** Mr. Fisher clarified that the proposal that we got was not to completely rewire the building. The proposal was just to change some of the items that had to be changed to meet code. Rewiring the building, taking out all the knob and tube wiring that is in the building was not included, only changing outlets and switches.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that if the project continued, a quote should be provided as to what it would cost to rewire the building.

**FISHER** Mr. Fisher stated that this quote is not that.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch understood that, but asked whether it would bring us up to code.

**FISHER** Mr. Fisher responded that it would.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked Mr. Stern whether knob and tube wiring should be replaced.

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it does not have to be replaced.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that in York City this would not be permitted.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that if this building was in the city and was being renovated the knob and tube wiring would have to be replaced.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that if that was good enough for the city shouldn't it be replaced. If we're going to do this house, it should be done so that it's safe.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated agreement, but stated that the whole house should be rewired.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that if the portion of the building that would be occupied would be rewired, new wiring could always be run when we needed to occupy the rest of the building.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch pointed out that while the contractor is there and working there's a certain amount of set up time. It's probably less expensive to do it and have it run and ready to go whether you tie it off at the end on second floor until a later date.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he did not disagree but that the wiring should be done correctly and replacing it with new would be the smart thing to do.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove summarized the to date dollar amount as \$9,119. If you are looking at the big picture, the bid for the total job is \$86,627 so you'd add the \$9,119 to it and it would equal \$95,746. Beyond that, then you can start to look at the electrical upgrades, and the fire alarm system. If the project were stopped at this point, and the contractors would be paid for what they have done, all the work would be completed. We are within a month of being completed at the \$73,000 number. Just for your information the number below (referring to written material previously presented to the Board) is what the contract values are, that's the \$86,627 number. In addition, demolition costs had been requested.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what the status was logistically if we get a quote on doing more electrical work.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove asked whether Mr. Bishop was referring to service for the entire building or a service for the first floor with the provision to continue onto the second floor at a later date. Mr. Grove added that with either request he did not see a problem getting a proposal in a couple days.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether we would be in a position where the contractor would not have to be paid to mobilize again if a quote were accepted and a decision made that we want to do that.

**FISHER** Mr. Fisher stated that they're the same contractor that's going to be on site through next July. He did not see a problem. The contractor would have to add into his number what he would need to do to run the wire. He may have to take up the carpet on the second floor, cut up the wood floor so he could get into the floor joist. He has to have access into the walls.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that there was no real push for the house. We have a real push for our building. We should be working on the new building and coming back to the house.

**FISHER** Mr. Fisher commented that the electrician doesn't have anything to do in the new building right now.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Grove to clarify one thing for her and for Mr. Gurreri, whether anyone indicated to the contractors any pressure or had they been given the directive to come in low, otherwise the project would not gong fly.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove re-stated her question, i.e., whether the contractor had been pressured.

**FISHER** Mr. Fisher explained to Mr. Grove that Mr. Gurreri was referring to the time during which the building was being designed and was asking what prompted keeping the building so inexpensive.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that whether this Board wanted to raze that farmhouse was absolutely the Board's decision. We had no reason to have that price being there. That scope of work was developed on what we understood was the intended use of the building. We worked with our engineers based on that approach, and I honestly don't know of any pressure or reason to do what you are suggesting.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the engineer admitted that someone had told him.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove added that the only thing he could think that the engineer may have meant was that the scope of work was to be limited and that we were not going to do a whole new heating system, new windows, new insulation. Most 18<sup>th</sup> century farmhouse can be used for offices and all sorts of things. That's for the Board to discuss.

- SHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that he felt the Board's discussions with Frank Dittenhafer were very clear, i.e., that the Board wanted a basic minimal facelift but to make it nice in order to continue using it.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated that perhaps they had not reviewed the work in detail enough with the Board, but that they had reviewed the scope of work. It seemed to be what was decided.
- SHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he agreed with that part but that he was really disappointed. Electrical to him is real obvious, and he was surprised.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove stated that had there been discussion with the engineers and us and if it had been mentioned, we probably would have come back and tried to discuss adding some good wiring.
- SHENCK** Mr. Schenck continued that it is still a building project within the township. Mr. Stern has obligations within the township to get a building permit for this, to check the wiring, the plumbing, and whether things where they need to be.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated they have a cost, and he hoped the Board had information needed to make a decision.
- FISHER** Mr. Fisher stated that somebody will have to tell him exactly what it is that is wanted.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic thought that they had heard what you wanted once you did the quote.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that they don't even know what to quote on. They've heard rewire the basement to attic but also they've heard rewire the first floor and cap it off. The second floor is basically dead. Nothing is working. I heard talk of putting in a new service or are we not. I don't know what service is there. He asked Mr. Stern whether it was sub par.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that he couldn't answer as far as amperage, but he would guess it's 60 amp.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that this is something that the Board should have been made aware of. The Board relied on the architect and the other engineers to at least alert us to this kind of thing and, based on what Andrew said, they go through and exam on the face, and what they come up in order to meet the codes that are here in Springettsbury Township, this is what's required. It's not something that is hidden. But the smoke detection and emergency lighting from Labor and Industry is something that you folks should be aware of.

- GROVE** Mr. Grove stated that they were aware of those L&I requirements, it's not the electric.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that what L&I requires you know what their going to require.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that they would have required what they normally would have required. There was negotiation that went on here.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked why the project would be started without getting their okay.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that the time line was responsible.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that it would be very foolish if they're going to make us re-gut the thing, and we're starting a project.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added without L&I approval. We didn't start the project, but we bid the project. We bid it without their stamp of approval.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove added that he had been able to negotiate what it looked like we would have to do to the building. Then we had to get that onto documents so that bidders could bid it. The final approval from the Board came after the bids came in. I had an idea that it looked like what we were hoping was going to be able to be done was going to be able to be done.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what was going to be done about the electrical. What do we want to tell him to get bids on.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she would have preferred that Mr. Grove had come to the Board and indicated through the bidding process that there was an option to proceed knowing the building would not meet our own codes. Secondly, the Board would have considered putting the additional work in order to meet the codes. She thought that the feeling of the Board would be to meet our own codes at a minimum.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that as far as the present bid quote was concerned a quote should be prepared that indicates do the first floor, and as an option, stub in the second floor.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that when the first floor is done, the basement has to be done because you've got furnace down there.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that when we say "do" we're talking new service.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that he agreed for new service and asked Mr. Grove to provide an idea as to what it would cost.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that a quote should be obtained for both scenarios, i.e., to do the basement and first floor and stub off the second.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested that one be done with an option to add the other, i.e., the first floor and the basement and an option to add the second floor at this time.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove understood.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the township would be covered, in terms of actually using this building, by exterior lighting and security kinds of things. He reminded the Board that one of the ideas for the use of the farmhouse was for service clubs to utilize the facility.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that there was a campus light switch and a light at the back porch, which would now become the main entrance. He could not recall what lighting was between the parking and the walking area and through the grass area to the house. No pole light currently existed.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated it would be important if the building were utilized that people would be able to walk there and see what they're doing.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated that he would go back and take another look at the lighting.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that a walkway that becomes pitch black in the middle would not be acceptable. The item should be included in the quote.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that Mr. Grove was in the "hot seat" and that perhaps Mr. Dittenhafer should have attended this meeting. He added that the Board was sorry to put him through this. Mr. Gurreri added that this had been done sloppily on many people's parts. We're at \$120,000 right now, I don't know how much it was for the architectural fees maybe \$8,000, so we're almost at \$130,000 and additionally we need extra electrical work. It's a lot more than we cared to spend.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove responded that the Board knows everything that they (Murphy & Dittenhafer) do right now. Mr. Fisher and he had discussed that during the early stages of a renovation project is when the contractors are tearing into things and discovering things, and we have passed that point. There are still four weeks to discover some small items, but there are no known things at this time.

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what would happen at this point. He asked when the bid would be received. He asked whether the contractor was working on the electrical in the house.
- FISHER** Mr. Fisher responded that the work had stopped as they had gone as far as they could until the fire alarm system issue has been resolved. As far as the base requirement it had been all pre-wired and that was complete. The fire alarm system was affected because there was a change from what was bid originally and how the township really wanted to see the system operate. That had affected what had been done previously, and that was what the new number represents. Based on the December 10<sup>th</sup> meeting with the township, the work scope had changed.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the wiring that they already did would tie into the new service and the new wiring or whether it would have to be redone.
- FISHER** Mr. Fisher responded that they would not have to do that. He was unsure of the work involving the panel, the service and the existing wiring. The contractor had been changing fixtures, not rewiring the building. Mr. Fisher indicated it was possible that the panel or some of the wiring that is there would not be adequate and would have to be changed under the scenario of providing service for the building. If the panel board is not large enough to take the new service then obviously panel board would have to be changed.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked again what was being done with the electrical work, in order to be perfectly clear.
- FISHER** Mr. Fisher stated that the bid would include providing new service throughout the first floor and the basement and making provisions for the second floor.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that he recalled questioning the quote of \$6,000 as it seemed low as far as taking care of what was necessary in that building. He recalled being reassured that it was fine, that it had been reviewed and it was adequate.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked about the fire alarm system for \$11,000.
- STERN** Mr. Stern explained that the township does not require fire alarm systems in the farmhouse or the two new buildings. However, L&I required some form of fire alarm system in the farmhouse, as part of the negotiations for the other items. The electrician recommended putting in a smoke detector/fire alarm system. He had added that the township might want to consider doing it differently than planned. A meeting had been held with the Fire Chief, Ron Simmons and Mr. Stern, and the result was that if a

fire alarm system were to be installed it was important to do it right. At the same time a review was done of the buildings where alarms were not required, and in the new building and existing municipal building where seventy-five smoke detectors had been planned. All three buildings were then considered on an over-all scale toward getting all three to a similar level of safety and also compatibility so they'd all be tied into a single protective system. Mr. Stern added that where there may be a more expensive system of \$11,000, but some of the \$4,627 would be eliminated (credited) from the cost.

**FISHER** Mr. Fisher stated that he would like to clarify one thing regarding Mr. Stern's statement. When the state requires that a fire alarm system be installed, it must be installed as required by the code. There is no option to not have it installed. The system must be compatible to meet all NFPA codes. Mr. Fisher explained that what was different about the system planned for the farmhouse was that the system was a non-monitored system. When the alarm went off, that was the only alarm that would have gone off, and if one went off in attic and someone were down on the first floor, that alarm may not have been heard. The revisions from the December 10<sup>th</sup> meeting upgraded the system to tie it in to the other two buildings, have it monitored, and have all the alarms annunciated. That was what was in the \$11,000.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the \$11,000 includes the new building.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove explained that there would be credits coming from the new building because we going to be reducing the quantities.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that he understood it was tied into the new building.

**FISHER** Mr. Fisher responded that it had not been tied in before, but this would be connected to the new building so it can be annunciated and people know there's an alarm going off in that building. There are 44 being eliminated.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that this would have been hard wired anyway, so it would have eliminated more than just the cost of the smoke detectors.

**FISHER** Mr. Fisher indicated that was correct. The wiring, the runs, and the conduit information had just been received from Rettew and had been sent to the township for code department to review. At the same time the information had been sent to Shannon Smith for his fire alarm supplier to take a look at it in order to figure the credit.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented that he had not yet reviewed that, but assuming it's similar to what we talked about that day, the staff agreed that would be the way to go.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what the net cost would be.
- FISHER** Mr. Fisher indicated that the Shannon Smith change order #1 was all done in early November, and that's what was being billed. The proposals were approved, now he's done nothing with that because of the request form not to do anything with that. Following the December 10<sup>th</sup> meeting the approach was changed for the system. Shannon Smith would review what had been presented and possibly scrap most of it, and give back a credit for that change order. However, the \$11,000 is what the system would cost. The credit was not known at this time.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that because the \$4,627 had been accomplished, the likelihood of getting back very much is pretty slim.
- FISHER** Mr. Fisher stated that would not be correct because the items had not been purchased nor installed, and there was nothing beyond the \$11,000.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that what had been said was that the change order was done early enough.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned that no work had been done.
- FISHER** Mr. Fisher confirmed that was correct.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the credit could be \$6,000.
- FISHER** Mr. Fisher explained that what they would have to do is decide what has to be done, and then make the adjustment.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether it would be smart to get a price for putting new windows in the first floor rather than repair them.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded if replacement windows were installed that would match the architecture of that building, the cost would be totally different.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the restored quality or the motif of this particular farmhouse would not be matched at Andersen Window. He added that matching those windows might be difficult.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that Andersen would make them.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed with Mr. Schenck and added that it would not be cheap to have specially-made windows.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that vinyl replacement window which are made to order and are cheap might be a possibility.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked when the next meeting would be for discussion.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that it would take place when the bids come back.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that it would be after the first of the year.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated it would be after the holidays. We'll give them a week to look over it, and as soon as the information had been received they would notify Mr. Amic. Perhaps the Board could call a short meeting at that time.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that it should be done quickly, because we're holding things up.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he wanted assurance that the bid for this electrical work would include the cost to redo whatever other work had been done, such as drywall work. The Board would not want to see another change order for redoing the drywall because we had to tear it out to do the electrical. Mr. Schenck added that he hoped the bid would be inclusive so we're getting the real picture of what it's costing. I know electrical normally would not bid dry wall work, but he heard that work already done may have to be ripped out. That may be minor work, but he would caution them not to come back with yet another change order. He asked that they would do this in such a way that it would be inclusive.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on an unrelated item, but reported that the township was experiencing it on the pump station, and had experienced it with prior work. The contractors come to these meetings, and the township tries to explain what we want to do. These contractors are looking for any new laws to add to the copy, but what they're also looking for is to get themselves off of the hook on what their requirements are to build this particular building or this pump station or whatever in a certain amount of time. When things of this nature go on, they'll come back and say it's the township's responsibility. The township delayed this, we didn't. Mr. Yost and Mr. Halbert are working on the pump station problem daily. Anything the Board does not do as a group or we, as the staff, the contractor will seize in a minute and could care less.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated that Mr. Amic was absolutely correct and that it's something with which Vernon Fisher works very closely. The minutes, the discussion with the schedule and progress meetings, all of that's documented for that purpose that it is very clear why the project is behind. We could go back to 8 months earlier.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the board wanted to consider encouraging that they bring these changes back to us at the Re-organization meeting.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked for the date of that meeting.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the meeting had been scheduled for Tuesday evening, January 4 at 7:00 p.m. The Board has at least a half hour of work first.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that it should be brief.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it could be added to the agenda, which normally is short.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned the one change order that had been approved by Mr. Amic which was for \$4,600 for the L&I smoke protection system.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that no work had been done. He had previously brought that before the Board. The first two items he approved were windows.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether, if the work had not been done, would the \$4,600 be included in the \$11,000.
- FISHER** Mr. Fisher responded that \$4,600 is for more than just doing the fire alarm. Only a part of that was for the fire alarms, so that work is still to be done, and he has it pre-wired for that.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether it was 50% started.
- FISHER** Mr. Fisher responded that if it were \$1,000 he would be surprised. There were other items in the \$4,600. When a decision has been made as to the fire alarm system, then that's what the contractor would take out of the \$4,600. MPJ had completed all of change orders 1 and 2. He was authorized to do that. Frey Lutz change order #1 the township had not received, but that work was required and had to be done. Those pipes were bad; they had to be taken out and replaced. The sanitary line that was in the building did not meet code for the bathrooms that we were putting in. That work is beyond the point where you can say we're not going to pay for that work, so those three items are over and done. The \$4,600 can be held until we can get the fire alarm system issue worked out. The fire alarm system, if its what we want from the December 10<sup>th</sup> meeting, will run the \$11,059 and then we'll get a credit off of the change order # 1 in January. Now the one thing that had been mentioned was security in the farmhouse. There is no security in the farmhouse, so if you're thinking that that building has a security system, it does not. The only security is a

bell that is attached to the door so that when you opened up the door the bell went off.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri agreed that there was no security in the farmhouse.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether there was a lock.

**FISHER** Mr. Fisher indicated that was questionable.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether there was anything else that needed to be clarified.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that for the moment there was nothing. Once the credit would be known, a decision could be made, because if a fire alarm system is installed the cost will be down.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the only thing is the credit that's going to be there for all these smoke detectors that are being removed.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there were any other questions.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove stated that he hoped we got the hard one out of the way first here.

**FISHER** Mr. Fisher asked whether he could be sure that no letters would be written right now to tell contractors to stop. He indicated that the contractors have all called wanting to know what's going on. The Township had asked for our drop dead number as of last Friday, He asked whether they were to continue, because in another two weeks that number would be appreciatively more.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the Board would not want the electrical contractor to continue or any contractors to continue in the farmhouse that would effect what was being done that would have to be redone. It would not be wise to have them to go ahead and do more work in there and have somebody else covering up where they're going to have to go and rip it out.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated that they could probably talk to the contractor about tailoring and organizing his work in a way that would not be counter-productive.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated he was concerned about the point that Mr. Amic made earlier. As soon as work is stopped, the contractors indicate that these contracts are out the window because of what the Township did or didn't do, and then all the prices change.

- FISHER** Mr. Fisher commented that there is a 90-day project of which they're 70 days into.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that it would be cheaper just to let them continue working and then undo whatever has to be undone instead of giving them the chance to renegotiate the entire contract because they were told to stop.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that they could come back with a change order for remobilization.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that was his point, and they could get another 20% on the whole project. Whatever bid we get from Shannon, I want us to make sure it includes all those other hidden other costs. So we're saying that that new quote we're going to get is based upon doing work after everything else is done.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove stated that there are very few new partitions there in that building.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether we are already in a position where we told them to stop.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that no, they were told based upon this information they may be advised to stop but haven't stopped them.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that no one could come back to the Township at this point and say we reneged on our contract.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove indicated the answer was no.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Grove and Mr. Fisher for coming in for the discussion.

**6. ADJOURNMENT:**

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 9:40 a.m.

Sincerely,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
BUDGET WORK SESSION #3**

**DECEMBER 6, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a 7:00 p.m. budget work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri (Absent until 8:20 p.m.)  
Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Randy Wachter, General Accountant  
Ray Madden, Internal Auditor  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. This was the third meeting in the series of budget meetings.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Mr. Schenck had met with Mr. Amic and gone over the whole budget.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter began the budget discussion with the Subdivision Recreation. Mr. Wachter planned to make the adjustment that's required for 1999 activity for District 2. He added that the majority of the fund is still in Subdivision Recreation and use of those funds will depend on what is allocated for the studies for the improvements to Springettsbury Park.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the grants that were received through Senator Armstrong's office.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that by June of the year 2000 that grant money must be spent. Thought should be given about how it will be spent. When the grant money was applied for, it was done on the basis of site improvement so it can be spent anywhere to improve the site.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the cost for Rettew or the Newton Group could be paid with grant money.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the money could only be used for actual capital improvement of the park. Mr. Amic stated he would place the item on the Agenda as a reminder.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter continued the discussion in the line of recreation. As part of the Capital Improvements Fund there's money that remains as far as the Recreational Reserve. Additional monies have been set aside for recreation in the township, and that fund estimated at the end of 1999 to be just shy of \$56,000. The expenditure this year was the purchase of some playground equipment for Camp Security. That equipment was installed and had been budgeted last year at about \$18,000. The only additional planned project would deplete the funds. That project would be the capital construction for Penn Oaks Park. Mr. Bainbridge's request was presented there but there are not enough funds in the account to do it. Mr. Bainbridge puts together the capital requests for recreation. Part of the money goes for continuing maintenance on the Creative Playground.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the Penn Oaks project had been in the budget for \$80,000.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it had been in the budget for sometime. There had been some discussion on whether it should be done or not because of it's high expenditure.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the work was for backstops.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that this was for leveling the fields.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Sherry Nichols responded.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated she had not.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated it would cover the grading of parks so the field is level for athletic events.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the work had never been documented.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated it had never come back to the Board for a vote.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that there had been no push to do it. The Board had some discussions, and we all went out there to tour it. Mr. Pasch asked whether Mr. Bainbridge was pushing it.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that Mr. Bainbridge puts the item in the budget every year.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Mr. Bainbridge had not brought it up with him. Mr. Amic recalled discussions in the meeting minutes of the Recreation Board about providing sufficient facilities. There had never been any opposition; it's just been an awful lot of money.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that it seemed that Sherry seemed fairly confident that she could get the Army COE to do the work.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Sherry Nichols had not advised him of anything, but if she could get some help it would greatly reduce this number.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that it was a shame that nothing had been done with that property because that neighborhood has a lot of children, and it's a big piece of property.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that what was shown indicates \$26,000 would have to be transferred to this if you wanted to do it, if it cost \$80,000.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that if the project had been semi-dormant for a period of time and nothing was done, perhaps it wasn't necessary.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the fact is that municipalities do not have facilities for soccer all through the York region. Mr. Amic suggested that the Board participate in a philosophical discussion about whether to continue to provide more and more recreational facilities for organized sports.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that this issue had consistently appeared in the Park and Recreation meeting minutes.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that this was one of the places that's fairly well suited for soccer as opposed to a place like Kingston that doesn't have any parking,
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that there were some topography problems, which was why the cost was so high.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he had no problem with the project as long as there was something presented indicating why it should be done.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the Park and Recreation people have those discussions, but the Board had not received any proposal to get it going.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested that the first step would be for somebody to get someone to quote the job (not bid the job) so the Board would have an idea what it might cost.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the problem with the Creative Playground.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that the Corps was here to do the work, and the township would not sign an insurance certificate. Basically it meant that the township would assume all the liability if the Corps did something wrong, and the township refused. Mr. Schenck added that the neither present Board nor the staff was part of that decision but that was very frustrating to see those trucks pack up and leave.
- AMIC** Sherry Nichols is the one who said she has information. Mr. Amic agreed to telephone her to learn the status.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that that particular park is plenty big enough to do a lot of things.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that the request will be allowed for this year yet and then if they don't take care of it until next year he would not allow it to be put back in as a budgeted request.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated to Mr. Wachter to make a note to follow up with him rather than wait until June or July.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that Mr. Wachter made the statement not to put it in next year. It's been there, and she would like to see something happen with that park.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter asked whether there were any further questions on the Recreation Reserve. He reported that the Fire Company Fund was where a part of the real estate tax allocation goes to support the volunteer fire companies. At the present time .113 mils of the real estate taxes of the 6.27 are allocated to the fire fund. Basically this covered some of the auditing fees that the volunteer fire companies have as well as an allocation each year for the Springetts Fire and the Commonwealth Fire Company. The balance of what is left has built into it a use for the purchase of capital vehicles. There is an item for \$344,000, which was carried over from last year, and that is the fire company fund contribution to the Engine 1602 and the aerial truck.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that last week when the capital items were discussed, there was this another \$100,000. If you're looking at this \$344,000 number, we have another \$100,000 in the capital fund. Should there be a need to augment their purchase of a vehicle, we would have a total budget of \$444,000.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that was correct.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he understood the \$444,000, but wondered whether that was necessary.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it would be \$650,000 for a truck.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated it was a \$2 million dollar purchase.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated the fire company would get a loan, and use some of their own money as well.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Chief Hickman indicated that they would not be purchasing this kind of truck in 2000. More than likely it would be 2001, and this piece of equipment is down the road further than that.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated it could be in the latter part of 2000.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked about the general fund transfer of \$15,560.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter explained the fund transfers/operating transfers. There was a negative \$15,560. Each year the general fund makes a contribution to the fire equipment reserve portion of that fire company fund, and we know it's \$15,560. Mr. Wachter had made a suggestion to increase the amount of millage, the percentage of the real estate taxes. It's just a volunteer contribution that we make every year to the fire company fund. It's designated more or less towards fire equipment purchases.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was the only funding we give them every year out of the capital account.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that this was a General Fund item. The real estate and the interest that accrues here goes to support the operations and anything that's left over out of the allocation and audit fees and any capital equipment purchases accumulates in here for future capital equipment purchases. Mr. Wachter's suggestion was rather than continue a flat amount of contribution, to increase the millage. If we put an additional .011 mils into the fire company fund based on the 95% collection rate on taxes that would put an additional \$15,464 into the fire company fund, and if we went .012 that would take it up to \$16,325.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that they would still have to have a way in this fund to keep the operating expenses less than the revenue.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that the allocation controls what is set up for the Springetts and Commonwealth fire companies.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked how a decision was made as to how much money goes to the fire companies.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they get what they spend, not .113.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that it was a capped amount. For instance Springetts is capped at \$74,880 and Commonwealth is capped at \$69,120.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated there have been on-going discussion between these fire companies as to why one is paid more than the other.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he had not heard that discussion, but he had heard a great deal of discussion about how a fire company is expected to run with absolutely no increases since 1996. Mr. Bishop asked whether the Board thinks that the cost of providing fire serve has been static for the last 4 or 5 years and perhaps longer than that.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the fire companies had alluded to Mr. Bishop that they needed more money.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that they obviously need more money.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that through three quarters Springetts has spent all but about \$15,800 of their allocation. He expected that they would spend their whole allocation. Commonwealth still had well over \$23,000 to go on their allocation based on their expenses.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that one of the big differences you're seeing there is the fact that they'll write this part down, Springetts has their act together and write numbers down on a piece of paper and give them to you. Commonwealth can't do that. They never submit to you more then their allocation.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that at least Springetts does. He indicated he requests that they submit the whole thing, regardless of whether it exceeds their allocation or not.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what their motivation would be to do so.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that the motivation would be to be aware of what it's costing to operate the Fire Company in order to make intelligent budget decisions. Commonwealth is trying to come up with more expenditures to spend their whole allocation for the year. Unless they just go crazy with spending money on legitimate things, they will not reach their allocation for this year. And to reallocate money between the fire companies would show even more favoritism towards Springettsbury as opposed to Commonwealth. Obviously it doesn't cost as much money to run the Commonwealth station as it take to run Springettesbury. They have a much bigger facility, and the Ambulance Club is there. They are

using electricity, which is probably submitted right in the fire company's expenditures.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that she had been told that the Ambulance Club contributes the Fire Company to cover their expenses for their square footage.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he had been told that as well and that information could be obtained from the audit reports.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the real estate tax allocation of .113 mils in 2000. He wondered if that was how the real estate tax estimate was proposed for 2000 in the revenue.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that was correct. The fund benefits from the increased assessments or any changes that are made in millage to the fire company fund.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that when the real estate assessments go up, they get the same amount of money. If the assessment goes up, they're still getting their \$74,880. An increase would not show at this point.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that in any event what happens is all the excess money still stays in this fund. It's still available for whatever, and they're still going to get it.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that was true, but at the whim of this Board.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he understood, but it's still there available to them. He stated that there may be some question in terms of whether the allocation should be increased or not because of what they spend it on.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that they are only reimbursed for the general operating expenditures and that's the point that Mr. Amic was making.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he had disallowed an expenditure to the fire museum, as contributions should be approved by the Board of Supervisors. He added that he noticed that they're paying rather significant amounts of money to clean the fire companies. He wondered what had changed that they're paying this kind of money to clean their hall. Mr. Amic intended to discuss this with the Fire Chief. He added that there had been a \$3500 purchase for a lawn mower that had come to his attention as well.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that it was not so much that the purchase would not have been allowed, had they complied with the township purchasing laws.

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether it was beyond the realm of their responsibilities while they're on the job to clean up.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the former fire chief had a work schedule and some of them had to clean up. Mr. Amic did not recall paying bills to clean the fire halls.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated she would like to know what their responsibilities are while they're on the job. If you look at the numbers of calls that they get and the number of hours they're in the station, if that fell between the cracks when we switched chiefs, she would like to know that.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Mr. Bishop might be right to some degree in the fact that they're reluctant. Sometimes they may be in their own funds paying for things that they shouldn't either, but the audit tells us some of those things.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that there's a great deal of uncertainty from the volunteer leaders exactly how this whole thing really works. There's a great deal of consternation about the fact that that allocation had not changed in recent history, and they know that the revenue generated from that .113 had changed.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they had tried a year or so ago when he had gone to the Commonwealth on your invitation to make a presentation on how this is working. They were advised that they really weren't losing anything whether they spent the money or they didn't, it was going in their capital money. Mr. Amic added that he had come away from that knowing that they didn't understand it.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that their allocation could be raised in terms of the amount allocated. The Fire Company should not be holding back the expenditures that they submit. He had asked them before indicating he wanted all the amounts.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that, if these are independent organizations, why should they be telling you what they spend every penny on.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated he could not go to bat for them and say that they're spending more for their operations. No one had asked him to request an increase in that allocation.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that they don't know how to do that. An organization, the objective of which was to improve communications with these volunteer companies was set up, and Mr. Bishop sits at that table every month, and that's exactly what he had heard.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that this discussion had proved that neither side knows why this allocation is the way it is.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that no one knows. That's why he brought it up. He wanted to make sure his suspicions were correct. He had advised these people things and thought he was right .

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that his comments were exactly correct. It hasn't changed and probably had not changed since he had been Manager.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that it was a difficult position for him to justify. He could justify it the way Ken said, i.e., the money still goes into the budget, and it's earmarked. That is the way it must be done.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that we're going from an estimated 1999 end of the year surplus of \$388,000. Next year we're going to a \$91,000 surplus because we're spending the money. Mr. Pasch indicated that if Commonwealth is not spending their allotment, perhaps it was not needed.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that if the fire companies want an increase in their allocation of \$74,000 and \$69,000, they ought to present a budget for it.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they did present a budget.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated surprise, i.e. presented to the Board.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic affirmed that a budget was received every year.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that Springettsbury had presented their one page budget. Commonwealth had not presented a budget to date.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was in the Ordinance that they're to do that.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reported that Commonwealth had not had a Treasurer for a couple of months.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked what the allocation was.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that a breakdown had been provided by Springetts. They have Fire Protection, they have General Company and then they have a Total. For the Fire Protection they show \$77,937 as the total. And for General Company they show \$38,750 of which \$12,000 is Fund Raising Expenses, \$4,000 is Miscellaneous, \$1,000 for Cleaning \$10,000 for Supplies, Maintenance, Building and Grounds.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked what they showed as their revenue.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that the Total Income was \$167,000.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch noted that they show \$86,000 in revenue besides ours, \$75,000 from the township, \$10,000 from Fund Raisers.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck observed that their fund raising expenses were \$12,000 to raise \$10,000.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated some of their contributions, donations, contributing memberships - \$40,000, social room rentals - \$20,000, interest - \$10,000. for a total income of \$167,000 and they are only spending \$112,687. Their utilities are split fifty-fifty. Fifty percent fire protection and fifty percent general company. That's is the only thing that shows up in general company.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Amic whether their budget needed approval or not.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it is covered by an Ordinance. Commonwealth shouldn't be paid any money in the year 2000 according to this budget. Our Ordinance states that in the month of October they're to provide a budget. If they haven't provided a budget, nothing should be funded to them until they do.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated Commonwealth should be given a wake up call.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic advised he had a meeting scheduled with their new president and added that he would mention that.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that they need to get that budget in. He stated he would then put it in writing and send it registered mail. Give them plenty of notice. Mr. Pasch stated that as long as Mr. Amic approved their budget, fine. That's what the allocation should be as long as it doesn't exceed this .113 mils.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Pasch whether he wanted that line item to be increased to what their budget is.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded with agreement to increase or decreased for whatever the amount is.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter asked what should happen if they came in with a budget that's \$72,000.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that Mr. Amic had to approve it.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that as far as he was concerned if it's a reasonable increase from an inflation standpoint, he didn't think it should be denied.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that we'll increase that to \$78,000 (\$77,937) for Springettsbury.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether they actually indicate what they're anticipating their allocation to be within that budget.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded affirmatively -- at \$75,000. and added that total income projected is \$167,000.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the township agreed to pay their operating expenses.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that we never really did agree in the past to pay their operating expenses. The Board had agreed to give them their allocation.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that it was agreed to write them a big check once a year, and they had it and we modified that to be expenses.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated it had to be justified by legitimate expenses for the township to legally pay.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter suggested to increase the mills and do away with that yearly transfer of \$15,560.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that it's a real political question whether you do that because as soon as you increase that millage, dozens of volunteer fire companies believe that's their money and they are entitled to it. Mr. Bishop stated that the fire companies would be upset that they don't get that entire .113. For this particular \$15,000, they can't say that we're legally required to put that \$15,000 in.

**Petition Street Light Fund**

- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that the Street Light Fund was pretty straight forward in terms of who pays the electricity for most of the street lighting and a little bit of repairs and that pretty well covers it. It's a real estate tax that's based on property square footage.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that this fund takes care of itself.

**Stormwater Reserve**

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter reported that the Stormwater Reserve fund covered itself also in terms of money that's been set aside for Mill Creek, Kreutz Creek, Codorus Creek, the drainage basins, the Penn Oaks Detention Pond and Plesantry Storm Water(new development). Penn Oaks is the only place where any money was being spent, and that's just to keep the pine trees from getting diseased.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether this amount would be needed in the next year and a half to two years.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it would not. It had been suggested at something closer to \$40,000 for the maintenance of this pond. The figure of \$11,000 had been agreed upon, but over the course of time the ponds do require maintenance.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that at the same time, the one's that are listed are the only ones allowed to get the funds.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that he was concerned that the Board should be looking at this in terms the future, not only from this aspect, but also in terms of forming a storm water district. He stated his concern that we're going to be faced in the next 10 years with some real horrendous problems.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that several years ago the subject of stormwater districts had been discussed with Solicitor Yost. Mr. Yost said the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania told the County of York, (actually all 67 Pennsylvania counties) that their primary responsibility was to plan and deal with storm water.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that what he was concerned about is that a lot of the expenses for storm water are not shown.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that there are a lot of legal fees, engineering fees, a lot of things going on, and we're really not recognizing what's costing us now.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that John Luciani is going to come back with a staged proposal. Mr. Luciani had asked Mr. Amic how he wanted to handle it. Mr. Amic advised him to provide phase A, B, C, D and maybe E because it's going to be an expensive proposition. Mr. Amic added that the districts could be created and there was an existing Ordinance written.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that the county has one district. The one they're working on is Kreutz Creek, and the problem is that basin extends all the way down to Hellam, picks up part of Windsor. It crosses all these township borders and unless you fix the whole district, the basin, and fix a little piece of it you're really not solving the problem.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that even if the county were involved, they could still not solve any problem.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the legislature realized that this was a bigger problem than most small to medium sized communities could handle so they tried to put this structure into place.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that for the county it's a very low priority. Mr. Bishop agreed with Mr. Pasch, that there are some big problems down the road. Mr. Bishop suggested that the board should be just looking at Springettsbury Township and indicating there are five districts or whatever the geography tells us should be created. The costs within them can be captured and then decisions could be made on how those costs get reallocated to the people who are in that area.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated agreement.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that once the districts were established, then planning could be done to proceed in phases. It may take 15 years. The allocations can then be figured for the property owners.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch emphasized that something must be addressed, and preferably during the year 2000. The one thing in here under revenue is stormwater fees. Stormwater fees should be started to build a surplus so that we can do these things.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that it could very well be part of the Land Development process at some point.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch is in favor of making provisions to pay for the district.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether there would be any value to having a budget line item for expenditures for stormwater. An accounting line could be established for John Luciani's bills and other minor projects.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter reported that within the Capital Improvements Fund, that was used to pay for the East York storm system. A line item is noted for engineering stormwater. Right now that's only budgeted at \$7,000. The fund has built up considerably over the years and if projections hold out

and even if we spend what we project this year, at the end of this year we'll have over \$2.1 million.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the \$2.1 million is allocated for storm water.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that it was not. It's a combination of highway reserve allocation.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what was allocated.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that allocation for stormwater was the engineering of \$7,000.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that 50% of what John Luciani does deals with stormwater.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that he had \$60,000, which was raised to \$70,000 that had been included in the budget for engineering fees.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested that a line item be placed in here for stormwater work to begin to do the district work. John Luciani was authorized to come back with a plan, and \$35,000 or \$40,000 will be needed.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that Mr. Pasch had a valid point. We don't really know what we're spending.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that even though we don't know, it would be easy to find out. Mr. Luciani's bills would reveal the projects, and he details what he's working on.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the projects should be coded.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that Mr. Stern had given him very little coded to stormwater. Developer projects were listed.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that money should be put into the budget to provide for the stormwater districts. It can be placed under the Highway Reserve, which has over a million dollars in capital.

**SCHECNK** Mr. Schenck stated that the Highway Reserve money must be spent on defined things.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that \$114,000 had been spent on the East York stormwater system.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that was true, but that was to get stormwater off the road.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic discussed the way to fund additional roadways. This is where it would be funded. As you can see we've anticipated \$2.8 million.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked why it was called Highway Reserve fund.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that a portion of the real estate taxes are placed in Highway Reserve every year. Capital improvement money can be placed in other funds.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated he had not known this was the Highway Reserve, and thought this was the General Capital.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that this is the Highway Reserve specifically. The Board could say with the real estate taxes to allocate it to the stormwater fund for a year.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that \$113,000 had been placed in that fund for that East York storm water problem in 1998.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that this is nothing more than the Capital Improvements Fund. When you took the Highway Reserve Fund, the Building Reserve Fund, and the Recreation Reserve and merged them into one fund and named the fund the Capital Reserves or Capital Improvements Fund, I'm still accounting separately for the Building Allocation, for the Recreation Allocation so that those monies don't get lost. They're still in that fund but even though it is called the Highway Reserve Allocation to be consistent that to me is nothing more than the Capital Improvements.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that it doesn't make any difference where it was placed. If it's the Board desire to do something with stormwater, then, frankly, the Board could take the same amount of money and put it in this Highway Reserve and they could put it into stormwater. They don't have to fund it.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that this Stormwater Reserve Fund is funded strictly by fees that are charged to developers for stormwater. For instance, the money that's in that fund that came from Pleasantry stormwater, that came from the developer.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that they could certainly fund it if they chose.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Amic whether he was talking about co-mingling it with the one that he's talking about.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he was not. He was talking about putting it anywhere and ear marking it. Instead of ear marking it for Highway Reserve you can ear mark it for the stormwater.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested to take the .191 mils and allocate it to stormwater.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic continued that this is Capital Reserve Fund, the Highway Reserve allocation. Engineering stormwater is shown as \$7,000.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that three funds, Highway Reserve, Building Reserve and the Recreation Reserve were merged into one fund which is now referred to as the Capital Reserve or Capital Improvements. Instructions were to keep a separate accounting.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether that was the total of the Capital Reserve Fund or just the Highway portion.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that it was just the Highway portion. There's an additional \$1.2 million which is Building and additional \$57,000 which is Recreation. The intent was to turn what had been previously the Highway Reserve Fund into nothing more than the total Capital Improvements Fund.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was partially correct. The Board didn't have any objections to combining these funds as long as they could be accounted for separately. However, the Board still wanted to know at that time what's in this fund and that's what you've given them.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck re-stated that it was the Highway Reserve allocation, Building Reserve allocation and Recreation. Why wouldn't we name that Capital Reserve Fund, Recreation Reserve Fund just like we know it should be just so you can understand that those are allocations underneath the Capital Reserve Fund.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic pointed out that if the Board wanted to line item 'x' number of dollars we can certainly have one page, i.e., allocate 'x' number of dollars to the stormwater.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch thought the focus should be the 2.3 million to project through the year 2000; that \$2.3 million should be there for a reason.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that it is there for a reason.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what reason.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there were a number of things in here that he recommended that be spent. There is a connecting road for Memory Lane; there's \$500,000 in there if needed. Any highway projects and road building should go in this area. Mr. Pasch's point was well taken if you're saying we've got all this money and we're not doing anything with it, you're correct.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the \$2.3 million, you're projecting that by the time we spend this \$715,000 we're still going to have the \$2.8 reserve. Mr. Pasch asked what it was there for.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it was to build highways but nobody is building highways.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that when he questioned what it's for, it's that we know what we want it for. If I still have \$2.8 left in my surplus and all the highway money has been spent, what else would the money be needed for: creation of stormwater districts, highways, whatever, but the cost would be known.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that at the present time money is placed here for no reason in this fund because nothing has been ear marked. If we need to build a road, that could be another half a million, but still it doesn't make any difference, you've still have \$2.3 million. Mr. Amic added that there would not be any problem in allocating some of this money right in this fund for stormwater.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch continued that some allocation of the funds needed to be made to determine what we have to do to make this redevelopment thing work.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated agreement that allocations should be made. It's been on the Capital Fund for years until we started building a building.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that one of the problems is Memory Lane, and I think funds should be allocated now to start doing the engineering in Year 2000 to figure out what can be done right away with Memory Lane. This would be a new project, Memory Lane from at least Market Street to Rt. 30 or else from Rt. 30 to Exit 7 to Route 83. The whole thing's is a problem, but perhaps a connector road would help. Mr. Bishop suggested that the Board accelerate that.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that this was the opportunity to earmark that money. Another half a million dollars could be added in there. Mr. Amic stated that he had visited the roadway and that dog-leg on the connector road troubles him.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that what he was suggesting was the time, not the dollars.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated to move the \$50,000 to 2000 was just for engineering work.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that he was talking about the Development Zone, which could happen quickly.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested that the whole \$500,000 be moved into 2000 instead of just \$50,000.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that there ought to be a line item for Memory Lane. The connector road is not just from Mt. Zion to Memory Lane. He was talking about Memory Lane itself.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that a connector road is kind of a misnomer. What we're actually doing would not extend all the way to Memory Lane.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that there would be no real serious work except for around Sam's.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the focus would be looking at Industrial Highway. It's going to take you from Sam's to Memory Lane.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated it should be called Industrial Highway Extended.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what happens when it crosses the tracks, because it's not Industrial Highway, it then becomes Concord.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic asked how much money do you want to earmark to this Memory Lane.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that a study should be done, because as a Board there was no way of knowing the cost.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch agreed and continued that some engineering money needed to be spent to determine what should be created.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck added that the study included the exit off of 30 and all of Memory Lane there would be a better chance of getting outside funding.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop suggested adding \$100,000 for the study to move traffic through.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic re-stated to add \$100,000 to study Exit 30 to Memory Lane all the way to Exit 7.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter agreed to add \$100,000.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that she had spoken with Mr. Stern regarding the Development Zone and the concern about traffic. Mr. Stern indicated that if a comprehensive traffic study were done that would truly evaluate that whole area, it would take one year to do it. If the Board would be interested in going ahead and passing the zoning and then letting part of it develop, the money that would be generated to the township could then in turn help to pay for these projects. We can't do it in less than that if we want a comprehensive study.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that if a comprehensive study were done that would take a year, what that says to me is that there are a lot of problems that have to be resolved. Mr. Pasch does not want to be on record as knowing the problems are there but going ahead with it anyway.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that just because he said it's going to take a year does not mean there are a lot of problems. He added that everyone was agreeing with Mr. Pasch, but were not convinced that doing a traffic study gets us any closer to providing the infrastructure.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that an engineering study of the whole thing was needed and if that included a traffic study that was okay. He was not ready to say go ahead and pass this zone and then live with it along with all of the residents of the township for a long, long time.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that Mr. Stern's point was that area, no matter what piece of property is placed in that zone, it's not going to develop overnight. I think what he is saying is, he is hoping the Board will look at the timing of what we want to do as well.
- PASCH** Mr. Stern commented that if the budget is reviewed, with the projections that we have in terms of revenue versus expenditure, he thought that if there was a 4 to 5 year window there was nothing to worry about timing. Caterpillar and the other property owners are the real benefactors if it were changed right now, not the whole community. Mr. Stern is stating that we're not going to do it in a year, and if that's what it takes I'd rather see it take us two years to do it right so the whole community benefits.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the reason she brought it up was if we're talking about Memory Lane and a \$100,000 allocation to that effort, and if we were going to request a full blown traffic study for that total area, this area should be included in that. Chairman Mitrick commented that in the

areas near York Hospital neighborhoods, grass islands had been installed which slowed traffic down.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that one item for decision was what to do with stormwater. He asked whether the Board wanted to allocate a portion to the Reserve fund and spend more, or to just let the General fund continue handle it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the issue was that we don't know what is being spent on stormwater.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that he didn't think that was a huge issue. The fact that it had not yet been prioritized was a problem, but he was not sure that it was a budget problem in terms of where it was allocated.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated he was just trying to clarify things.

**Capital Waste Reduction Reserve**

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter provided background information regarding the Capital Waste Reduction Reserve. This fund collects the waste reduction fees and the garbage bills given to us by York Waste. What that basically does is take care of the leaf collection, the street cleaning, and some of the administrative cost associated with those activities.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that this had been reduced once, and everybody was concerned but the surpluses continued to build.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter asked Mr. Pasch whether he would like to set aside some monies for stormwater.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that he wouldn't know how much.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that there are monies built into the General Fund for engineering, which was to cover stormwater activities.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that there are funds built into this Capital Reserve Fund that we can use for whatever we want. Rather than change the budget, Mr. Pasch would like to get started and come up with a plan for what should be done as far as stormwater is concerned. He suggested starting a five-year plan.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop suggested that money be allocated for the study.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested to put \$50,000 in for the study of the stormwater districts. The rest of it can be transferred. He pointed out that anything in

the Capital Funds can be changed anytime during the year. All this is a guide line, and it has to come to the Board to spend the money. But, if you want to earmark something then earmark \$50,000 and title it Stormwater District Study. That way it's earmarked and will remind us that we've got it.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter confirmed that it would be for Year 2000.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to put an item on the Agenda. She added that part of this \$50,000 could be legal fees.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented to look at Home Depot and how long it took them and they still aren't built. Anything that they do it's going to take at least a year, especially with Caterpillar.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that if you change the Ordinance and the Zoning they can do whatever they want and you can't stop them unless you have the infrastructure in place.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he believed if we pass this zoning that we'll have a development in 2000.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked for how much of the property.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked how much she would like. It wouldn't be surprise Mr. Amic at all to probably get 200 million dollars for it quick and that's not as much as you can get.

### **Wastewater Department**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided additional copies of support documents for the Board, which indicated everything that might be needed at the plant. This portion of the budget was explained because it had not been incorporated. Mr. Amic provided overheads for review. Mr. Amic began the discussion with an overall view of the Sewer Fund Capital Reserves. He emphasized that this was Springettsbury's money and projects anticipated between now and the year 2004. He directed the Board's attention to the items marked with a "K", which were itemized in the 537 Plan. He stated he would be discussing the on-lot sewage system and how to address that problem. Should everything shown on Mr. Amic's spreadsheet be done, there would still be a surplus in the fund.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that with the approach on the 537 Plan the collector line extensions will move off the spreadsheet.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether it was reasonable to expect that the work could be done within that time frame (2004).
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it could be done. There could be some changes which might adjust the planning. He added that the spreadsheet showed the inter-municipal shared reserves including all nine municipalities.
- Mr. Amic provided a second spreadsheet showing the Administration Department and the Technical Department. Additional notations were provided to show the difference between the 537 Plan and changes made.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the beginning cash balance of \$6,900,000 included the bond.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that none of that figure was included in the first item (\$2,100,000 of the \$3,000,000 bond issue for collector lines). He added that all of the detail for these figures appeared in the budget book. Mr. Amic emphasized that the digester work needed to be completed. R.K. & K. had advised that the odor problem would be minimized. Mr. Amic concluded that the money is available to do the work. Regarding the transfer of capital formation figure, every year this kind of capital was being formed because of the agreements in depreciation, etc. A lot of money is being added each year.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that she had neighbors complaining that Barwood Road systems are failing. She did not see that area mentioned. They had been in the capital project list for some time. She asked whether that meant that the engineers did not see them as important.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that he had talked with some of the Barwood residents. They had been asked to come forward and comment about their situation, but they had not done so.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he did not recall that the Barwood was in the 537 Plan.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that Barwood should be in the 537 Plan.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it was a good point and should be reviewed.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she knows that personally but that there may be other areas that are in need of attention.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Enterprise Fund is the only fund that operates as a profit center. The state of Pennsylvania treats it in that manner. Mr. Amic commented about his concern in operations. His question would be

whether the revenue in operations covered the expenditures. Mr. Amic explained the operating revenue projected for next year, i.e., \$4,069,170. This year projected revenue was \$3,515,292. Expenses were predicted at \$3,644,390. From an operations standpoint, a profit is projected at \$424,760 for the year 2000. An adjusted 1999 column indicated a profit of \$164,409. That is 10%. This year it is 5%. Mr. Amic also reviewed the non-operating accounts, items that are not charged to the operation. He pointed out a revenue item of \$2,073,000 of non-operating revenue. Non-operating expenses were shown of \$1,479,000. This indicates an excess revenue of \$594,554. The debt service must be paid of \$655,000 and the excess after debt service in the year 2000 would be \$364,334. Two unusual things happened in 1999. Shown on page 3 was non-operating revenue showing two depreciation accounts, capital depreciation outside \$87,248 and capital depreciation of Springettsbury, \$169,364, totaling \$256,608. Changing of the audit period to a year and a half instead of a year made a difference. In the right column \$126,230 and \$354,080 totaling \$480,310. The \$480,310 is due to another half a year of depreciation and the second thing is the auditor said that the 100-year depreciation isn't going to work. The life of the depreciation items to fifty years. We are recapturing 15 – 17 years. That is the difference between the 100 year or 50 year depreciation. Sister municipalities are calling wondering what is going on. The dramatic difference is due to the audit change and the life of the assets being changed from 100 years to 50 years.

**SHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked what 2001 shows on the depreciation.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it should be more consistent.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it wouldn't be more consistent because it is 18 months, and therefore, should come down.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed that it should come down due to picking up the additional 128 because of the 18 months. There also would be additional depreciation for the pump station. It should come down but not dramatically. The interest for the pump station would be \$50,000.

**Wastewater Dept. - Operating Revenue**

**MADDEN** Mr. Ray Madden provided further information regarding the Wastewater Department budget. Shown on the first page were the revenue numbers, the next group is non-operating revenue, and then the second page shows the expenses but it doesn't show you the revenue less expenses, or provide a sub-total or an operating total.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked why, if \$400 a year was budgeted for hauler revenue, why did we only do \$313.

- MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded that it had been a dry year, and they're not bringing in as much waste. There are a couple of haulers that built their own small waste plant.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether an incorrect assumption had been made when the price was raised. People are actually going elsewhere or building their own plants.
- MADDEN** Mr. Madden added that some of the municipalities can only operate at a certain amount.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the budget for capacity rental of the City of York was under \$69,000. That is the recapture under schedule C, which he expected York Township to carry on about the extra 8%, amounting to an extra \$800,000 that York Township has to pay Springettsbury.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the treatment outside is the same thing and whether it reflected the 817 over 254.
- MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded no, the 800 is the flow going to the York City pump station pumping everything into the city. That's where that \$800,000 allocation came from--it's a revenue.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Madden to explain the huge difference in the numbers, i.e., the difference between what occurred in this treatment.
- MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded that there are four municipalities included, York Township, Spring Garden Township, Manchester Township and Windsor Township. These four municipalities are billed on a four-week basis for the treatment of their waste that comes in through the interceptors and through the plant and it's based on flow. The cost of the treatment is allocated to the outside municipalities. One of the reasons why it's higher in the year 2000 is due to the revenue that is billed them. The audit was changed to be an 18-month audit. In December there will be two audits, our regular year end audit for the plant and an operations audit to make sure that we are in compliance with the agreement with the other municipalities on billing them back.

**Sewer Charges**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the dramatic reduction in flow of 564,00 to 254,000 is the result of an extremely dry year.
- MADDEN** Mr. Madden added that the numbers shown represent revenue that can be used to offset the expenses of the plant. Some of the revenue that was

billed for treatment is recalculating depreciation. That falls under the line of non-operating revenue. Mr. Madden indicated that he projected the municipalities to be billed \$3,034,000. Sewer charges are expected at \$1,944,000, which can be used for operations. The rest of that is being reserved for non-operating revenue.

**SHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he was told that Caterpillar flowed a million gallons a day.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded approximately 52,000 each quarter.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked where that flow is today and how Caterpillar had affected billing for the last quarter.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded that it had been about \$10,000. Their flow will be lower next year. The Distribution Center is the only building generating much.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that it might change too because there may be a company in there that's a water user.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the revenue from capacity rental from York City \$609,000 and the expenses for the capacity is \$725,000.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden indicated that was correct. The \$609,000 is what we billed the other municipalities; the \$750,000 is what the total expense is, including Springettsbury. The difference is Springettsbury.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that the difference between the two is what it will cost us next year.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the sewer funds itself, and Springettsbury Township pays that fund.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded that the total bill is for \$725,000. We pay the city for our additional flow, a portion of that and then that is our portion that we have to pay them.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the revenue and expenses come in and out of this fund then our charge for Springettsbury and the other so your doing net accounting.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded that he actually showed the revenue coming in and then the expense going out. If you wanted the net then the final number would be the expense and there wouldn't be any income.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that when he reviewed what the sewage plant is doing, we're not really showing the true picture. What we pay to the city is what we charged everybody including ourselves so that should be a push and what we're showing as far as the Waste Treatment Plant is concerned is an inaccurate number.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded that the rest of the numbers are for billing customers.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that our customers are being billed for it, but there's the difference between this not showing up in this budget and it's showing that we have less revenue coming in then we do expenses for the rental. So it is a net accounting, and this is not strictly factual in terms of what we're doing within this department. Mr. Pasch continued that this is a profit organization but your taking a hundred and some thousand profit away from them because of things shown over on the other part of Springettsbury. You don't show the revenue coming in here from Springettsbury.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded that was correct, because the township does not charge itself.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed because we're talking about going through all of this work to determine the profitability of the plant, and we've got a profit in here that we're not showing.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented about the salary adjustment of \$2,000.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it included employment of a Wastewater Director. He added that, as shown in the budget, it was dramatically down.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there would be monies allocated for the search.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there is no money in this budget for the search.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated it was appropriate to put it in there so the rest of the municipalities pay their share.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed because in this particular case it's more important because by determining this is going to cost 'x' number dollars they will pick up about 50% of it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenk indicated it could be placed in professional fees.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was where it belonged.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated it doesn't really matter if we budget this or not as long as we pay the bill.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that this would be a professional search for a Wastewater Director.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the budget anticipated a director for 12 months.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded it does, for 12 months.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the money is there.
- SHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether we had written the bad debt off.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that he and Mr. Madden had spoken with the auditor some three years ago, and it was written off and provided for. It doesn't impact these numbers at all.
- MADDEN** Mr. Madden stated that it had already been reserved in prior years.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that under the law, Mr. Yost would probably tell you we need a motion from the Board to clear these items.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that was not her understanding.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was what he had been told and indicated he'd check again. He added that Mr. Madden came in the other day and had 20 liens. He passed them on to Solicitor Yost. If people don't pay their bill, we lien the property. That's what should have happened in all these cases, because if you don't lien the property then they go out of business.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that when the property changes hands some money would be recaptured.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic continued that every year in December if you don't pay for four quarters the property is liened.
- Expense Line Items**
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that it appeared the only major changes were for chemical expenses.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the chemical expenses were budgeted at \$236,000 last year and only \$186,000 was used.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden reported that for the previous year \$38,000 had been budgeted for grout, but what had been planned was not done. The grouting is planned for this year, so the item still appeared in the budget. There are expenses for lime, chlorination, polymer, wood chips, grout and chemicals.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the use of grout, i.e., whether it was a repair item and whether it was for collector lines.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded that it was for the collector lines.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented about Mr. Wachter's work in the accounting for expenses. The expenses will be placed where the responsible department heads can see where the money is going.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the grouting was placed there by Mr. Crooks, but Mr. Hodgkinson is probably responsible for it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck noted that one thing that he was not seeing was what would be spent on collector lines for the township. He assumed all the maintenance and repair was chemical expense. He asked whether maintenance and repair included collector lines within the township.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded that it was included as chemical expense, as well as planned maintenance and equipment maintenance.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether those costs are split for the purposes of the audit.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided explanation in that it was being expensed rather than capitalized. When grouting is done, it's a line repair – not building a new line. It had been capitalized before, but Mr. Schenck raised the question that it should be an expense. However, a valid point was being made, if all of that is expensed, then the other municipalities are paying when Mr. Crooks goes out and grouts on Kingston and Harrowgate.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden explained further that when the bill comes in, grout is purchased to do one of our lines, that figure goes into one of Springettsbury's line items that is not included in charges to the other municipalities.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided a copy of the audit report which showed how the costs are passed back to the township. All the calculations are based on metered gallons and all the calculations take place to arrive at what percentage they get and what percentage Springettsbury gets. Mr. Amic stated that Mr.

Pasch made a good point that an auditor might come along and advise that the other municipalities are billed too much, and we don't want to do that.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that what he would like to see in that with this new system, it be set up properly to get the information that's going to be helpful to everybody. He added that the system should allow us to be able to hold all of the department heads responsible for what they're doing.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reassured Mr. Pasch that the new system is capable of doing that.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that even if York Township came and asked for a particular figure, the system could provide the information.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic pointed out the administrative charges which indicated that the 1999 budgeted figure of \$47,250.00 to \$79,900.00. It is anticipated that in the year 2000 \$80,000.00 would be spent in administrative charges. That's about what it cost for us to administer that from this office. That may change if we get a Wastewater Director.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the salary figure for the new director would be included, and whether he would keep the figure at \$80,000.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he preferred to leave the figure alone because no matter who comes on board and when, there would be a transition period. He did not sense that it would change dramatically.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about conferences and training.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that that figure was increased dramatically, and the greater portion of that was on-going PLC training.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden added that part of the reason the PLC training in 1999 was not included is because that part of the training was included in capital. This is additional training that was not included with the contract.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that the contractor who installed the PLC systems paid for so some training, and that figure was additional training.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic mentioned the decrease in the utilities. That is because of two things. One is for arid weather and two the contracts we signed reduces the use somewhat. Utilities were \$213,000, and the budget was \$314,000 and a piece of that was the weather, but we did save about \$3,500 a month on electricity.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the septic that is hauled in here is a cash cow because, in spite of the drop in the flow, we didn't drop that much in the total that was processed. A lot of that is fixed cost.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he had never been overly concerned about the operation of the Wastewater Treatment Plant, because there are a number of really good people employed. The technical people are excellent and lab people are excellent; the people do their jobs.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the grant revenue that was shown here and whether Mr. Amic anticipated these next \$950,000 coming in to be shown as revenue.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that it was to be shown as revenue.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what would happen if the township didn't get that revenue.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that even though there would not be money at the end of 2004, if there were a deficit, one of the projects would not be completed.

**Non-Operational Revenue and Expenses**

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden commented that a lot of the figures were self-explanatory.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the difference in the interest is still calculated at the same interest rate but is part of the reserve.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden indicated that was correct.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether tap-in fees all stay within the Springettesbury side of the equation.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden responded that they do and they go into a reserve account for "Springettesbury Township Only" tap-in fees.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the number was very conservative, and if a review were made of the cash forecast, the number is based on the Chapter 94 report. If this were opened up, that number would explode, but Mr. Amic did not find that exploding by 2000.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden stated that the figure was based on 27 – 28 new residences.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that a lot of this is that all of these calculations are tied up in Municipal Service Agreement and what we're required to do, and in the audit requirements, the service agreements and bond issues, as well.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that that's all the more reason why the more it was cleaned up, the better.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that since the time she had been on the board, each year we seem to get more and more confident of the figures from each department.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he had been pleased with the budget work. He also was pleased when he opened up the rate study. He indicated his estimates were pretty close, and at least in a short period of time of what he had projected for 2000, it was fairly consistent from what had been done earlier in the year. He added that now that the initial program is available, it should be helpful in our computer to do a lot of neat things.

**Vehicle Purchases**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that there were some issues related to vehicles that needed decisions.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed and added that a discussion had been held with Chief Eshbach about the three vehicles. He had taken one out of the budget and as a result, we're in the position that Mr. Stern's got two vehicles that are listed as 4-wheel drives in the capital fund, and Chief has two police vehicles. Bruce Bainbridge has a van and bus for \$6000 in his budget. Mr. Amic suggested consideration might be given to leasing a bus rather than going to buy another whole bus. The question he asked was whether the third police car should be put back in, and would it be all right for him to bring it back to the Board sometime after the first of the year to purchase two vehicles for Economic Development.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that there were three people in that department out on the road: Andrew, Greg and Ron, and he asked how many vehicles the department has today.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they presently have two, a reconditioned police car and the old K car.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop brought up the fact that people borrow those vehicles to go to the bank.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that they use his car there too. Mr. Amic recommended that Economic Development does need a couple of vehicles.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked if two were purchased, would one be kept, i.e., the reconditioned police car as a third.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that would be an option.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked for an explanation as to why it is the employees can't use their personal vehicles and get reimbursed for mileage.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the reimbursement rate being used was twenty-five cents. The IRS rate is thirty-four cents now. All the Board would have to do is pass a Resolution to file what rate is passed regarding what your going to pay for mileage and as long as you don't exceed IRS rate. The low reimbursement is the reason people don't use their own car.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he wouldn't object to it if it were more reasonable.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that more information was needed as to how many miles are driven a year, 6,000 or 60,000
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it would be closer to 6,000 than 60,000.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated he would like to see some real numbers and added that he did not have any problem with two vehicles.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they are in the capital fund. He added that they do need to have serviceable vehicles.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that sometimes the police cars they turn in are good but most of the times they're not. He asked what would be wrong with using an ex-police car.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that you can't depend on what your going to get and when.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there was some success with the last one, but there aren't any more as they had been sold.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated if two new police cars were purchased, then there would be at least two vehicles available.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that it had cost about \$2,800 to recondition the police car that had been in use. The car had been reconditioned and painted, and the car hasn't been a great maintenance problem. It had been in use about three years.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that if three police cars were purchased, and one of the older police cars were retired a little bit earlier, then there might be a better guarantee of getting one that would be half decent.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated the cars are just not good for police work.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that they are pretty low mileage applications.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was correct.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that they are just for transportation and it doesn't have to be anything like a van or a station wagon or anything like that, it could be a Taurus or equal. Mr. Pasch added that he personally did not think that the policy should be disrupted on the police cars. The police cars are a vital necessity and three cars would not be unreasonable. He added that Mr. Stern's group should get one new car plus one of the reconditioned police cars.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added to take the best police car possible out of service.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated agreement to do so.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck recommended getting out of the bus business, contract that out with a bus and driver for the recreation programs.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that he would be in favor of leasing.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck added that the schools figured out that it's better to subcontract, and added that the township should take a lesson. He stated it would cost us more.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Amic had written down all the other items; for example, adding the fifteenth firefighter.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they are all written in, but we've got to get them into the budget. The Board should make all the changes now. Mr. Wachter can produce the book in a day. If you get changes to him in the morning he can make all these changes and have them printed. Not every page has a change. He should have the new budget ready for Thursday for the Board's consideration.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether at that time the Board would have a better picture of the surplus and if we're going to allocate monies to particular funds.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that this was typically how surplus is allocated after the first of the year.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that there would be about \$300,000 to allocate. It had been done during the Reorganization Meeting, during the first meeting in January. He added that there really is not a surplus until December 31.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated the Board had also taken it and given it back to the people who gave it to us in the first place.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that in 2000 with the changes this would be up over \$100,000 because there is \$42,000 in other changes and your probably going to have over \$100,000 anyway. The Board could allocate it to the capital fund. Mr. Amic added if he had \$100,000, he would not need any more than that to manage this budget.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated agreement.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested that the Board might think about what they would like to do with that surplus.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether they were really in a position to get the budget and vote on it on Thursday.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it would have to be completed by the end of the year.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about articles in the paper where some of the other municipalities had sealed their budgets, but no numbers are published. She wondered whether they started earlier than Springettsbury.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he did not think a lot of municipalities do what Springettsbury does with the budget. He stated that this is an involved budget, and added that he did not think there are a lot of municipalities spending the time that you folks do.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether it would be possible to start the budget a little bit earlier so that we don't have this crunch time.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it could be started whenever the Board desired. The reason for this schedule is because we try to wrap it around the last meeting of the year.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that we're not late, and it's 98 percent completed.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Mr. Wachter had a number of changes to make.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that we need to spend enough time to look at it. Receiving the budget on Thursday, and voting on it Thursday would make him a little uncomfortable.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she was not recommending it for this year—just thinking of the future.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the down side to starting earlier is that then your actual numbers are not right and then the quality of your numbers deteriorate.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed that the earlier the budget process would begin, the numbers used would be estimated numbers.

**MADDEN** Mr. Madden added that he did not think the other municipalities are concerned with the actual numbers; they're just doing their 2000 budget.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether anyone would be opposed to a 10-minute meeting to finalize the budget.

**There was no opposition voiced.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that would give Mr. Wachter more time and she was not opposed to a short meeting.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated some concern with holding the surplus.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he would view the things being planned and what the Board wants to get done.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked that whatever the schedule indicated would be fine with him. He would ask that before the clock strikes the millennium that the Board vote on the budget.

**Consensus of the Board was to meet on December 23<sup>rd</sup>, Thursday, at 8:00 a.m. to finalize the budget.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that Mr. Wachter should have the book completed and that it should be delivered by Friday evening. That would give the Board two weeks for review.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick announced that there would be a brief Executive Session immediately following adjournment.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
BUDGET WORK SESSION #3**

**DECEMBER 6, 1999  
APPROVED**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

MITRICK Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 11:05 p.m.

Sincerely,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
DEVELOPMENT ZONE WORK SESSION**

**NOVEMBER 23, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a 12:00 p.m. work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Ken Pasch  
Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Alan Maciejewski, Chairman - Planning Commission  
Larry Stets – Planning Commission  
Mark Robertson – Planning Commission  
Larry Gibbs – Planning Commission  
Andrew Stern – Director of Economic Development  
Attorney Donald Yost – Township Solicitor  
Jewel Frey – Stenographer

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. She stated the purpose of the meeting is to further discuss the proposed flexible development zoning district.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked everyone for coming and stated she would like to try to close the meeting around 1:30 p.m.

**STERN** Mr. Stern turned the meeting over to Mr. Maciejewski.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski's only concern was landscaping according to current uses and screening as to what trees to use, and wondered how we accomplish screening and impact the 80% opacity over the years?

**GIBBS** Mr. Gibbs noted improvement to the noise provisions so that we don't have an opposite effect as to detract businesses instead of attracting businesses. Mr. Gibbs wondered once a business is established, who would enforce or control the noise? Would the police issue tickets or what would be done?

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson stated there should be a baseline map as to where we are now to compare against maybe what would be in the future. Noise has different frequencies and some noise might cancel out other noises.

**GIBBS** Mr. Gibbs said at some point the baseline map might have to change over time due to buildings, buffers and vegetation.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson asked if a baseline map was provided in the package?

- STERN** Mr. Stern said there was a baseline map with 20 samples taken in the area and the only purpose was to establish criteria.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson made note that a baseline map should be supplied with a frequency spectrum and to check it as businesses go in the zone.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said the baseline map should be supplied, but not as a part of the ordinance, as the baseline could change over time.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked if the firm provided or recommended that you provide a potential developer with the information?
- STERN** Mr. Stern suggested maybe helping the first few developers with environmental impact studies just to get them started.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked if the developer could develop their own baseline?
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson said that could run into problems especially with the Planning Commission comparing what the developer thinks would be appropriate.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said the actual noise at the property line would be measured by the developer or the Township's baseline might not work.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson noted that the baseline shouldn't be put in the ordinance as it would be forever changing, it should be a procedural thing.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said if the developer does not meet noise requirements, then a buffer needs to be added.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what would happen if the property exceeds the noise ordinance?
- STERN** Mr. Stern said it could be written in the ordinance that they need to comply with the ordinance or they would have to pay for the Township to hire an expert to determine non-compliance levels.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch was concerned that if someone would come in and invest a lot of money, hire a lot of people and all of a sudden it doesn't work and then they can't fix it. Then what does the Township do?
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski said the incinerator is a prime example of that. People at the top of the hill were getting noises that people at the bottom of the hill didn't hear. So they put in baffles and mufflers in to decrease the noise level.

- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson noted there are certain items that they legally have to do. It would depend on if the business having 1, 2, or 3 shifts running.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Attorney Yost if something could be written in the ordinance to protect the zoning area?
- YOST** Attorney Yost noted that it could be done if the property line standard would be modified.
- STERN** Mr. Stern noted the ordinance now states it is measured at the property line. Did we now want to state it to be beyond the property line?
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson noted that there is a possibility of being too restrictive? There is no way of knowing sometimes where the noise is coming from.
- YOST** Attorney Yost said if we could identify the source of the noise we could deem it to be beyond the property line.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said most of the time the noise will be heard at the property line.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski said that Warren Spangler's comment was that he hears metal on metal and that the noise goes past the boundary line and also past Route 30.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch wondered if anyone would have stopped Caterpillar with all the noise?
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that he would have told Caterpillar to buffer the noise, as Mr. Stern told Donelee Industries and they put in a muffler to solve the problem.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick made a comment that the people coming in to the zone should know from the start that we have standards that are going to be enforced.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said that noise is one thing that can't be ignored. Some noises are annoying and constant and you can't just look the other way. Whereas, storm water problems, if it is not raining you could forget about it and put it in the back of your mind for the time being.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson noted that noise and smells are two things that gets people's attention and is something that you just can't ignore. We also need to get someone with new technology or development because that is what really provides growth to the community.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick noted there were other issues and wondered if there were anymore comments on noise?

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
DEVELOPMENT ZONE WORK SESSION**

**NOVEMBER 23, 1999  
APPROVED**

- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson's main concern was that we needed a map for something to start with.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch noted that when a developer comes before the Planning Commission we mainly have to rely on what their engineer says.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said that depended on the project. If for an example a paper company would come into the Township the first thing to come to mind would be an odor problem. We could have an expert engineer come in to review and submit it to make sure it was done right.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson commented on another issue; light. An example would be the York Mall lights.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck wondered if the York Mall was in compliance with the ordinance, as the lights seem too bright.
- STERN** Mr. Stern noted that Mr. Luciani reviewed the specifications that were given and approved them. When the York Mall is complete with putting in all the lights, we will send out Mr. Luciani to investigate the matter.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson noted that the lights in the York Mall are a different type of light that are more vivid. Mr. Robertson questioned if there would be the same lighting standard for commercial, industrial or residential?
- STERN** Mr. Stern made a comment about changing some of the language concerning the candlepower.
- STETS** Mr. Stets wondered if we had the fire equipment to handle 100 ft. building height.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said he would check with Chief Hickman on the matter.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick passed out Mr. Pasch's suggestion of the map.
- STETS** Mr. Stets suggested we start out small because once it is passed then we can't take it away.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck was concerned about the smaller parcels and that opening up to them wouldn't be what they were looking for in the flexible development zone.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski biggest concern was Caterpillar and the expansion of the commercial area and the impact it would have on the residents.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch was concerned that if we open up this new flexible zone, we might create more traffic problems. The Rockburn area was a problem

before when Caterpillar was open and traffic is still a mess now that it is closed. Maybe expanding the lanes would be an option to look at.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson made a comment that residential and small commercial are not going to support the Township, especially from a tax standpoint.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch personally thinks we need a traffic study done that says if we develop this zone on this broad of scale, what is required in order to handle the traffic that potentially is going to happen. The idea is a very good one but we need to look at it very carefully.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson noted that now is the time to get people in the zone while the economy is still booming.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Attorney Yost if language could be put in the ordinance regarding traffic so as to move forward with the ordinance at the same time move forward with a comprehensive traffic study for the area.

**YOST** Attorney Yost mentioned that is conceivable, but most municipalities have looked at it and said it creates a bureaucrat nightmare.

**STERN** Mr. Stern said that Texas A& M University did a study on traffic and came up with that the more roads you built the more traffic you will have and the increase in traffic was because of more cars, not because of more commercial development.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck noticed that the automobile industry is booming because everybody is buying extra cars.

**STERN** Mr. Stern noted that if you encourage development, your mercantile business privilege tax, market value and property taxes will all go up and instead of lowering taxes, use the money to make road improvements.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick noted that we need to bring this discussion to some conclusion and if you have any comments or input that you would like to provide Mr. Stern's office, please try to get it to him by December 1, 1999, so that Mr. Stern could have it ready for the new packet.

**STERN** Mr. Stern wanted everyone to mainly address the specific items and leave open the large items, such as traffic that would be more of a policy discussion on how the Board would want to deal with it. The main issues are traffic and the size of the zone.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski reminded everyone that a lot of the main roads in this area are state roads, and dealing with the state, as everyone knows they are not the fastest to move.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
DEVELOPMENT ZONE WORK SESSION**

**NOVEMBER 23, 1999  
APPROVED**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick had been sitting in on a lot of the transportation coalition meetings and the state has really been looking into cooperative funding. Chairman Mitrick asked Attorney Yost if there is a possibility for getting participation and financial support from the people coming into the new zone?

**YOST** Attorney Yost said he would check into the possibility and said it probably would work for this type of situation.

**STERN** Mr. Stern mentioned that the Caterpillar site is too large to go all commercial or all industrial. Once Caterpillar gets broken up Mr. Stern noted that he thinks industrial components would be at that site. Mr. Stern noted that the market should decide what is feasible and what's not.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson said that is the whole idea of the flexible development zone, to have flexibility to intermingle.

**YOST** Attorney Yost questioned why no one was in Caterpillar?

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented that Caterpillar is not on the market at the present time and is getting prospects for industrial users but are all conditioned on the flexible development zone being passed. Mr. Stern could not elaborate, as much of the information is still confidential.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch noted that the concept is a good one and if done right we'll attract others to come in.

**STERN** Mr. Stern said he would draw up a new draft that will address all the main items and put all the comments in and would get with Attorney Yost on the traffic situation.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck noted that he fully supported the flexible development zone and noted that it is easier to expand the area than to take away.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jaf

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
BUDGET WORK SESSION #2**

**NOVEMBER 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a budget work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
R. Bruce Bainbridge, Director of Recreation  
Michael Hickman, Fire Chief  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Randy Wachter, General Accountant  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. She stated that the meeting was the second in a series of budget meetings. The three areas for discussion included Economic Development, Fire and Recreation Departments.

**Economic Development Department**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided some background information with regard to the Economic Development budget.

**WACHTER** Randy Wachter began the discussion on Economic Development with information that took place during 1999. He provided some projections for the year 2000, which indicated little change in the budgeting. The main change of \$5,000 is due to salary increases. The replacement for Joy Lauchman was included, which would bring the department to the full salary range projected. An additional \$1,000 for a vehicle mechanic was added. Under Professional Development there were additional funds allotted for computer training and travel expenses.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick noted the amount for dues and subscriptions, which was higher.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that Mr. Stern requested additional monies for the Historic Preservation Committee. Traditional \$5,000 budget was split and allotted money for the National Registry District and cut the regular

Historic Preservation Committee budget to \$3,500. For the year 2,000 Mr. Stern requested \$7,750 for Historic Preservation.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch noted that the budget figure was \$7,750 and the estimated figure was \$863. He asked what would be done in the year 2000 that would raise it from \$863 spent to \$7,750.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the \$863 item during 1999 would actually be \$3,500. Consultants for Historic York, as well as Mark Shermeyer, would be billing the department by the end of the year. He added that for the year 2,000 the Historic Preservation committee budgeted \$3,500 for signs for Pleasureville, which may be high. Another item of \$3,500 covered was survey work, which included taking pictures, measurements and documenting property when properties are demolished. \$500 is paid for the on-going survey work where pictures are taken and placed in books in the library; \$500 to public education. This year it was used for sending letters to people in proposed districts to inform them of what was being worked on; \$750 for miscellaneous supplies which were archive materials, photos for books in the library.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented about the signs and the figure of \$3,500 indicating that figure was too high.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the selection of signs would be the deciding factor. There had been discussion regarding pole-mounted signs or a monument sign. If the monument signs are selected with either stone or brick base, the cost would be \$ 3,500.00 for two signs. If you go with what was put on the table recently, the cost would be \$1,000.00 for two signs.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that his observation of those signs was that they looked pretty good, but there had been questions from other Board members.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that \$3,500 could not be justified. The amount should not be left in the budget.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that Mr. Bishop and Mr. Gurreri had a question as to whether we were granting ourselves a variance in the ordinance with the signs. As far as he was concerned, he thought it was fine. The signs looked good but a variance would be required.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated it does not necessarily require a variance. The Ordinance allows for a township sign.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the Supervisors were just imposing that on ourselves.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the original design would have looked more like what we wouldn't have allowed.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the way this is, he thought it was great and he would remove the \$2,500 out of the budget
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that from the discussion, he was instructed to remove the \$2,500 out of the Historical Preservation of \$2,000.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that would allow some leeway within the budgeted amount. The number of properties to be demolished is an unknown at this time, as well as the projects that may surface. For example, this past year authorization was made for the work on the entrenchments at the quarry, which would come out of the \$3,500.00.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned employee benefits. Salaries had increased, but the benefits figure was down.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that new employees would not have any benefits for a period of six months for health insurance, etc. One-fourth of the department would not be eligible for benefits until the later part of the year.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether the new employees were replacements.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that was correct. He stated that the figure included the pension and all the other things that go along with it. The replacement was for Joy Lauchman.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked how Mr. Stern had been functioning without someone in that capacity.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that they have been functioning and would make it.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there was a delay in hiring somebody, or whether no one can be found.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the position had been advertised. Last Sunday or Monday was the deadline for applications.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked about the legal services and whether that was primarily the Zoning Hearing Board.

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it was for Zoning Hearing Board.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked for justification in putting the community development number in there.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that within Community Development during 1999, a large chunk of that was for the Development Zone. There were a couple of other items (Andrew's trip to Oklahoma for the Economic Development Institute), which were expected to be moved into Professional Development. Mr. Stern added that in 2000 money would be brought in by Planning Commission stipends. Assuming that Caterpillar would be sold, some expense would be involved. The Development Zone showed a reserve of \$2,500 for miscellaneous studies. It was unknown when that would be resolved. Miscellaneous studies are \$4,250 which covered the Route 30 exit ramp.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the Planning Commission stipend.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the Planning Commission members get \$150 each December.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that was almost an insult.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned that at one time they were getting extra monies by submitting mileage.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there had been a discussion about that, and he had gave up the fight because he thought it was illegal under the code; finally he agreed to just do it the best way.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what that \$150 stipend covered.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it was basically to offset expenses and travel.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated the members are pleased with it and would call him if they do not have a check by the middle of December.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Zoning Hearing Board still receives checks.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that they do.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the only difference was that for a couple years we decided that they should turn in slips.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested that the title be changed from stipend to an expense reimbursement.

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the Planning Commission would be very involved in the comprehensive plan. She asked whether there would be any way that the figure could be raised or have a second figure for their involvement in that. She stated that that effort would be very time consuming.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the question would have to be asked of Solicitor Yost. If the Planning Commission is going to do the comprehensive plan itself, there would be more time and more money involved as well. Solicitor Yost may advise that they are appointed officials, and therefore, they can't have the money and instruct that someone outside be hired to do the comprehensive plan. This matter that should be reviewed.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that having been involved in one, it would require a large effort by consultants and volunteers.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to look into the matter.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would check with Solicitor Yost to see if there is a way that could be accomplished.
- STERN** Mr. Stern added that he had not included any expenses for the comp plan in this budget. The reason why he had not was that the staff can't handle it right now. Mr. Stern did not think the Planning Commission could handle it at this time due to the number of projects that they have. Mr. Stern added that he had been involved in York City's comp plan project, and an extreme amount of time was involved even with consultants if the job is going to be done right.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether it would expire in a month.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it doesn't expire. It was recommended that one be done every ten years. However, it's not imperative that one ever be done again if that were the decision. Mr. Stern encouraged that one should be done at this time, and added if one is done, it should be done correctly.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch called attention to Page 34 – Program Highlights, which indicated a change in the average cost of a dwelling in Springettsbury Township to \$185,000. He questioned the figure.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that a portion of the figure was the result of fewer permits for condominiums this year. The number had gone down. Crown Point and Heritage Hills are nearly completed. Condominium figures are

smaller numbers, but he added that there were some very expensive homes.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the fact that condominiums would be listed as a new single family detached dwelling.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated he would have to check his work for a reply to his question.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that Mr. Stern had taken the word “detached” out. Condos are referred to as a new single family dwelling.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that it would normally be included as new single family detached dwellings.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that housing costs are going up.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that 20% is a big increase.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that there had been very few houses built for less than \$200,000.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that the clue was that very few were being built. When building was being done, big homes were involved. Once the sewer moratorium is lifted, homes will be built and the number would change. Real estate taxes as a percent of our total revenue or about 5 to 10%?

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that the forecast for next year does not show a lot of houses. He added that at the most there are 20 new homes built each year.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that Real Estate taxes were estimated at \$458,000 for the year 2000 which figure was up by 7.3% of the projected revenue. The low millage rate takes a big swing in assessment, which would have a big impact on additional real estate taxes.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the Professional Development covered only Mr. Stern.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that \$2,000 of that is local training which should be done regardless of what the state does. The second would be the state code which would require classes in certifications for three of us, Ron, Greg and Andrew. \$600 is to finish Economic Development school in Oklahoma and an additional \$400 for Business Retention class and the rest is travel expenses for the three of them.

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri inquired about the Vehicle Maintenance figure, which indicated parts and repairs at \$2,000.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the figure was a rough estimate and covered two vehicles, the K car and the Caprice.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the figure included fuel.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that fuel was separate.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter reported that a separate line was entered for fuel. The figure was changed for next year because a request had been made for two new vehicles. \$2,000 was estimated for parts and repairs. New vehicles would save those costs.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that some of those costs would continue. Ron and Greg use the cars 90% of the day. Mr. Stern indicated he used his own car, but if he goes to an inspection such as Home Depot, he would not use a personal car. Other employees make trips to the bank, court house, etc. Even if there were two new cars, there would still be a need for the other two cars or at least one of them for the other administrative staff.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the fuel cost.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that would be \$23.00 per week for two cars. Mr. Amic asked Mr. Stern whether \$12.00 a week covered the fuel for each car.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the actual figures are documented by the Gas Boy fuel system.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the price was approximately \$.67 per gallon with the municipal discount.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that the average cost that used was \$.676 cents a gallon.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that surprisingly enough that had not gone up.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated it had actually gone down and added that the Township does not pay any taxes on gasoline.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the Education Reimbursement.

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it applied to his work toward a Masters Program. This year in the spring he had taken one class that was not related to work plus and classes that were not related to work. As a result Mr. Stern had not asked for reimbursement.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented about the \$1,000, which was the result of a program available for years and everyone who desires to take college courses must sign a slip and give it to Mr. Amic. He authorizes payment for the courses provided the course relates to that person's job function.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Amic whether the Township would encourage employees taking courses.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there had a number of employees who had attended graduate college courses. The benefit is offered to those employees if they opt to exercise it.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that he did not have any problem with the reimbursement. Education which furthers the individual and aid in the performance of their job within the community is a good benefit.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that there had been policemen who wanted to take a biology course, which he had not authorized. We've had the police chief taking criminology courses toward his degree.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated some surprise that even in the Masters program Mr. Stern was not taking courses that related to the job.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he had been in a public administration program but at this time he was taking a business administration course, which involved classes in accounting, marketing, finance and things of that nature.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that in the police contract, extra money would be paid for police who have degrees. They get \$360 more per year in their paycheck because of their criminology degree. It is a great program, and it does encourage people to advance their education.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that all the time that they are studying, they are improving their ability to do the job intelligently.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that it might not have been emphasized enough.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick agreed with the program and suggested it might be expanded.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter asked whether there were any further questions regarding the Economic Development portion.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that there had been discussion during the beginning of this Budget session where he had placed Capital improvements shown on page 48. Two four-wheel drive vehicles had been requested for each department. These are not three-year vehicles and are depreciable items.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that Stambaugh-Ness views police cars as a capital expenditure.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic repeated his comment and indicated he could not see a three year police vehicle as a capital item.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter commented that it appeared as a Capital Expenditure, but the township does not depreciate. Starting in 2003 or 2004 a choice will be offered where assets could be depreciated. This would include all of our assets such as road improvements, storm sewer culverts where we can have a comprehensive study done every 3 years. It is something that is coming, but is a little premature at this point to talk extensively about it because the ground rules of this study are unknown. At this point in time Mr. Wachter suggested that the assets be scheduled for depreciation over some normal period of life or perhaps having a three-year study done.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that an appraisal should be performed to determine the assets of the township. Insurance is based upon appraisals. Mr. Amic added that there could be several possible scenarios: (1) the township would be under-insured (not enough insurance), (2) an over-insured status because of additions, or (3) items that are not even covered in the insurance are there. Mr. Amic suggested that at some future point, an appraisal should be completed to determine the accuracy for insurance purposes.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether the numbers in place are based on cost and whether the insurance is based on replacement value.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter advised that he had met with E. K. McConkey, the commercial liability and property insurance carrier. Automobile insurance is based on all owned vehicles so that a car could be purchased anytime during the year and is automatically covered at the same premium. The vehicle list had been reviewed and updated. The same procedure is followed for equipment (mostly related to wastewater treatment) and a comprehensive inventory on all of the buildings is scheduled for spring. The insurance people have given some comparative numbers of replacement costs for a building of this size.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that another reason why they had not gone further with the appraisal was that the insurance costs are presently modest. The Township has a lot of coverage for not a lot of money. Mr. Amic does not believe the insurance premiums are out of line at all.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether there was a \$1,000 deductible.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that in some areas there is a \$1,000 deductible; in others it is \$5,000. The Liability insurance has a \$5,000 deductible.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he agreed with a review of cost, but as far as the deductible is concerned, I think that Springettsbury Township can afford a deductible much higher.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the Ramos case which has a \$5,000 deductible. Our insurance company is defending this case and billing us for the work up to \$5,000.00. This is very reasonable. Those deductibles with the reserves we have probably should be looked at, because premiums compress.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked how the township would justify one or two vehicles to run around town.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that 90% of the time spent in the course of day-to-day operations for the field inspectors is in the department vehicle.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked why it would be necessary to have a four-wheel drive.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that some of the sites that they go into get pretty muddy, such as a new development. The field inspectors indicated that they would prefer not to use their own cars for inspections. They will use them to go to computer training or to a meeting or a job site, but they won't use them for inspections.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the years of the cars presently being used.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the K-car is a 1982 and the Caprice is a 1991.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what was wrong with the old police car.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that Chief Eshbach indicated the shocks and suspension are bad and they are very noisy.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented on the last cars which were sold. A new transmission was put in one and the mechanic indicated that one car was in good shape. The other one was no good at all. Mr. Gurreri suggested

reusing the police cars. They have been maintained and the mechanics know their condition.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that there would be costs to refurbish those cars.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that the car that Mr. Gurreri was referring to was in operation three or four years. He added that the refurbishing cost was approximately \$2,500 and repainting would be an additional \$1,000. For a total of \$3,500.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that the Caprice had been in the shop at least six weeks during 1999. In fact, it had been taken to the Chevy dealership in Red Lion as the mechanics were unable to fix the problems. He added that his department just needs cars that work.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether his department really needed a four-wheel drive.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated his department needs whatever the budget allots us. Mr. Stern recommended at least one four-wheel drive vehicle and preferably two for the kinds of things that we are doing. Galleria-West project was nearly impossible to get into with a regular vehicle due to the mud.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that anything on this particular item has to be approved later anyway. Anything that is of Capital nature comes back to the Board for the request of purchases like anything else.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that this item should be part of the plan. Mr. Pasch questioned the four-wheel drive as most of the inspections would not be done in muddy areas.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the time of year would be a factor and what kind of inspection. For example, this coming Spring when the sewer moratorium is lifted, there are projects that will be approved for a lot of new residential developments such as Fortune Hills, Sheridan Manor, Hunters Crossing, which will be difficult but not impossible to gain access into these sites.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether Mr. Stern's would keep any of the vehicles he has now.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the present cars being used would not be kept.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that at least one car should be retained. He added that the use is not limited only to his department. There are 10 people in the building, many who use his department cars for their township errands

such as going to the bank, and therefore our inspectors can't get to an inspection. He recommended having at least one other car unless we decide to not have any cars and the employees use their own.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what kind of mileage would be considered. He asked whether a \$22,000 4-wheel drive or a \$12,000 Saturn or a lease option would be the best solution as the Supervisors really have no idea. Is this car being driven 8,000 miles a year or 25,000 miles a year. This will make a big difference in the decision to solve this problem.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that there would be no question that they need to have the capability of getting to the inspections. They have to be able to get to all the corners of the township.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that if \$12,000 a year is all that is being discussed, a lease would be a good solution.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that was a definite option. He added that Andrew did get some lease papers from Jack Giambalvo, which would need to be updated at this point, but that would be a definite possibility

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that the possibility surfaced when they were borrowing the Jeep. Both the "K" car and the Caprice had been in the shop for a week at the same time.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he had been asked at that time as to what would be done, and he opted to lease one for a month.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that was how the \$22,000 came into the picture as the purchase price of one of the vehicles with the lease information.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked Mr. Wachter to get some additional mileage and comparable leasing information.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated he was not sure whether a lease made sense or not.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he had reviewed that but had not made any comparison to the \$22,000.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that the cost of capital is virtually nil, perhaps a lease would not make any sense.

**Fire Department**

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter provided an overview on the status of the Fire Department budget. He reported that the biggest change for the fire administration

included the previously-approved appointment of a Deputy Fire Chief, which added \$48,650 to the salaries for next year. Vehicle fuel and parts were increased by \$1,000. Wireless communication was increased slightly. Chief Hickman will use his training for the coming year. This category had been allocated every year and never had been spent. Wages were increased the standard of 2% through the negotiated contract. There are 13 actual firefighters. Because Dan Flohr was the acting chief, that had a profound affect on the overtime bringing a dramatic decrease in the overtime. As requested last year, the volunteer recruitment and the volunteer retention were broken into two separate categories and the lowest that was budgeted for 1999 was \$30,000. Including the Volunteer Retention Program the actual spending was about \$27,000. Total Employee Benefits are anticipated to be modestly higher. Uniforms were budgeted at \$23,000 last year, but actual spending is about \$7,000, so that next year the budget can be increased to \$15,000.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned why there had been such a big difference.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that it had been his understanding that last year with the adopted budget there were Class A uniforms involved, which had been cut but for some reason the figure in the budget did not decrease. The proposed year 2000 budget for \$15,000 also included some personal protective equipment for the Deputy and Chief Hickman. That alone is about \$4,000 for protective pants and boots.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that training for professional development had been added for \$2,000.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that while the contract negotiations were successful, the negotiations did have a cost.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that firefighters first wanted to reduce their work week and do some other things. What was really needed was to get rid of the overtime. They wanted to go from 52 hours to 48 hours. One of the things suggested was to not cut the number of hours, but see what would take place if a 15<sup>th</sup> firefighter was hired. An analysis was done which indicated that, given the amount of normal sick time; the amount of scheduled vacation time, how many hours would fully complement fourteen firefighters, the number was 2644 hours of overtime. The firefighter works approximately 2079 hours; therefore, with basically one additional fire person a good part of the overtime could be eliminated. A review of those who are working that overtime and what they are getting paid, including the fact that there are still two of the firefighters who have more than 10% contribution to their pension plan, so as they work overtime they are not only at a higher rate of overtime pay, but also their fringe benefits are added in as well and the whole thing escalates. By

hiring the 15th firefighter a considerable amount of money can be saved, not only on the overtime but also on the resultant fringe benefits, i.e., pension, social security and the items that roll right along with it. We did the following projections based on hiring one firefighter. We could reduce the total wages to \$662,000 subsequently reducing the employee benefits to \$216,000. That would result in a \$42,000 savings in the first year of the contract alone; therefore, part of the plan to submit this was to understand what hiring just one firefighter (even though on the surface it looks as if it will increase the cost), basically with the overtime coverage that we would be able to accomplish, it would have a pronounced savings

**AMIC**

Mr. Amic added that the amount is about \$42,000 of the \$67,000. It does not eliminate all of it. With this change based on the schedule provided, these numbers are the same totals equaling the present value. The total cost of this contract for four years is \$266,000, which is a big number. The present value is \$245,000. With this change the total price of this contract at present value is \$128,000. What results is a no cost contract in the first year and about 7.1% over four years or about a 1.6% increase in the contract on the average per year so it is under 2%. Mr. Amic indicated he thought it was a pretty good deal!

**BISHOP**

Mr. Bishop asked whether it was realistic to hire one firefighter and eliminate 2,079 hours.

**AMIC**

Mr. Amic commented that there were several things involved. The overtime is not being eliminated. On paper the calculations are correct; however, there is still \$26,000 in overtime. In addition to that, if the 15<sup>th</sup> firefighter is hired, this person is available for duty. He does not have three weeks vacation, holiday time, or seniority and in addition to what is here. A lot of money would be saved on the contract. When the Deputy Fire Chief is promoted from within the department, a \$45,000 to \$50,000 man will be moving to the Deputy Fire Chief. When we negotiated this contract, we negotiated a further step down, step three, so now what we have is not two-tier contract years. Mr. Amic suggested that the contract is a good one. He added that Chief Hickman had helped a lot with the creation of the budget, and that an additional firefighter would aid the Chief in scheduling and take some pressure off of him. Mr. Amic further expanded on the costs and the offsetting attrition, which would take place as time progressed. It's an expensive contract. Mr. Amic stated the contract was negotiated at \$266,000. However, with the other mechanisms, it isn't that expensive. Mr. Amic was not suggesting that anyone needed to be hired. Messrs. Amic, Wachter and Hickman worked together in agreement to get the Chief what he needs and at the same time get it to him at the least possible cost to the township.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic about the promotion from within where the 14<sup>th</sup> spot is vacant you promote one from within and hire two new people.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the total complement goes up by one to get advantage of the overtime.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that the promotion would change nothing

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter further explained that there would be savings that would be realized, because built in are the higher paid firefighters. Most wages are within the base rate of \$45,000 to \$50,000. With fourteen firefighters right now, there are only two that make below \$45,000.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that this firefighter would not receive all the fringe benefits that are paid to firefighters now.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that scheduling is a major issue right now for them.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that this effort would be helpful as the oncoming firefighter is a floater. Right now he has one floater.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman added that there are actually two who are scheduled in December for the following year. They do know their schedule by January 1<sup>st</sup>, for the following year because there is that much time off taken due to the Christmas holiday, so those two people are kept abreast of how they are going to work in the new year. Anything additional as far as sick time, personal days, falls in the overtime category and they are picked up by the other firefighters. This third relief or third floater would pick up a lot of it, which will reduce the overtime budget significantly.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that it was her understanding they made up their own schedule.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman discussed the procedure in response. He stated that their annual meeting is in December. Schedules are made for time off, vacation, and personal days, up to a certain number of days that are already established. Through the course of the year should they want off a day here and a day there, they call John Kline. Everything is computerized so that this time can be charged accordingly. Ground rules are established so that there time off is taken at an appropriate time where you do not have too many people off at one time.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the Supervisors could control that in terms of the number who can be off, etc.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Charlie Lauer had been fighting that, but there is a war going on between us and the Teamsters, because they are determined they will have three off at one time, and Charlie says two and that is it.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked about whether other fire departments schedule that same way.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that the majority of the time it is such a time consuming effort to maintain a schedule that would be so complex that it would involve the Fire Chief and other areas would suffer.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what would happen when someone would call off.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman advised that there would be “x” numbers of overtime to begin with at the first of the year. Even with the two relief people, we still have \$67,000 in overtime. Right now Dan Hoff and Rob Carpenter are the two relief fire fighters.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether they are assured a certain number.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that they do receive their full 2700 hours. My ultimate goal is to hire from within, to grant the position of Deputy Chief.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that if that did not work, the \$22,000 benefit would be lost.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman added that if someone is sick, instead of having them call the Chief at 3:00 a.m. to report off, they call the station at 4:30 a.m. and they know who is up, they can call them and get it taken care of.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the present firefighters would lose money at this because of this practice.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the firefighters actually supported it in the negotiations 100%.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated she did not want them having other jobs and asked whether the scheduling would still provide for them.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that everything would stay the same and added that he would not see any difference. The same amount of firefighters would be available and the same amount of coverage. There will be a day or two

here or there where he might have an extra person at the station by the indicated that would be rare.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the Fire Chief would have the same amount of people most of the time. There will not be an extra firefighter around because he will fill the gap of the overtime factor.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated she thought it was about time.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that this will work. Mr. Wachter's numbers are pretty good.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned the extra firefighter hanging around the fire hall. You don't get the benefit by not eating up the overtime when that happens. Two or three days out of a year are no big deal.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman added that it would be rare that it would happen with the amount of overtime that we are expending now, and quite frankly I have never had an overtime budget that big before. I came from a resort community, which did not have overtime to that extreme.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that he hoped that at the budget meeting next year, they would not see \$67,000 here in overtime because he would not be coming to that budget meeting. I agree that this will work.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri interjected that the 15<sup>th</sup> person should be hired.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that if that extra person were hired, adding the prices of uniforms etc. the cost would go up slightly.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the prices of the fringe benefits go down and so we are not going to pay these benefits for a new firefighter.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether this would be something that the Board could do and get incorporated into this budget

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they are asking & requesting that the Board approve this action. What happens now is your fire budget surplus is going to be more than \$42,287.64. That's the budget surplus if you add another fireman.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter asked whether he could make that adjustment.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated agreement.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated agreement.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there would be anything in that contract that is going open up desires of the other employees, such as the teamsters or the police.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the fire department is getting what was previously given the other people. There is nothing unusual. They asked for the diagnostic care increase, which wasn't very much at all. Uniform allowance is \$25.00. That is not very much. We gave a bonus to the police and that goes to the firefighters as a retirement benefit. So once again there is nothing new here.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that there is nothing new in this contract that is going to place the other one in status quo.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he did not think so. A four-year contract was signed with the police, and this is a four year contract with the firefighters. The teamster negotiations are totally different. The reason is the fact that they have no arbitration rights and they know that. It is much easier to take a more conservative line. These guys come in and are getting 3 or 4% raises. They are either going to get it from us or from the state. You try to think of something creative to spread out the costs.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that putting this item into the budget would not authorize the position.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it does not. The position must be created. The Manager's Ordinance is specific that he can't create any positions. The Manager can fill positions, give someone a small raise, but I can't create positions. That's a privilege of the Board of Supervisors.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CHANGE THE PRELIMINARY BUDGET AND ADD THE 15<sup>TH</sup> FIREFIGHTER. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Mr. Amic to place that item on the Agenda.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter called attention to an item in Parks & Rec budget under Contracts and Service. The item should have been listed as \$3,000 and not \$2,000.

Mr. Wachter continued with the EMT's and the ambulance showing the wage contractual changes. As part of the Teamsters their contract had been negotiated. The actual amount of overtime for 1999 was higher than anticipated and that was due to the loss of an EMT this year. Due to the lost of the EMT, it had to be made up for in overtime. You will notice the

salary is a little bit less than what we projected, but the overtime is up correspondingly.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman brought up an item on some pending enactment by the Senate regarding the Fair Labor Standards Act. The legislators are getting ready to do away with the 40-hour clause for EMS providers. It has passed the house; it's on its way to the Senate now to get repealed, so to speak. If they are working 40 hours, anything over 40 is overtime. That falls back to the way it used to be when working 52 hours so there may be a chance of changing some things there. It may cost a little more in salaries, but the overtime should go down.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the regular full-time employees cover all part-time hours.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that the way their schedules are developed, it allowed room for volunteerism on Saturday and Sunday night. There are no volunteers running those shifts. It is picked up by the employees. That overtime is basically paid for/reimbursed by the Ambulance Club.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that it was covered by the money they make billing people for their services.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he was talking hours.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated that it covered 16 hours of overtime a week, which used to be part-time hours.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter asked for a small clarification on something. Mr. Wachter indicated Ms. Speicher's understanding was that the contribution that the Ambulance Club makes to us is only to compensate us for the hours that replace the part-timers. Mr. Wachter told her he did not think that was the case, but that they make a flat contribution which covered all overtime.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that they give the township \$80,000.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated they give whatever they please.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic continued that we are leading to something important here that was mentioned. Their overtime for this particular year is \$63,914. If that overtime estimated at \$72,000, then part-time is \$12,000 and that is in fact \$84,000 to \$85,000. That is really what they are paying us for. This year it is over the \$80,000. They have always paid us for the overtime and the part-timers.

- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that it was a long story as to how we got to this point.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that that was what wanted clarified.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that Mr. Wachter was thinking about the item way too logically. There is no logic to it. They are paying the township \$80,000 to keep us from taking away their ability to bring in \$240,000.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that it probably used to be \$50,000 and then it went up to \$80,000.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it used to be \$20,000.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that there is no change. The part-time person is still a part-time which will always be a part-time person, which is included in this. These employees work overtime. This is what used to be strictly the Ambulance Club with part-timers.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether those were part-time employees or actually volunteers.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated they were part-time non-paid employees.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that basically in the past as he understood it, this \$50,000 was allotted in specific places based on what had been done the previous year.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Ambulance Club was asked to pay for the secretarial help and overtime, which resulted in their paying the \$80,000.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the department can do the things legally, i.e., third party billing.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic reassured her that the activity was perfectly legal.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch interjected that they do not spend it on themselves.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that he would prefer not to have the EMT staff do that. He would prefer having a clerical person do it.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the Sheri does all of that.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that Sheri does the billing and checks with credit card companies and all that. He added that he did not know what the bottom line would be with the third party billing. He had been told that

their pay rate is above 80%, which is almost unheard of. The system Chief Hickman is looking at gets 18% to 21% and they get 80% to 81%. I get phone calls monthly either from Quality, White Rose or private ambulance services. I do not have a viable answer either, but if the system isn't working exactly as it should now it is definitely out of line.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether anybody knows actually what the Ambulance Club does have.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated they have about ½ million dollars in the bank.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented on the evaluation that is presently being done and asked about the elimination of the administration of it.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the evaluation should be completed soon. Conversations indicated the Ambulance Club wanted to get rid of the administration as they had been burned two or three times where people have not been licensed and they were in the middle of it. Mr. Amic indicated he had not received the agreement.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated that it sounded like they wanted the authority to come to me.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that that would include the billing as well.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that he doubted that the billing would be included.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what it would include.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it would include the management training and personnel, anything in reference to administration.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that the problems still exist.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that was correct. They wanted to sign an agreement with Springettsbury saying here is what our responsibilities are and here is what yours are. He added that he had not seen that yet.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated that the agreement should be completed by Thanksgiving.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that listening to them they want to get rid of all the other administrative activity for which they are responsible to Mr. Amic.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked who was doing the work now.

- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated that he was doing a lot of it now. The information is in a shambles right now as nothing has been done in years.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that as soon as he received a copy of the information he would provide copies to the Supervisors. Primarily what this means is that the township would be responsible for making certain that the license is maintained.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what would happen if they are not licensed.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that certain things must be done within six months as warranted in a conditional license; if you don't the license is expired.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that if this would happen, we would get a provisional license. The Ambulance Club would sacrifice the license.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the point should be checked with Solicitor Yost, because he had indicated that if push would come to shove that equipment would belong to the township.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that he had asked the same question, but the problem is that could take a while. He stated that there would be no question that the township would ultimately have it sometime, but not in twelve hours.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that if that happened that they did not have a license, the people that are working there would want to work for us at any rate.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether this would be an opportunity.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he thought the problems should be straightened out.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that there are benefits to its operation, such as the low-interest loans.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that if Mr. Bishop's reorganization would have taken place, they wouldn't have that anymore. They could have bought two more ambulances.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that their attorney had figured out that they have enough annuity to keep them going for 15 years. Mr. Bishop asked who decides whether an \$80,000 ambulance or a \$180,000 ambulance is purchased.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Ambulance Club decides.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman added that there are five people on the Board of Directors.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that in talking with the leadership of the Ambulance Club he had asked what was important specifically to their finance people. The response he heard was that their job was to insure the financial stability of the Ambulance Club. Mr. Bishop advised them at that time that it was his job to insure the public safety of the people in Springettsbury Township. Mr. Bishop did not sense that all parties involved were thinking alike.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked about the aerial truck and the budgeted amount.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked why there was only \$8,000 in the budget.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it had been put in last year in the anticipation of funding an additional truck.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman explained the present focus regarding the fire engine. He stated that he had received a bid package three weeks ago from American LaFrance for a new fire engine. Even if a contract were signed tomorrow, it would still be ten months to a year before the new equipment would be in the firehouse.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that it could be early 2001.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that the new fire engine equipment had not yet been customized. A low profile cab and adjusting the turntable ladder to make it 3" to 4" lower is being considered. Spring Garden, Manchester and York Township all have towers, which have a bucket on the end. Chief Hickman continued that the fire department wants to go with the straight stick and eliminate the bucket on the end to make Springettsbury more diversified. Springettsbury's main application is for residential fires, and unfortunately, we don't always have the best access to place the truck. A straight stick would be 110 foot in length. The fire engine could actually be parked on the street in front of the another house and still reach the roof across the street, and that's what we are primarily looking for in making rescues. Chief Hickman also discussed ISO as another good reason. The insurance service also says a truck must meet certain specifications. The rating in place at this time is an ISO4 rating. Because of the age of the snorkel truck a penalty was given. Once a full rating for the truck is available and it can be staffed and run as a truck, then full credit can be received. Hopefully, the ISO rating can be lowered to a 3. It is almost borderline 5. Overall with an ISO rating, it affects the overall insurance ratings for all the insurance carriers in the townships.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what affect does ISO on the individual's insurance.

- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that he did not know what the breakdown would be, but he would speculate that it would be pennies.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that it might be pennies for residential but not for commercial.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that when you look at the overall picture, a drop in an ISO rating of 1% can mean millions in insurance aid depending on how big the insurance base is.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he would like to know percentage wise what the difference would be, depending on the base. He added it probably would not do anything for residential.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that this is one of the misconceptions about this whole ISO thing. It is the large industrial and commercial establishments that are going down.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated it would still be nice to quantify that to see the difference. He added that he thought he heard somewhere in terms of ISO ratings, we don't necessarily have to own this equipment as long as we have agreements in place that make it available to us.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that that would affect the credit amount that you get for lease back. Spring Garden is eight blocks from the township. It does not fall within that mile and a half boundary of this building; therefore, this building wouldn't be credited for having the apparatus in the township, whereas on East Market Street, it would. Chief Hickman's ultimate plan is to run it as a 'quit operation.' It will have a pump with 500 gallons of water, 800 feet of hose plus a ladder. When it goes to a structure fire, it will go alone out of station 16. The engine from 17 will come also. Both firefighters from 16 will be on the apparatus to go and that is the technology of today with reduced staffing to run a dual-purpose piece. So that will be functioned as the engine and the pumper and the ladder truck both. Basically, getting two for one is how my plans are to run.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether Chief Hickman thought it could save lives.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded absolutely and added that the first three minutes are what counts.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether everyone would have to be trained.

- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that would be correct, before the engine were put into service.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked about the Deputy Fire Chief hiring status.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that discussions had been held with Mr. Amic to determine exactly how we need to post the position and basically the way its looking now, it will be an internal promotion.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that the question was asked whether it had to be advertised when promoted from within. Mr. Amic indicated it did not have to be advertised, but it would need to be posted.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the big problem in finding a Deputy is learning what would entice someone.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated Chief Hickman believes he is going to get someone and believes that internally that there will be applications for this position.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there are more than one who is qualified.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that he thought there were two at this time. He thought three would apply. It will be a matter of deciding whether we want to promote so badly from within there would be a lesser standard to accommodate a person or whether we decide that no we need the standard that is written and look perhaps outside. Whether or not the two people qualified for the job will take what is being offered is an unknown.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Chief Hickman felt confident that with the promotion from within, that the person would be able to survive.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that he believed an inside person could survive better than bringing in someone from the outside. It took a month for him to weigh the waters of turmoil and basically prove his worth. Now the individuals are coming to him and telling him that they respect what he is doing. They understand that he is not an outsider who is trying to do the job, but one who has done the job and will continue and he is earning the respect that the position carries. Chief Hickman added that he would not want an outsider filling the Deputy Chief position and have to earn what he had to earn. He stated that he needs someone to step in and hit the ground running and be ready to do the job. He continued that without question any one of the 14 individuals should be able to step up and do the job to a level. Whether it is the level needed or not, he didn't know, but there are at least two he knows who qualify.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about Chief Hickman's plan for testing.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that a candidate would go through the normal testing process and there would be discussions and compile a list of people here that we will interview and recommend to you which ones will be the best for the job. He asked Chief Hickman whether he would have an oral examination.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that he would have an examination. He would prefer to have a written test, however, there is no written testing in place at the present time. I think that qualification will come from certifications that are in hand and proven documentation of the education and experiences that they have. The oral interview that Chief Hickman proposed is based on scenario type questions to see how they react etc.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether Chief Hickman would have a fixed specific educational requirement or just look at each individual.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated that he would look at who has the best of what we have. A standard that was written into the proposal in the packet which was basically the same given for the Fire Chief with a couple of down grades. Hopefully, they can all meet or obtain it in short order.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what Chief Hickman's game plan would be if he got the opportunity to promote from within for Deputy. He stated that there would be a vacancy within the 14 firefighters.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated that he had not ironed out all of the details as yet. He intended to hire the firefighters as expediently as possible to get them on the job. In that way, the overtime budget would not be impacted anymore than it has been for the year.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether firefighters are plentiful or is it like there is no one there looking for work.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman added that there is one qualified volunteer that has expressed an interest. He had other volunteers from other areas that had expressed an interest as well. I believe that once it is opened up for testing that there would be 30 plus applicants for the job. There never had been a problem for career departments hiring as far as getting qualified applicants. It is for the police, but not for firefighters.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that during the time that Chief Hickman is moving toward hiring for the Deputy position, he could also be moving on the one vacant firefighter position.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that was correct and that he hoped Chief Hickman was doing that.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated that the good thing about hiring the one position is that a list us developed from that.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked refocused on the Ambulance service. He stated that all the people now in place are EMTs. There are some training issues there. Mr. Bishop asked whether this might be something that the township should be looking at down the road for paramedics.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that yes, it is an issue that he is looking into. He does not like having to rely on another service to provide advanced life support. He believes that we should take the best care possible for our citizens, and this is something that should be expanded. It is a trend in the United States that we have basic life support service and that you have a paramedic, but he does not necessarily see that would work here today; it may work five years from now or maybe two years from now. Now the paramedics are needed on the ambulances and functioning as such. Scott Williams is a paramedic, functioning as an EMT, but he does not have the ALS equipment for advanced life support on the ambulances. He would like to see us take care of our end, and not have to rely on anyone else. Right now we have too many issues, major issues, with the service to try expand them.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked about the authority of the emergency services. I do not know what you had on the 99 update. He asked Chief Hickman whether he felt as though he has the authority.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that, yes, as he read it and understood it and read the by-laws of both organizations. Taking the Commonwealth, by-laws of Springetts, and the Ordinance and reading them as they are written, taking word for word that's what it says.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what it said.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that it said the Fire Chief is responsible for the protection of the citizens of Springettsbury Township from fire, etc. The by-laws of the fire company say that the organizational responsibilities are protection of citizens of Springettsbury Township from fire. So basically, everything those organizations do affect fire suppression, so therefore it falls into my jurisdiction.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that it was really not clear and added that clarification is what we are trying to do with this EMT Agreement. Particularly in need of clarification is the administrative areas. He added that Chief

Hickman's analysis was correct. The Chief is in charge of it all, but it is not crystal clear.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that he read a copy of it the other day and it all leads to the protection of the township.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether there would be something in the way that money is going to these organizations that should be changed to reinforce that authority. He added that he had listened to six hours worth of explanation of how this works over the last six months and still has no clue how it actually works.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated that at the present time the volunteer incentive program is in place. The volunteer incentive is no problem at all. The volunteer incentive I am looking at as the T-Shirts, sweatshirts, whatever, the little "perks" that we can give the volunteers to make them feel good about what they are doing. Chief Hickman stated that he disagrees with the paid on call program. He had a problem paying \$7,400 to seven or nine individuals to respond as a volunteer for calls. The last time was \$7,019.94 for three months. That was what we paid for 9 people. Two district chiefs, two lieutenants, two firefighters and three fire police. Out of that we had 239 calls for that quarter. The most anyone responded was Doc with 149 calls and he got \$2,000. I am not saying that it is a bad idea to pay people to come to calls and do a job. I disagree with it because it doesn't really helping the numbers out. Chief Hickman had privilege to see the first one, and the same number of people were paid to do the same thing, but it was \$5,000, therefore the cost has gone up and you have not gained anybody and you are paying three fire policemen, two firefighters, two lieutenants and two district chiefs \$7,000 for the quarter when they are supposedly volunteering to do the job. I disagree with this issue, it needs to be re-worked to maybe increase the incentive portion, not necessarily pay them for the services provided. Chief Hickman indicated this would be an area he would look at more closely and investigate.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there are any statistics regarding retention of \$27,000 for volunteer retention.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he did not think there was retention. He added that the people who are here are the same people that had always answered the calls.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the \$27,000 did not do anything except to give the same people that have been here for years and have been coming out, the \$27,000. You didn't retain any volunteers that you wouldn't have retained anyway.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the word is that an individual shows up with the clipboard and when they come by the scene, they tick off the name and keep going. His job is to “tick” off if they are attending so that they can be on the “listing” for payment. That’s all this guy does, and then he goes home. This thing is being “finessed”.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman added that certain duties are performed in the fire house. If you mop the floor, if you sweep the hall, empty the trash, then you get compensated. It is a common practice to come to the fire house in the morning and mop the floor and leave and then come back later and do other chores and get three or four sheets a day. It was not designed to work that way.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what he would do to correct this problem.

**HICKMAN** I believe wholeheartedly that you will still have the core firefighters that you have now. I was in volunteer services, eighteen or nineteen years ago. I would do it for a T-shirt, coffee mug, or any other item. I got more satisfaction out of some one giving me a T-shirt and saying that I did a good job and see you later than have someone give me a \$2,000 check.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated agreement that he did not think these fire fighters would be lost.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the function of the fire police. It is a critical function. She had observed chaos with the fire police. She asked what could be done about it.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that there is a fundamental problem that he is having with the fire police. There is a need to appoint a captain; however, no one wants the job.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked why no one wants to do the job.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that he really did not know unless it related to the handling all of the administrative issues that come with that position.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that one of the problems he had heard over and over again is that they have no money. If someone gives them money, they have to go to one of the two fire companies and give them the money and then ask for it back. It is just a nightmare. It is hard enough to run a volunteer organization, but this one makes no sense. Hopefully, there is a way to fix that. Legally, by state law, they have to be members of a fire company to exist.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether if they had a radio in their hand, are they in contact with the police

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that they would they would get him.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that he had learned that police are on another band. They changed their band. They are on with the Rec Department and Wastewater. The police changed their band due to the “chatter.”

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that they talked to him, and if they need something they talk to the Incident Commander and he calls York, and York calls the police and they come.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether they were on the police frequency before.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that he thought so. The argument was not the police in the beginning, it was that they couldn't get in touch with Charlie Lauer. That's O.K. The police changed their frequency because of all the chatter on this band so they now have their own frequency.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that when the power went out in this area, and there were fire police on Mt. Zion and they were in contact with each other, did they even know what the police were doing with all the chaos going up and down the hill involved with the lights not functioning. She asked whether that was okay.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he did not know if it was okay. They are in communication with Chief Hickman. He has to determine if it is O.K. The answer is with Chief Hickman, not me.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick expressed her alarm that they could have been sending traffic into one another. She asked Mr. Amic whether or not the police channel change went through his office.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded absolutely not, and added that distinguished former Chief of Police fought that tooth and nail that this was not going to happen. I suspect that this went on through here and this one decided that he wasn't going to have it either, but he never came to me and said “what should we do here.”

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick continued that the Fire Police do not always know what is happening on the roadway, but also they are putting their life in jeopardy because they are standing out there without radio contact with the proper people. Chairman Mitrick did not think that is right.

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that doesn't say we're doing anything about it though.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that he would not know what we can do about it right now. Chief Hickman volunteered to discuss it with Chief Eshbach.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was what is needed. He thought he knew what his response would be, we certainly should talk to him together. Response is not going to do it because there is too much chatter on here and he can't get his police calls through, that's the answer you will get.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman suggested that he talk to York County monitors.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he may be right that there is too much chatter. He received a lot of these calls on my car radio and will pick up the collection crew working and they will be radioing back and forth, and other disturbances, and there is a lot of chatter.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that there has to be a way of resolving this, perhaps two radios. If you need to talk to the police you have to get to them.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that if anyone would see him on an incident, he has three radios in his hand. I have low band fire radio, and the fire police radio and the EMA radio which has the police – three radios to keep in contact with everybody.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that temporarily it is a means of handling it at least.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that he would not want to leave the Supervisors with the impression that he thought it was all right that we can not get to the police. It is not all right.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that Chief Hickman could get in touch with the police.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that when we found out that the power was out in this whole area, he can't be in all locations at one time.
- HICKMAN** Chairman Hickman added that when he said he had the police radio, that is just a monitoring frequency only. He couldn't transmit back to anyone and has to call York County Control.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated Chief Hickman would have to pick up the phone and dial 911.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked why we can't get this right.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that they would have to sit down and talk to the Chief to find out what needs to be done.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked again about the volunteer retention. He asked whether the Board should do anything. Would you want to do a plan, or would you rather have us be the bad guys and eliminate the budget.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that he would emphatically say that it doesn't work. He recommended an allocation for incentive. He followed the formula that was presented to him and \$34,000 is what it came out to. He stated again that he did not agree with it.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that she wished to go on record that the Board was very concerned about that, and that we asked the Chief to look into it.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that with an increase of \$8,000 going on record, the Supervisors are saying the Chief will change the program. There is no choice.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that it should be left the way it was and the Chief change the program and bring it down to a specific number. We have to take a different approach, because it is not doing a thing. I think it is \$27,000 that is being referred to.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what the Supervisors wanted it changed to.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he thought it should be changed to estimated expenses \$26,787.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the program could not be run any higher than that.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter commented that the fourth quarter is strictly an estimate. If you remember our discussion from last year, the volunteer program was a combination of recruitment and retention. We said o.k. officially we are really not spending money on recruitment so we changed the title to volunteer retention, budgeted at \$30,000. We really did spend legitimately \$125.00 on volunteer recruitment so I call a spade a spade.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he thought the Boards intention all along was for this to be volunteer recruitment as it was four years ago when the cost was \$10,000 for volunteer recruitment.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that he placed \$500 in the volunteer recruitment .

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop suggested that we budget \$25,000 for volunteer retention and \$5,000 for volunteer recruitment. He added that would send the kind of message that we want to send.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the Supervisors created this monster. To eliminate all the heads of this monster is not going to be an easy job. Mr. Pasch stated that the Supervisors need to give the Chief time to come up with something. He agreed with the \$25,000 and \$5,000.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that this is where we fought this through the labor contract, we fought like the devil to get it in there. Former Chief Siegrist said this would be great for volunteer recruitment. That was the basis he sold it to me under, and no sooner that we put it into the labor contract he came back a month later and said it does not have anything to do with recruitment. Retention is the word!
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it hasn't recruited or retained many.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that the new members that are coming in aren't eligible for it.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that may be what volunteer recruitment is. Maybe you need to front load it to get people up to speed. It certainly hasn't improved morale of the volunteers.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the firefighters complain quite a bit about it. They do not like it at all.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Wachter if he had that change.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that he did - net reducing by \$4,500.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked why not stay with the \$26,787.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that the \$25,000 sends a little message.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop re-stated what Mr. Pasch said regarding creating this monster and we should take some of the responsibility for it.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic disagreed with Mr. Bishop. In this case I think you were ill advised.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated, ill advised or not, we finally signed the budget.
- HICKMAN** Chief Hickman commented on In the EMT budget, calling attention to an increase in training expenses. Everyone is being brought up to speed for

what is required by OSHA, as far as hazardous materials, awareness in operations and also their bloodborne and airborne pathogens.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked about the certifications where we have had problems in the past and whether that was something that we pay for.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that was correct and due to the fact that we are paying for them to attend classes to make sure that certification is maintained.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the township pays for the classes.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman added that depending upon where the classes are, most of the time the Ambulance Club has picked up the expense of hosting the class, and the township is paying the straight time for employees to attend. Most are lax in meeting the minimum requirements of the Federation. Hopefully, by Feb. 26<sup>th</sup> all that will be taken completed.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated he would like to see more control on the overtime.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that he thought eventually there would be more control. Right now as far as the fire side goes this past year was bad having Dan out as the Interim Chief. The addition of the 15<sup>th</sup> firefighter pretty much put a handle on it. We will still have an overtime expense, but we are not seeing the figures of \$90,000 to \$117,000.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that in any industry the people do not have a say on the overtime. Management has the say. In this case it seems as though the employees have the say.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated that this is something he would be reviewing especially with the Deputy Chief coming and attempt to get a collar on.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that there must be control in terms of the number of people, but if there were more control in terms of “yes, you can do it”, but we approve it.

### **Recreation Department Budget**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that there would be an another budget meeting, and the only thing scheduled on that one is the Wastewater Department. If there is anything else that you want to carry over this evening, fine. You have some minor funds that you can stick on for the beginning of the next meeting and for the first hour.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter provided commentary regarding Bruce Bainbridge's Recreation Department covering general services under Recreation. We have the Parks and the Playgrounds and we also have our new category which is Civil and Military Celebrations. Overall the performance in this budget was pretty solid. A \$14,000 projected increase of revenue is budgeted which would be strictly associated to the trip sales, ticket sales, the recreation programs, etc. Mr. Wachter explained an attempt was being made to get these things into a format that can be readily identify for those expenditures over which we have control and the expenditures that kind of come along in relationship to the revenue. Each trip that Bruce takes next year, each type of discount ticket that he sells, whether it is ski tickets or Hershey Park, or whatever will have its own little project, so we will be able to identify by activity so to speak, of the revenue and costs associated with the programs that he has. The concerts have revenue associated with them. You will notice that the revenue is up \$14,000, but you will also notice, based on the budget, as a total amount that we are projecting that it will be up, just under \$5,000.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Wachter which two numbers are different by \$14,000.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that there would be trip fees.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he could see \$120,000 then going down to \$109,000.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that was correct and those are Bruce's projections based on what his activities are going to net, but that does not guarantee that he will not have more ticket sales than what he projected.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the \$14,000 confused him. You talked about revenues being us \$14,000.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated the \$14,000 was over what was budgeted last year, Mr. Bishop. See in 1999 we only budgeted just under \$106,000.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that was okay in that he referred to 1999 actually.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that was correct, and that what he was trying to show on the surface was that it looked as though he overran his budget by just under \$5,000. So, again, I am trying to break these out and I am trying to identify them, but if you look at the salaries, and the overtime the benefits were up a little bit because we had the major surgery within the employee benefits this year. Surgery was not anticipated when we did the budget last year. Operating supplies, modest increase.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the revenue on page 42 agreed with the revenue on page 7.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that with a few minor exceptions, it would agree. Mr. Wachter provided a breakdown scenario for explanation.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the difference between \$42,000 and \$7,000 is just recreation fees. One other thing that Mr. Pasch would like to see, however, is that the expenses here are \$104,000 so probably for last year it was about the same. Projecting expenses are \$335,000 and \$103,000 so you have about 30%. Of the total budget expenses, does the overhead flow pretty evenly with that. Would 30% of the rest of the administrative work and all the other work that is involved. Should 30% of those expenses apply in this to.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated he would be able to provide a more accurate figure for that next year.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that direct expenses are being covered. Whatever our direct expenses are we ought to be able to add on 10-15-20% when we charge for the tickets, because we are not covering our expenses and the people that are getting the advantage of these trips are the ones that should be paying for them rather than the rest of the residents of the township.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge stated that an additional 5% had been added for the last couple of years.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch did not think that was enough.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge indicated he thought it would cover expenses.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he would question Mr. Bainbridge's judgment on that, but he would like to see this in detail for the next year just to make sure. It just doesn't seem that this can be true, because if you spend 20% of your time and some of the other people in the office are spending 10-15-20% of their time, their salaries, their benefits, everything else that's involved would entail a considerable amount of money: \$20,000-\$30,000 plus 15% even to recover that.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated he hoped to have a better feel for that after the end of the first quarter.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he would not know how you are going to arrive at this, because they do not submit time sheets.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter advised that they do submit time sheets. The recreation report has a detailed listing of the employee and the number of hours that was spent. That is going to be the neat thing about the new project accounting system.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge added that when a trip is planned, some of the trips do not require tickets, just a bus. Others need a ticket and a bus. Those are the two things that we are doing. We have not included in that cost for any salaries.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that no salaries had been turned over. Last year when we had this discussion you said you were going to look into that and you added your 5%. Our question is whether that is enough because you are not adding that into the cost. You know that overhead is not going in there. It costs a certain amount to run your office but that cost is not allocated. .

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that he felt that the folks that take advantage of these trips and these tours and the music things should pay for that, rather than the rest of the township residents who do not take advantage of it. This would mean that there would be more money to put into other things in the parks, etc. that will benefit all of the township residents. Mr. Pasch suggested an additional 15%.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Bainbridge whether he thought an increase like that would have an impact in the participation for the trips.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge responded that would be hard to say. Sometimes you think a trip is going to go over well, and it doesn't. On other trips they just flock in. I think a good example would be these trips to the Broadway plays. That has caught on like wildfire the last couple of years. We have long waiting lists. It is hard to predict.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there are people outside of Springettsbury Township that take advantage of these trips.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge responded that there are, and they are charged 5.00 a day extra. We have it on our registration forms and one resident could take one non-resident as a courtesy. Most of the trips are just one day.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that he did not think the residents should support the non-residents.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge added that this practice was done with our aerobics and other classes. We charge them \$5.00 additional for any non-resident registration.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that one of her concerns is if Mr. Pasch was saying that there should be some sort of a fee built in to cover the ticketing process, those people may be residents of Springettsbury and their tax dollars are going for playgrounds that they may not use. Chairman Mitrick was not disagreeing with Mr. Pasch, but she did not want to be carried away because the argument may come back to us.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the information is needed first of all. He was not ready to say that just because the information were available that every trip has to have all the costs covered as well as make a profit. There may be situations where somebody needs to decide that it is okay to subsidize some of these things. That decision needed to be made knowing what we are talking about or at least that somebody has the numbers.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge commented that if a trip from Springettsbury to a Broadway play were compared with the same trip from Red Lion the cost is a lot more. He added that if you buy a ticket today for 'Phantom of the Opera', you will be paying more than what we pay for the bus because we get group rates. Mr. Bainbridge added that regarding the buses he compares Red Lion, F & S, and Rohrer Bus to see where we get the best deal.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that in summary, Mr. Bainbridge does a great job of controlling the associated costs. There probably are some costs that maybe we should be passing along so we could somewhat defray the costs to operate our Recreation Department.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that we should be able to know what the costs are.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about money received from tickets for Ski Roundtop.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge indicated that this may be the first year. A commission comes to us every year some of which is used, say if I go to a conference, instead of paying out we get credit toward a conference and the rest is kept for profits.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter asked whether Hershey Park would give you credit for a seminar.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge responded that PRPS, Penna. Park & Recreation Society, is the place where we get the tickets. That is the Professional Recreation Society in Pennsylvania. There are about 1400 recreation professionals, and an annual conference is held every year. This year it will be held at

Hershey Lodge. Let's say the registration is \$200.00. If we earn \$200.00, that would pay for that.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Hershey Park tickets are purchased on consignment.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge responded that was correct. A monthly report is compiled and a check is sent back to PRPS and Penn State. At the end of the season we give them a final report.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that was all done through your association.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge stated that was correct and that when he first started that years ago, he hesitated doing it because of handling all that money, but he thinks now it is one of the best things that has ever happened in the Recreation Department. We found that people have been coming into the office that never knew we had an office, find out we have other things going on and they are asking questions on other things the township has. It's a wonderful public relations tool.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether he had to pay for tickets ahead of time on the New York trips.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge commented that when the first trip was planned to 'Phantom of the Opera', he had to have \$3,000 down. He was apprehensive as he hadn't sold tickets and had to put out \$3,000. Eleven bus loads of people to see Phantom of the Opera have been taken so far and there is current waiting list. Two hundred people are on the waiting list for Lion King, and we put something in our brochure this time that we are not going to register anyone this semester because we have these people on a waiting list, we feel that they have first preference.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that under Utilities he only saw the telephone and nothing else.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that Recreation is part of the new Administration Building. Township buildings have their own budget page. This is basically the raw cost of the telephones to operate the department. Mr. Wachter observed that what Mr. Pasch was really getting at is what are these trips costing us that may be we wouldn't have if we did not have the trips.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that the utilities are not that much perhaps about \$2,000.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added a comment on the Recreation budget, General Services, regarding the Park Directors.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge responded that with regard to the bonus, which was called the 200 club. We have 32 Park Directors for the summer. We had six people that made the 200 club, and they did everything they could. Several times they came to work not feeling well but they wanted to get that \$200.00.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether Mr. Bainbridge thought it would help in getting the people back for the next year. That was one of the problems in getting new people all of the time.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge added that at the end of the summer we asked them to respond by saying if they would be coming back or not. The return looks pretty good so far.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the increase in pay brought in higher quality.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge responded that this year it did not bring in any teachers. Overall the quality was good, but here again it was mediocre in some cases. Wherever we had mediocre or poor leadership the program suffered on that particular part.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether changing the pay rates would help.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge responded that it would be all right to leave it the way it is for this year. I know those who came back last year were pleased with the increase, and so I am hoping that will be the case this year.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that it is a tough battle to secure good workers. He received in the mail from the Post Office a delivery rate of \$11.35 an hour for temporary mail deliveries. The U.S. Post Office must be having real problems.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that his perspective on what was done for the Park Directors. Throwing money does not necessarily attract higher caliber people because of the number of hours that they would actually work. If a person who may be a recreation or education major comes here for one summer or whatever the case might be and considers the experience more valuable to them. It gives them a little extra incentive that perhaps they would take us on for the summer as opposed to going somewhere else to make money.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge added that the Recreation Department had been functioning as a training ground for many of these people that are going into schools. We get a lot of requests for recommendations from school districts on some of these people. I tell my Park Directors, particularly the new ones, when they are finished at the end of this summer they will be able to be the best Park Director they can be, and we will give you enough experience to manage any park out there.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that it was a good thing. As inflation takes its toll that we have to be cognizant of what we are doing, but I think that the rate schedule that we set up for last year should be good for this year, too. The \$200.00 bonus should be adequate.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge stated that each of the seven specialists are school teachers. They all started out in the Parks Department a number of years ago and they have been very faithful to the township and the Recreation program, which makes a difference.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Bainbridge had made any contact with the administration at York College to see if any teachers on staff who would be interested in an intern type program for their students, which might draw people who are interested in the training process.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge stated that they have had interns every now and then from York College, but we haven't gotten them from anywhere else. Penn State had contacted him over the last 5 or 6 years and wanted to know if we would take an intern here if they had some available, but they did not have anybody from this area that could live here and still be an intern with us. About a month ago saying there had been a call from a young man who would like to be an intern for this coming year, but there are not too many that we were able to get.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter asked whether there were any questions General Services aspect of Recreation.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on his thinking in terms of janitorial services for the new Administration Building. He provided the Board with his analysis of how that aspect for the new building could be handled so that the Board was aware of it.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented about Shipley Field and asked that it be placed on the table for discussion..

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the advice had been given right from the very beginning that the field can stay.

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated it needed to be discussed.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that a lot of money is being spent on that based upon our word that the field would not be affected.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that she had understood someone to say that one of the neighboring parks does not have enough money.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was correct, and it won't be long until all of this money will be gone.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Bainbridge about his computer training figure that indicates people seeking a lot of training.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that in 1998 we covered a lot of the basic training. The training that you see budgeted for 2,000 gets into the intermediate and the advanced level training. There are still courses that we want them to take so that they have some intermediate level computer experience.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that the courses were excellent courses and they did a wonderful job of taking time with everybody. He added that he did not hear one person complaining about not understanding or liking it.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about where the status of the newsletter.
- BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge stated that the newsletter will be out December 31<sup>st</sup>. He added that he intended to enter the fall issue in the state-wide competition. A couple of years ago we won something on the music or the concerts. I've been sending my newsletter in and the people that have won have done more of a professional job, so we will enter it in this year's competition and I am hoping to go through with a brochure that wins this time and gets first place in the state. I also put an application in for a grant for concerts for the state.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he had reported that to the Board. The amount is about \$7,500.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that the only remaining item he had regarding Recreation, just because it falls under culture is the Civil and Military celebrations, for 1999 we have about \$1,500 or \$1,600 in revenue that offset some of the \$5,686 that you see here in actual costs that we had.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that entertainment could get very expensive.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether a committee is working on this project. He added that there are only six or seven months left.

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that nothing is being done right now. If we want entertainment, we should book it now.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter asked whether a date had been established.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri responded that a date had not been established. There had been discussion about the first three weeks in June.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that the real question here is do we want to allocate \$7,600 of the township resources to engage in a picnic.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that a picnic was held last year and it wasn't in the budget.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the impression given that this was going to become an annual function.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that he had comments from a number of people that said they would like to see it happen every year. It was a tough day because it was so brutally hot. Consequently it wasn't as well attended as it might have been. Even so there were quite a number of people there.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that there was a feeling of community. Most of the vendors would like to come back. Some commented that they hoped the township would have it again next year. Most of the vendors made money, but not much. They didn't go broke.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that functions of that nature often times grow with repetition. Chairman Mitrick indicated that a real "push" should be made to find some leadership for this.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that someone has to be found who wants to get in there and do it, because something needs to be done soon. Last year Mr. Gurreri took over late and did a fine job on it. It is too stressful to take the job over late like it was done.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that Mr. Schenck expressed interest in the job. He said he would check his schedule. I am interested.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the Board could appoint him.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that if the item is entered into the budget, we need to commit to try and find someone to do it.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that there should be more than enough township money to support.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that if the function did not happen, the money isn't spent..

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what the budget figure was for the picnic.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that the amount was \$6,000.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter discussed the minor funds dealing with Recreation, Sub-division Recreation and Recreation Reserve. Sub-division Recreation was created as a Parks Special Revenue designation of funds. Districts were set up when developers begin land development they are charged a \$602 per lot fee. Last year we ran out District 3 and you can see District 2 for this year was only 4.8% of the fund. We only had a balance there of \$6,151 and we spent \$8,543. Mr. Wachter suggested that the deficit there should be taken from the Community Centralized Parks, which was established three years ago where they made a 45% contribution into this to set up the Centralized Parks. The money was spent for playground equipment at Springetts Oaks.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that deficit could be made up just as easily out of the general fund.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that could be done. He added that Mr. Bishop's suggestion is well taken, if we intend to do some work on this park we need the money.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that in the long run we should do away with this fund and when a developer builds a development we can still charge him the \$602. The money could be put it in the General Fund and keep it in a separate account and basically it does the same thing.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether there would be legal responsibility to use the money in that area.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch thought there was a legal responsibility in here in terms that it had to be spent within a certain number of years.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the item is in the Land Development Ordinance. The Land Development Ordinance says that when the developer contributes to that it has to be spent in that area in so much time. It is not in our standard ordinances.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it was a good enticement for them to do it.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated it was a good control on us.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that he could set up a separate account to manage this fund. All it would require would be one revenue line item, and the way you present it in your general fund is just like it would be part of recreation.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that there are more new nuances in there in terms of developers selling a part of their development. Selling homes in that development because there are recreation funds established for that area helps them to sell. If I am a developer, I do not have the tools to help sell the homes in my development if you are going to use it someplace else and there is no park.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated it could still be spent purely for recreation. I can still have the same districts and everything. When we set up this district system, here is the problem: District 3 now is out of money.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed, because there is nobody developed in that area. If the board wants to do additional recreation, it can be taken out of the general fund and fund it. They can do it out of the surplus. This is developer money. Mr. Amic indicated the Board could always transfer money from the General fund to these districts.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he liked the idea but something that I want to get in and start making the decision on now.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated he was just planting seeds for future consideration.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated he wanted you to see where we stood. I do need some guidance on what you would like to do to fund the district deficit. Do we want a fund within the fund itself, or do we want to make an appropriation as you said from the general fund to clear that up.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated his question would be why there is deficit in the first place.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that we spent more money than was in the fund.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked why action was taken to do those kinds of things to end up with a deficit.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the grading would be part of that spending.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
BUDGET WORK SESSION #2**

**NOVEMBER 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that in the 1999 activity we spent \$8,543 and that put us in a deficit. He asked Mr. Bainbridge what was purchased there.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge responded that it might have been Camp Security. He added that it must have been the grading of Springetts Oaks.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the seeding done was over \$2,000. When he had the grading done, Charlie Lauer came to him and said it could not be left unseeded. Mr. Amic directed him to go ahead and have it seeded. What's the point if you are not going to seed the soccer field so grass grows on it.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the \$2,000 should have been charged someplace else instead of here.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed that it should have been.

**BAINBRIDGE** Mr. Bainbridge stated that he wanted to thank Mr. Amic and the Board for the support you have given the Recreation Department. He stated it was an encouragement to work for Springettsbury Township.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 11:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
BUDGET WORK SESSION**

**NOVEMBER 15, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a 7:00 p.m. budget work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Nick Gurreri  
Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Charles Lauer, Director of Public Works  
Randy Wachter, General Accountant  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:15 p.m.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic called attention to the previously provided Budget book. Mr. Amic indicated that Randy Wachter had projected \$381,597 surplus and the projection for the year 2000 was \$81,261. The total figure was \$462,258. There were a few nuances, one of which was within the fire contract, which proposal was not included for discussion at this meeting. The Capital items were discussed and comment made about some of the larger items, the largest being the Township Municipal Building for \$1.3 million. Park development costs of \$2.6 million. Mr. Amic stated that in the year 2004 there would be approximately \$729,000 in surplus. Mr. Amic briefly overviewed the budgeting process that Randy Wachter had followed. He indicated that he and Mr. Wachter had reviewed the material to be discussed and had met with each department director to gather recommendations.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that he wished to focus on the quality of the numbers, as well as the quantity. He had re-arranged the presentation of the budget, viewing cash versus modified accrual basis used by the auditors at year end. Mr. Wachter noted that the actual figures provided in the budget book were based on what the auditors provided. This year's budget included some two-year investments in Mellon Bank, and all the cash received in 1999 was included in 1999 income. The budgetary process should be the same as the auditor's report. His focus was to pull the

process together so that there would be no concern about the cash basis for budgetary purposes and the modified accrual basis.

Government accounting standards provide stringent guidelines for financial statements, not only from what is received within the 60 days following year end, but also actually what is earned in that period of time. Mr. Wachter's focus was to match the budget process to provide good quality.

Mr. Wachter stated that a comprehensive report was his focus. He sought to provide the governing body of the township a true revenue picture versus the true expense picture. His observation of the previous budgets was that there were separate reporting funds but no overall focus as a whole. He added that he attempted to match the actual revenue with the actual expenditures. Mr. Wachter had incorporated the capital expenditures into the first summary page with the revenue by account, which revealed the total expenditures out of that fund. Likewise, the financial report from the auditors will show capital expenditures included.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that the new computer system not only has the capabilities to report how much the police or recreation department spent on expenses such as telephone, it also reports all across the township including wastewater treatment what was spent on telephone for example. Mr. Wachter commented about the additional feature of project accounting. He could set up separate projects for the Police Department vehicles, the Public Works Department vehicles and keep track of the costs to maintain vehicles within each department. Mr. Wachter focused on the overall financial condition of the township. With the adoption of last year's budget, a final surplus had been projected of \$58,731. The total taxes received were underestimated by \$215,000 and the interest was overestimated. The General Fund figure of \$28,000 had to do with the accrual made for 1997 and 1998. As a result of changes at the Wastewater Treatment facility a decision was made that \$47,250 wasn't enough to cover the costs of administration. This figure will be increased to \$79,000. Expenditures within the General Government reveal a variance due to the Manager of Information Services' switch from the Wastewater Treatment facility to General Administration. This change accounts for a large portion of the \$38,000 variance.

Mr. Wachter had put together an overall three-year summary of the financial position of the township, which revealed the 1998 actual results from the audit report from Stambaugh Ness each year. This showed a very healthy 1998. Total revenue over total township expenditures provided a surplus of \$1.2 million. Between the different fund transfers the actual total went up \$2 million in 1998 alone. The amount the

township started with was \$9.8 million so the cash before capital expenditures equaled \$11.8 million, and \$340,000 was spent in 1998.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked Mr. Wachter to reinforce what that meant.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter continued that in terms of overall performance, this covered the total of all the funds. If the township had spent the \$3.5 million in capital expenditures as projected in the adopted 1999 budget, there would be only \$6.6 million left. The actual results are estimated results at this point. If everything is received the way it's stated now, revenues will be \$7.7 million; expenditures are estimated at about \$7.1 million for Revenue over Expenses of \$623,000. Some transfers remain to be accomplished, the biggest of which within this transfer is the money transferred from the General Fund to replenish the Insurance Fund. The Insurance Fund pays the medical, dental, teamsters vision charges and unemployment.

Mr. Wachter's projection for 1999 before capital expenditures is that \$1 million will be added to the township coffers. Actual expenditures would be \$375,000, of which a major portion has to do with \$200,000 spent in 1999 on engineering and architecture for the new building. Part of what was budgeted last year is being spent this year. The actual construction numbers have not come through to date, which also includes road improvements. Estimation of total township accounts at the end of the year is just above \$12 million. For the year 2000 budgeting revenue is considerably up over the past year.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether \$100,000 reduction in interest earnings is enough in consideration of the expenditures going down from \$12 million to \$8.8 million or down \$3 million.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that right now investments are yielding 5.65% and 5.75%. The major part of the building expenditures would not be spent until March or April. Monies were budgeted last year \$344,000 from the fire fund for fire trucks. Those monies are still there for this year, and there is no projection for new trucks into 2000.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter continued with discussion of the total financial statements. Review was made of special revenue, capital projects, insurance fund, and wastewater treatment all of which are proprietary funds. One fiduciary fund involves the library fund.

The planned capital expenditures out of the general fund alone of \$1.8 million for the year 2000 result in an ending cash surplus of \$4.2 million. Special revenue takes into consideration the Commonwealth Liquid Fuel Fund, Subdivision Recreation, Fire Company, Street Lights, Capital

Projects, Highway Reserve, Building Reserve, Recreation Reserve, Stormwater and Waste Reduction reserves.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter continued that as far as the expenditures go, most are shown as operating expenditures, when some really are capital expenditures with the exception of \$125,000 earmarked for Mr. Lauer's vehicles. \$344,000 is for the fire trucks. Out of the highway reserve, \$140,000 is earmarked for various projects like Cortleigh Drive, the Plymouth turning lane, etc. The General Fund is healthy and the total reserves have built up.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that from 1996 until now revenue is flat, but expenditures are going up. Revenue is down \$200,000 and Expenses are up \$600,000 so there is an \$800,000 spread. Mr. Pasch asked for an explanation.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that it was a combination. The best way to explain that is for consistency's sake he kept up through 1997 the revenue numbers as they were published in the budget. If you go back and pull a 1996 and 1997 budget, these items termed other financing sources, netted out and were all considered revenues but they are not revenues.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether Mr. Wachter had adjusted the numbers so that all the items are washed out in all the years.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that he had for the last three years.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the graph is really misleading.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that the graph could be misleading in a sense. He had no way to go back to 1994-95-96 and 97 and reconstitute all the things that were considered revenue at that point. But what he is trying to do from this point forward (starting with 1998) is to get rid of the misleading presentations in terms of whether we're really generating revenue to support our expenditures.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it appeared to him that revenues would be flattening out and every year we have a 5 – 6% increase in wages, expenses, etc. we'll be busting through that and will have to do something about revenues in the next few years.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that, in working with Mr. Amic over the last year, that he has done as much as humanly possible to help us deal with the expense side of it. He hasn't done things with the revenue side, but to address concerns about the rising expenditures with the police contract negotiated, you'll see that as we go through the budget the total budget for

2000 is down over what it was in 1999. Recent retirements bonuses were paid out, but regarding the fire contract, you'll see some favorable trends in the expenses that have been negotiated. You'll see there will be some good trends. As to whether we make progress on the teamster contract, we'll have to address that as it comes up.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that from what Mr. Wachter was saying his fears are unfounded.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that in the short run there would not be great concern. Two or three years down the road could be a different story.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Amic anticipated with the redevelopment of the Caterpillar property that that would help the scenario.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he did view the redevelopment of Caterpillar as a great help. Two-thirds of the loss of revenue that was faced about two years ago with the closing of Caterpillar, McCrory's and CNA Insurance, has been regained through aggressive development which had taken place. If we get the developments Mr. Amic believes can be obtained, the whole projection will change. There are also other properties in the community that should be marketed which will help.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that the expenditures to a certain degree will continue to rise. There are other issues besides the development that really need to be addressed.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated there is a considerable amount of money in the expenditure side of this budget that is simply there because there are no state-of-the art purchasing procedures and centralized buying procedures. Mr. Amic thinks it would be extremely easy to reduce costs based upon the plans to integrate the staff. Currently, the Police Department, Wastewater Department, and Recreation Department all purchase their own items. There is some overstocking and no continuity. Mr. Amic hopes to put purchasing procedures into place.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he thought that was a good idea. He asked whether there were plans to coordinate that.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that up until the present time there were no systems available to enable that procedure.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that as there is a need, people purchase what they want. If it's under a certain dollar amount it's purchased; if it's over it's approved by someone, etc.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that responsibility would be given to someone as part of what they do every day.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that would be a part of the structure for an individual and should recognize a large savings.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter commented that this is a start, and he hoped the Supervisors understand that the first part of that step is to break the expenditures down into categories.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the wastewater amount going up to \$79,000.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there had been some discussion on that amount; 40% of Mr. Amic's time was included; we didn't anticipate Mr. Kyle's departure and thought that that would become less as time went by, when actually it became more.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the summary of full and part-time positions for 1999 and whether all of those positions are filled at this time.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the positions are not filled but they are in the process of being filled.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that Economic Development is not really a municipal function.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that there is an Economic Development Department.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that the expenditures of that department as a total Economic/Community Development would show mostly just the Economic Development Director, two Code Enforcement Officers, and an Administrative Coordinator.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned an item titled, 2000 Taxable Revenue. It should be tax revenue, not taxable revenue.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the alarm figure on page 6 and what caused the jump.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that they are getting an incredible amount of false alarms.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether there were a lot more people with alarm systems.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that was correct. He added that he leaned toward being conservative on the entire revenue side.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the Occupation Privilege Tax.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter commented there is a need to track Walmart and other large vendor sales from year to year. The Tax Collector also believes it's time for audits.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that if he were doing this on a cash basis, he would bump up the tax base about \$50,000 a year no matter how much he would make.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the information obtained would be accurate.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that is the information that's provided on the Mercantile Tax paperwork.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Tax Collector would provide the information if the township would pay for it. Within reason it's probably a good thing to do, i.e., to select some prominent retailers and get an audit of around two or three.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he'd been suspicious about that for a number of years and nothing had ever been done to change it.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic observed that the township had five, six, seven years of growth, and is getting the same money with very little increase.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that there's probably an underground economy out there where people are working out of their houses where they have businesses. They may not be putting signs up and advertising that they have businesses. Ms. Cousler is pretty diligent. She's starting to get on top of it. There's also going to be an exchange of information between the Township Tax Collector and York County Earned Income Tax Bureau to help us identify businesses. We can begin by starting to get a few audits going to get the word out there.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
BUDGET WORK SESSION**

**NOVEMBER 15, 1999  
APPROVED**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Mercantile Tax for this year is estimated at \$1,337,000. Next year it is expected to be \$1,345,000. That means Kohl's, Target and Home Depot are going to do \$8,000 in Mercantile Tax.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that we have a larger Walmart as well.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that it could be a couple hundred smaller ones.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he would get a proposal together to find out how much it would cost to audit a few companies.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the Tax Collector had any information at all that showed major retail as to just what they reported in the past five years.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that by the Mercantile Tax return itself, yes.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter asked whether there were any other questions before he moved forward into the General Administration.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the Building Permits. He added that this year it was estimated at \$493,000; next year it is budgeted at \$240,000.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated Andrew Stern is doing extensive analysis on that revenue which could end up being as high as \$283,000.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that he had added \$1,500 for next year for a total of \$7,600 thinking that we'd still be doing something in General Revenue.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about charges for services under the Economic Development Department, such as Engineering Services – Board of Supervisors on page 10. She asked what that meant.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that the figure included charges they make for the Board to examine plans, etc. The engineering aspect of it to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Apparently there's revenue generated within Andrew's department for the Board's review of plans, etc.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that was correct regarding approving a plan.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether the Supervisors bill them for their time.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added not for our time but stated that it's a percentage of the whole project.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter provided commentary about the General Government portion of the budget. He responded to Mr. Pasch's comment in that his compensation was set by the Act 68.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that he knew where it came from, but he doesn't like the amount, especially if you're charging for his services.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Mr. Schenck would receive a raise now that he's re-elected.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the amount would cover the employee appreciation.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that it was less than \$6,000 for an appreciation. He asked how much had been spent the last time.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded the bill in question was \$4,500. That was the second portion.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the item should really be stated as operating supplies. It really should be in a category that makes some sense like employee morale.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested Mr. Wachter change the figure to \$10,000.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter discussed financial resources. He had built raises in there for the staff. It included some audit fees and their contract.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned how Mr. Wachter arrived at the increases.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded everything that is salaried is 3%.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether these audit fees are all the audit fees.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated it was all the general government's general fund.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether it was general government.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated it was the General Fund Audit Fees. They are considered an expense of the Financial Dept.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether that was because there were transfers from sewer.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that there are length of service bonuses included.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how much the longevity would be worth for an employee.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that it depended on the length of service beginning at five years at \$200.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether they get \$200 every year.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated it is capped at \$1,000.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter continued with Tax Collection. That's the commissions that are paid. The top commission line is paid through what the Tax Collector collects. Multiply the percentages times the revenue that is expected in the various categories, her FICA. A small amount of Operating Supplies is budgeted for her. In the past it has always been \$5,500. She never spends anywhere close to that. In 1999 he began to break out the commissions that we pay the county of York, the appeals of the Tax Collections office, when they collect monies for old accounts and the bottom is the Tax Collector. Part of the reason why the General Budget went up is specifically with the Professional Services as far as the legal and engineering fees go, so that's bumped up the legal fees \$10,000 and \$15,000 on the engineering, so that total increase is \$25,000.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that was only on what was adopted. If we went on what's estimated and add those kind of numbers we'd have a lot greater numbers.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated he did not anticipate an additional \$25,000 over and above what we have for this year.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that especially for engineering, we have new development that will take place and stormwater that we will have to work on and the new Administration Building and some of this work could cost a lot of money.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the Administrative Building will cost us a significant bit of money.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that the engineering fees for the Administration Building would not belong in the General Government Budget. They will be included in the Capital Expenditures.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that there had been a good amount of discussion regarding the watershed stormwater problems. He could easily project that the engineering for that problem to be \$15,000 to \$20,000.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned how the Board would direct that be done. We may end up with a stormwater district. He asked whether the money would come from this fund.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that monies for that would come out of the stormwater district fund.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that would even qualify for a stormwater district.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that things of that nature tend to be hidden. He directed attention to the Highway Reserve allocation where there is another \$7,000 in there for engineering stormwater. That engineering is primarily for the projects that we have.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he thought the engineering fees were light.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter commented that as new information is developed budgets have to be changed. He thought that by increasing the budgeted amount by \$25,000 it would cover the costs for this year.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that there are more projects coming.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested that \$10,000 be added for a total of \$70,000.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter reported that the General Administration included the biggest breakdown in terms of salaries, overtime, office supplies, computer supplies, service contracts. This included the new computer system, the Unix, service contracts on copiers, etc. Repairs and maintenance would cover general office machines, etc. Computer training is included at \$4,400. This would be the best educated guess of what is required. The approach to the budget is more or less of a department approach to the total expenses as opposed to line item approach.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that she observed some big jumps.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch also added that there are some big drops, such as Operating Supplies, which had dropped by \$13,000. There are shifts within the classifications.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the budget is still up \$20,000.
- AMIC** That includes eight in salaries and a few more thousand in employee benefits so there's \$10,000 out of the \$20,000.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated there had been some change in the township building aspect, the biggest part there is that this building will be renamed the Public Safety Building, and of course, the new building as the Administrative Building. Calculations kept the Administration Building as though in July it transferred into the new building. From that point forward this would be the Public Safety Building standing on its own where electric, gas, sewer are concerned. Refuse disposal would remain. Each building would have its own project number for the year 2000.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that as the budget had been prepared for this year the next budget would have better history.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked about the General Administration/General Government, as to how many people are shown for identification purposes. He would prefer more information as to a person's time flowing between two departments.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated perhaps that should be a part of the budget narrative as opposed to referencing the number of people. He indicated that he would review that aspect to see what he could do to clarify the issue.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether internet access would be one of the things that is spread out through the budgets.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that is being done. At the present time all that is allocated within different departments is postage. As to whether we will be re-allocating things like telephone, internet access in the future that's an unknown. He had placed it in a lot of the categories, some of which have budgeted numbers. Wireless communication is placed in the General Administration even though nobody has a phone that is charged to the township at this point in time.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the wireless telephones (including hand-held radios) would all be under one plan.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated it had not been but will be in the future.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated Mr. Hinkle is presently studying that problem. There is every indication that there would be a tremendous savings.

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT**

**LAUER** Charlie Lauer's Public Works Department Budget – page 36.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what was meant by Stewartstown.

**LAUER** Mr. Lauer responded that it represented York County Solid Waste Authority and Modern Landfill.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that he had received a Recycling Committee budget, and they had reduced their budget from \$2,490 to \$755.00.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether they are active and whether they didn't spend any money.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that they had spent very little money.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she would like to inquire why they had not spent any money and whether it relates to their becoming inactive. They had been upset about the trash contract.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated that he had telephoned them to get the budget.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether any funds are received from the state that depends upon what the Public Works Department does.

**LAUER** Mr. Lauer responded that Act 101 grant money is received for all the recycling that is removed from the waste stream.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that that continues no matter whether we had any activity or not.

**LAUER** Mr. Lauer added that as long as we provide public education every six months. He added that there are stipulations. They want someone to go out in the business sector and educate the business people. That's part of what the Recycling Committee should be doing.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that they said they were going to start doing that but they got stymied in figuring out how to do it.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether or not the township is actually receiving that money that we could get if they were out there.
- LAUER** Mr. Lauer indicated it would change for the year 2000. All the paperwork had been filed for 1999.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that they must be doing something as a new member was just appointed to the committee. She added that they requested the new member.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that we need to make sure that they are doing whatever is required in order for the funds to keep coming.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated a budget letter dated October 5 indicated the proposed budget Recycling Committee for the 1999-2000 fiscal year. The letter indicated that they plan to take a role in community education. He reviewed their proposed expenses.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated they are far more inactive than they used to be.
- LAUER** Mr. Lauer added that the only increases shown in his budget were contractual increases in salaries for the employees. Everything else stayed the same.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that the salaries are allocated among all the different categories.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that this portion of the budget does not include salaries.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that they are included within the different categories to the extent that's just about \$18,000 in the budget. General Services absorbs part of it; there are no salaries in clean up and waste reduction other than a small \$250. There is \$51,000 in street cleaning; another \$14,000 in snow and ice removal, and \$15,000 in signs and lines. The salaries are spread out all across the various activities that his department takes care of, such as storm sewers, highways, maintenance and repairs.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick inquired about difficulties with obtaining manpower for leaf collection. She asked whether this happened every year.

- LAUER** Mr. Lauer responded that every year they hire part-time help to do the project.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick observed that there were three.
- LAUER** Mr. Lauer stated that if all of his employees are in attendance and they have three part time people it can be done. If the part timers don't show up or if some of the regular employees don't show up, the work doesn't get done. Temporary help this year is difficult to obtain because people are working.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether it would be worth including additional part-time people.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that budgeting the money doesn't guarantee there would be people available.
- LAUER** Mr. Lauer added that there's money in the budget. If seven trucks and three machines are running, it takes 13 people. There are not 13 people in the department. Employees are not hired for peaks. Leaf collection is a peak season.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that if typically you are running one short if he had the option of a fourth part-time employee it would help.
- LAUER** Mr. Lauer commented that he had contracted for more people than he needed through the agency just to have them here. He can always send them home if he doesn't need them. He is satisfied with the number of people budgeted, but he can't get them to work.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that an incentive might be offered such as a \$10.00 bonus to someone who comes back again.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that was what had been done with the park directors last year for perfect attendance there was a bonus offered.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there would be a legal way to provide bonuses for these agencies and their employees.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter indicated that the agency would keep the bonus for themselves. They have a contractual relationship between the township and the agency. It comes down to the caliber of people you are dealing with.

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick suggested that Mr. Lauer and Mr. Amic work out something to obtain people to help during peak times.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that work would be something that could be contracted out to lawn care businesses.
- LAUER** Mr. Lauer indicated that most of the people who do that type of work are doing the same things the township is doing.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick suggested the prisoners be put to work.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that if Mr. Lauer can get the people he had no problem with paying them.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how we go from an adopted budget of 162 in 1999 to 146 in salaried employees.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that it was a reallocation of salaries in the different categories. Street cleaning is up, down in leaf collection. Highway maintenance is down but in every other way we are up from the estimated. Mr. Wachter called attention to the expenditures page 14, in 1998 we spent a total of \$589,000; we'll actually spend about \$602,000 in 1999 even though we budgeted \$637,000. Next year we will budget \$631,000. Part of the reason we don't spend the whole budget is unless we have to have heavy snow and ice removal.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that when he comes back into the details he begins to have questions and it's confusing to him. The estimated salaries in General Services for 1999 was \$137,000 and the proposed is \$146,000 so there's an increase. But I go to Employee Benefits which should track going with the shift in wages and salaries and I hit \$179,000 in 1999 instead of going up it goes down.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter pointed out that there was \$199,000 in 1998. There's a relationship as Charlie had some large medical claims. Part of why those things are not spelled out in detail is because of the sensitive nature of medical claims.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he would prefer to see some type of summary showing how the budget is being put together.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter's response was that in preparing a budget, they do not anticipate the dollar value of medical claims in the year 2000 that occurred in 1998 and 1999.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that he really doesn't have the entire picture reviewing the report and suggests more work on it for next year and the year after. He asked whether there would be the same number of full time and part time people.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Lauer whether there were any major changes in the budget.

**LAUER** Mr. Lauer pointed out that the Highway Maintenance Repair figure was up. One line item for Operating Supplies covered crack sealing material. The State has indicated that crack sealing is not eligible for Liquid Fuels funding.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the salary increase.

**LAUER** Mr. Lauer responded that the salary increase covered proposed roadwork for the next year.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that it's a shift from another place.

**LAUER** Mr. Lauer stated that for the last two years they were heavy into Parks and Recreation because we needed to get the parks (Rockburn, Fayfield, Stonewood) renovated because of the insurance risk management consideration.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned the area of Mill Street and Eastern Boulevard where there are two lanes going east and two lanes going west. One of those is a turning lane and she wondered whether there were arrows on the road.

**LAUER** Mr. Lauer responded that there are arrows both east and west.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the truck budget numbers and whether new equipment would be replacement equipment.

**LAUER** Mr. Lauer indicated the loader is a 1974 model and would be replaced.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he had no further questions.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Pasch whether it would help if Mr. Wachter simply wrote, "refer to page 14" or did he want something more extensive.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that his only problem with it is that it's a different breakdown here. You don't have a breakdown by the classification of expenses. You don't have salaries and supplies.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter stated Mr. Pasch needed a second summary that says salaries for specific items.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated it would give him the expenditures in the department by classification of expenses.

**POLICE DEPARTMENT**

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter spoke regarding the Police Department Budget. A decrease is projected but partially because of replacement of higher paid officers with lower paid new-hires.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that there are a lot of retirees.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter added that there were four categories: Administration, Supervision, Patrol and Vehicles.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether the department would be budgeting the same number of people.

**ESHBACH** Police Chief Dave Eshbach responded that to be correct. All of the officers except himself are under contract.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether we still get money back from the Federal program.

**ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach responded that there are three Federal grants, one which expired last September, one expired September 1999. There is still money being drawn from the last one, which will expire September 2000.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that all of that money would be included in revenue.

**WACHTER** Mr. Wachter had budgeted \$26,000 for 2000.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there had been a study done on overtime to justify an additional person to bring down the cost.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that overtime would cover items like court time.

**ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach responded that court time is a portion of the overtime. The end of 1999 is showing a large amount of overtime because of the shortage of men due to retirements. They are five people short.

Chief Eshbach is working toward replacement of the five people, but realistically they will not reduce the overtime substantially until they are hired, academy trained and field trained.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it's not a consistent thing to schedule overtime.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach added that they don't have mandatory staffing. In a typical year the \$13,000 - \$14,000 is usually spent in special events things. St. Joseph's Carnival they hire officers to be there on special surveillance.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the expenses are recovered.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach indicated that they are more than covered. They charge people a higher rate.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that was considered "Special Employee Services".
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach indicated it was.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether ammunition and uniform increase is a result of new people being hired.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach indicated that the uniform increase definitely was as it costs more to initially outfit someone than it does to maintain thereafter. He added that ammunition had risen in price. Through the Capital Budget they are hoping to replace some of the service weapons with a different caliber.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether they are up to speed on the PC in the cars.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach indicated they are and can run warrant, license, registration checks. There are lots more applications to be explored, some of which could be utilized in a county-wide police effort.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the request for vehicles.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach responded that he had requested three vehicles, which had been reduced to two. He had looked to replace car #7, 8, and 9. The mileage is high as of September 30, 1999. There are eight marked vehicles and a total of 12 fleet total.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Wachter whether he would be able to keep track of the costs of the vehicles.

- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter responded that he could keep track of the costs by vehicle by mechanic salary, parts, and maintenance.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the Chief expected to be fully manned by the beginning of the year.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach indicated he hoped to be fully staffed shortly after the first of the year. An academy class begins on January 18<sup>th</sup>.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether he had any trouble attracting applicants.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach stated that they used to attract over 200 people with each opening. The last time there were 62. He had inquired of other police departments and they indicated they are having a difficult time everywhere getting applicants. Some of that is due to the economy and the job market has been very good. Some of it's due to the fact that people just don't want to do the job. People can get the same amount of money and not have to work the holidays. He added that he had gone out of York County and advertised across the state. The applicants received had been better than in the past.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about cars and why one was removed.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he had taken it out. There were a number of cuts. Mr. Stern wanted three vehicles; Mr. Bainbridge wanted a new van and a new bus, and the chief wanted three vehicles for a total of eight vehicles.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach stated that one of the things he was looking at was mileage. It seemed better to buy three one year and three the next rather than two and then have to purchase four.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he'd like more information that showed downtime. Mileage is important, but there's a lot more involved than just mileage.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that when the department becomes fully staffed, the Chief is saying he would have to put two people in a vehicle because he's down a vehicle.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that should be evaluated because it reduces coverage.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that in watching the monthly police reports the job is not getting easier. Are you truly going to be down a car or is it realistic for someone to use one of the other vehicles.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would not have had any trouble except for the number of vehicles requested. There are justifications for them.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach added that it makes a difference in the number of people who drive a car as to the maintenance costs and life of the vehicle.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the price of cars is one thing but then to equip it.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it is \$24,170. The vehicles are looked at as three-year vehicles.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter called attention to the capital items, including portable radios, copier replacement, weapon replacement, body armor replacement, etc.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach called attention to page 28 and asked Mr. Wachter whether the Educational Reimbursement would be included in salaries, since it is a contractual arrangement.
- WACHTER** Mr. Wachter returned to the subject of having a summary page. What Mr. Pasch is looking for versus his interpretation is that now instead of having all the different charts I'll have basically one chart that shows salaries and different breakdowns.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he would have salaries and the breakdown summary. The budget can be approved as it is submitted, but in terms of what goes into the report, start keeping the comparisons.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT IN ORDER TO MEET THE STATE REQUIREMENT FOR A TIMELY PUBLISHING OF OUR PRELIMINARY BUDGET THAT WE APPROVE PRELIMINARY BUDGET AS PRESENTED BY THE MANAGEMENT OF THE TOWNSHIP AND NOT COMPLETELY REVIEWED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that with that motion action can be taken on December 9<sup>th</sup>.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 10:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
DEVELOPMENT ZONE WORK SESSION**

**NOVEMBER 11, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a work session at 6:00 p.m. on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Ken Pasch

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:**

Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Mark Robertson, Springettsbury Township Planning Commission  
Larry Gibbs, Springettsbury Township Planning Commission  
Alan Maciejewski, Springettsbury Township Planning Commission  
Larry Stets, Springettsbury Township Planning Commission  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the final draft of the Flexible Development Zone, as well as the map. Chairman Mitrick thanked everyone for coming at the 6 o'clock hour.

**STERN** Andrew Stern turned the discussion over to the Springettsbury Township Planning Commission and indicated he would be glad to answer questions.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Alan Maciejewski stated that he had reviewed the Flexible Development Zone map with a futuristic view toward working with it. He had made notes and comments, which he brought forward for comment.

Mr. Maciejewski indicated that recently he noted a larger number of attorneys in attendance at Planning Commission meetings. For the first subject of discussion, he asked about the term "Compatible Architectural Design" and how to discuss this in terms of development.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the term was an aesthetic consideration, valid with the development of subjective standards. He added that the purpose clause does not have to have any objective standard and commented that he did not have a problem with it in the purpose clause. Solicitor Yost indicated it would not be of much help or be a detriment because there's nothing later on in the Ordinance that attempts to apply a compatible architectural design standard to this district.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that his concern was that there is no "teeth" in the Ordinance.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that even though there is no "teeth" many times some items are obtainable when it's apparent that it has to be done.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that they had arm-wrestled many nights over this type of issue.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson stated that they had strong-armed people to get away from their standard boxy type design.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski indicated that care must be taken with mixed applications.

**GIBBS** Mr. Gibbs pointed out that there is a need to be comparable to what is already there.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson asked whether it would be possible to define what types of architecture previously had been acceptable and which are not.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the current state of the law indicates that aesthetic factors, which would be architectural components for renderings or the style can be a factor in determining whether or not it is a permitted facility, but it cannot be the sole determining factor. Most of the cases have dealt with signs and very few with actual buildings. Solicitor Yost called attention to East Market Street, the historic district. If that were established as an Historic District and it would be provided that objective standards or even subjective standards that would require someone locating there to maintain or to construct buildings compatible with what is already there then that could be done. It should not be necessary to look like an existing Caterpillar plant.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that we would not necessarily want that either.

- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated he posed the question because there needs to be a basis.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that if the Supervisors made it to look like Caterpillar, that's the basis.
- STETS** Mr. Stets commented that the question had been proposed previously as to what the Supervisors really want on the Caterpillar site.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski commented that, where we reference a specification like ANSI – one point for 1983 revision 1997. In other similar places they have words like “as amended,” “supplemented” and “revised.” In many of the things he does you have to make sure that the lawyers don't sit there and say well we went by the 1997 code only. Anywhere there is any standard or any law referenced there should be consistency.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski discussed the Environmental Profession – It says here that he's got to have the status of a professional and who is going to evaluate that he is professional. Mr. Maciejewski questioned whether there is anything such as a registered environmental professional.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that he was not aware of any such thing.
- GIBBS** Mr. Gibbs commented that if a person is a registered engineer that person practices within a specific discipline.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski asked whether there is a “registered engineer – environmental.”
- GIBBS** Mr. Gibbs stated the term simply would be “registered professional engineer.”
- GIBBS** Mr. Gibbs added that engineers have a Code of Ethics just like a doctor or an attorney or anyone else. When you take your certification you declare that you are going to practice within a certain discipline. A Civil Engineer can do several things, such as only surveying, geotechnical, electrical. The engineer must practice within his or her discipline or be subject to criminal prosecution if drawings are sealed outside of that discipline. For one engineer to certify for someone else becomes a very difficult thing.

- YOST** Solicitor Yost commented that the Township would determine whether the individual who purports to be qualified is qualified.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the Township wrestles with the question as well. Based on what had been said, he added that it's going to be difficult even for a professional engineer because there is a prescribed formula that says they are or are not capable in this discipline. Barring someone that's on their own, most engineering firms would encompass not only the registration of the individual engineers, but also the registration of the business in general. They are certifying as a professional business that they've got people working in a specific discipline.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether there were some kind of certification for a corporation.
- STETS** Mr. Stets responded that it would depend upon the type of courses or disciplines that individuals would complete.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that individual architectural engineers are certified.
- STETS** Mr. Stets added that based on state law, an architectural firm would not put a shingle out saying they're capable of doing environmental work.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether that determination varied by engineering firms, i.e., whether there could be a wide variation in terms of whether they say they're qualified or not qualified.
- STETS** Mr. Stets responded that the business is required by its insurance company to go through testing and re-qualifications annually.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the company itself, such as Nutech Engineering, does not have an engineering seal per se. Individual engineers have to certify each document. You can't get a "firm" certification.
- STETS** Mr. Stets responded that some people would seal anything if they think they can get away with it.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that if all the engineering companies are within a narrow range in terms of certifying work, there must be a set of criteria within that discipline that they're looking at in order to

certify that they are qualified in that discipline of environmental engineering.

- GIBBS** Mr. Gibbs stated that at United Defense he had to be certified in environmental engineering.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that the day Brian Kaufman was here, he indicated that some of the people doing some of these studies may not be engineers.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that portions of this Ordinance was not written by an engineer.
- STETS** Mr. Stets stated that a professional engineer must have been directly in charge of the work being done. It does not say the engineer has to do the actual work. Most of the engineers supervise people and have the responsibility to ensure that they were doing quality work. There would be all levels of engineers, such as those who had not taken their EIT yet; engineers who had their EIT; other engineers who had their registration. Other people who go out and do field work may have degrees in environmental engineering, or there might have been some chemical type people who would be more certified in environmental work and then that work would be overseen by a registered professional engineer.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the registered engineer by his signature is certifying that whatever was done met all the requirements.
- GIBBS** Mr. Gibbs responded that would indicate it had met all of the codes in terms of electrical, etc.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that at that point of certification, they certify the work; they're not certifying that the people who did the work were qualified to do the work. It does not matter who did the work, because by the time it got to us it was certified by someone that's in compliance.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost whether that was the issue with which he was concerned.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded yes, that he had a concern that a specific certification regarding the environmental professional is qualified. Solicitor Yost added that if you have the environmental standards, all the plans are going to have to be sealed by a professional engineer. The registered engineer, by implication, is certifying that whoever worked on the plan meets the standards.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that it meets the standards that are in the ordinance.
- STETS** Mr. Stets added that as you go through the pack of plans you would see multiple signatures.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski brought forward his second question concerning Noise Disturbance. He asked how to define what is annoying, disturbing, or perturbing in reference to one of the planned usages which is Livestock Farming in this area. Mr. Maciejewski lived next to a farm and the cows cried all night long. It was annoying, disturbing, and perturbing. He asked what might happen if there were cows next to an old age residence, and who would determine how many people have to call to say something is disturbing, annoying or perturbing.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the language that is used here is the type that is used in court cases. Court developed law, such as in pornography involves community standards. What constitutes community standards is whatever someone in the community thinks it is. It is subjective. The definition of noise is an adverse psychological or physiological effect, which is going to take a psychologist or a psychiatrist or a physician under testimony to determine.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that to a farmer the moo of a cow doesn't bother him. To a person living next door who has no care in the world for a cow it would be very disturbing.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the specific question of the perturbing problem is in the determination of the Zoning Officer.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that it would have to be described to a court in satisfactory terms.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that is specifically mentioned in the Zoning Ordinance.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson stated that in a court situation it would have to be described from a scientific approach where you have a calibrated noise meter, take a reading, and record the reading.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson asked about the source of the definitions.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
DEVELOPMENT ZONE WORK SESSION**

**NOVEMBER 11, 1999  
APPROVED**

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the overall source is Hyder Consulting, an engineering firm hired by the township to do this work.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson indicated a concern about the standards in that even among some engineers the terms may not be agreeable.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski questioned why livestock farming is being reviewed, given the location of the zone. There would be odor, runoff and the noise characteristic that is inherent with the operation.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it had been discussed early that agricultural uses would be included.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski responded that there were horticultural, crop farming and forestry. They don't bark or moan or smell. Odor, runoff and noise are three very important aspects of livestock farming.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that it is inconceivable that anyone would want to do that anyway.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski responded that it is in the ordinance
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he could imagine some things in the future that wouldn't be anything like the livestock that was being discussed. This would not include having a slaughterhouse, but who knows what kind of high tech animal husbandry type things could happen.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski asked what might be included in livestock, and added such animals as emu and ostrich. He stated that the concept would not fit with what the township is trying to do environmentally.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost added that theoretically you could put in a mass produce hog operations.
- STERN** Mr. Stern pointed out that a hog farm is possible now in any residential zone.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that it would be restricted only by the size of the lot.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski brought forward an item regarding the Determination of Prohibited Use – Landfill Scrapyard, Junkyards. He asked whether this excluded recycling. He commented that

there are places he had seen with mountains of plastic bottles, a recycling operation, not landfill, not scrap, not junk. Recycling is not excluded or included.

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it was not his intent to exclude it. The Pennsylvania Municipal Wastes laws separate recycling from junkyards, scrapyards and landfills.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated it would cover all material, such as iron, steel, concrete, cardboard, etc.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated it specified what recycling included.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he had some experience with that when Mr. Kinsley wanted to build his site. The Township had done some extensive work looking at the Commonwealth law which permitted the site. Those types of sites are permitted by Commonwealth law. The Township ordinances did not permit it, and the Commonwealth law overrode the ordinances in the Kinsley case.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the Commonwealth law would take precedence over the township.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic confirmed that was the case. The site that he had was not eligible for recycling, and so the way the site was justified was falling back on Commonwealth law, which defined recycling in all areas of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and was permitted under these conditions.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned why there are no restrictions that could permit such in the middle of a residential district.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that it was only permitted at that particular site, not in residential areas.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that it was site specific.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that maybe a definition was warranted, but if a Lavetan-type company came along with a mountain high pile of steel, he asked whether that would be scrap, or recycling of that pile of steel
- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the solid waste statute addresses specified recyclables, which are plastic, glass, newspaper, but steel is not a recyclable under the solid waste statutes. However, the

handling of scrap steel is something just as valuable, just as Kinsley was going to recycle building materials.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that was why he asked because of that specific application in an industrial zone where we have recycling. If one looks at a pile of cans, is that considered to be junk, scrap, or recycling.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch interjected that if it's aluminum, it's recyclable.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski questioned who the chosen consultant would be to review standards. First, we view the person's qualifications. Then we turn around and say the Environmental Impact Statement will be reviewed for consistency by the township's chosen consultant. He asked whether an additional person other than Mr. Stern or Mr. Luciani would be involved such as an environmental consultant.

**STERN** Mr. Stern interjected that depending upon what the case is, yes, and added that Mr. Luciani is not an environmental engineer.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that because of the way consultants interpret concepts, he would suggest that the same person interpret each one of the environmental impact studies from the township viewpoint, not somebody new each time.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that environmental engineering has so many different aspects to it that if a film developing company comes, the township would want an engineer with a specific understanding of that specific kind of facility to review it. If a car manufacturing plant comes, we would want an engineer who understands the environmental concerns specifically related to that.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski commented that he was looking for consistency in how the township ordinance is being evaluated in regard to the application. He stated that there is a need for consistency in terms of noise, traffic, etc. Every decision to be made on the zone by both the Planning Commission and the Board would be based on the environmental impact.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson stated that there were two ways to look at this. One is to have a consultant come in to give a verbal analysis of what had been done. The other is if you have an engineer who gives you something in writing and signs it, that's the same as sealing it. There are big differences in companies. If you pick a company to

do your environmental analysis of the EIS and they seal it, they are only going to seal it if they are qualified.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that it would work much the way it has worked in the past. Mr. Stern and Mr. Luciani both had enough experience to be able to review the reports. They know if they are comfortable or uncomfortable with them. If they're uncomfortable, they do what has been done in the past particularly in traffic reports, such as hire our own traffic engineer to review the report and come up with his conclusion.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how many times had the township hired its own traffic engineer.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he could only think of one time.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick interjected that this was one of the key issues in really being able to monitor what goes in that area.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that we could get into areas where we never had experience. He asked how that could be challenged.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson stated that an analysis must be done of the engineering firms with which the township is comfortable, have them produce documents of record for specific types of environmental work they've done and set up a file. This file would be utilized for consultants in a particular field.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that that procedure had been used to select the engineers being utilized. There were 10 RFP's, received 5 or 6 proposals back which included resumes of people to be involved with references. He had chosen ones who had experience with specific areas being addressed, such as air pollution.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski indicated concern when someone he doesn't know is reviewing the ordinance.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost asked him whether he anticipated every environmental impact statement that comes in for presentation to be reviewed by our own environmental consultant.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski responded that he would think review is necessary. Before it even got to the Planning Commission that report (with guidelines and minimums) would not even be reviewed because of any given number of other things.

- STETS** Mr. Stets indicated there are a number of firms which deal with environmental engineering. That will be an added cost of doing business.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the ordinance does charge back to the developer.
- STETS** Mr. Stets questioned when someone comes in and wants a variance against Section 2605 of the Noise portion, how is a group like the Zoning Hearing Board going to evaluate that and make a rational decision.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the Township would have an environmental expert at the meeting. One is coming up December 7 and an engineer applied for a variance from the stormwater management ordinance. We're going to have John Luciani there to testify for the township why the variance shouldn't be granted.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson stated that suppose Architectural Testing wanted to move down there, and they're going to use a 600 horsepower engine to test the window walls. They would want a noise ordinance waiver.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that it was your suggestion that having our township environmental engineer oversee these plans, which seemed reasonable to her in that this is such a new concept. We don't know where it is going to go. To me that would be an additional safeguard to insure that we are getting what is in print.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski responded that later on we might have a lot of problems, such as noise issue that someone doesn't like. The original report will be the guideline. In a residential zone, Mr. Stern knows exactly what is called for and can make a quick decision when applications come forth.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson commented that Knaub's Bakery, when they started it was not known that 10 to 15 refrigeration trucks would be making noise at night.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski reiterated that minimum, consistent standards must be in this report, perhaps even in check off form, such as no wetlands in the area. The environmental impact reports are getting shorter and shorter. If that would be the major criteria, the guidelines must be consistent and enforceable.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned the fact that when the reports are submitted, whether the township has any recourse if the Planning Commission somehow determines that the environmental report that was submitted doesn't really address the township's concerns. He asked whether the plan could be denied on that basis.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated it could be denied.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson indicated that you could go through all the requirements and then a year later something changes.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that with the mixed uses there is a need to be sensitive to the issues and to have enforcement with teeth.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that time was running out for the meeting with six minutes left. The Supervisors had interviews scheduled for 7 o'clock. She indicated that the discussions were not nearly finished. The issues are important and they had the rest of the ordinance to go through. The map needed to be discussed. There was a Noon work session coming up on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. She asked whether the agenda could be shifted to that work session and added that Mr. Stern was anxious to bring this to completion to get it adopted.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski responded that he agreed and that he was looking ahead to the time when the sewer moratorium would be lifted when more plans would be coming forward. A lot of it is in the dialogue already, and they also wish to move this item forward. He indicated that as long as the Planning Commission would know what is needed to make this work, they thought it was very good. He added that it was a lot better than the first cut, and they wanted to be sure to understand as they come face-to-face with the issues.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that they take the agenda scheduled for the 23<sup>rd</sup> and hold off until early January. The other morning when Andrew had an open session for Public Comment, there were issues at that meeting that Mr. Stern had not been considered, such as telecommunication facility going in, so maybe those are items for consideration.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented that towers had been mentioned as to whether they would be permitted in the zone.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson indicated a tower could be a satellite dish.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he would not want to get come the next meeting and have to go through all this again. He asked what the Planning Commission needed to resolve some of the questions asked so that staff and legal people prepare a response.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski indicated that as he read this he was reviewing having to work with it. The questions he brought up about registered professionals and the review process and what is in the reports is probably what 90% of our judgment is going to be based on whether the plan will move on to the supervisors with a recommendation for approval. The reason he brought the points to the meeting was that he wanted some sense of reassurance that the engineer standing in front of us has been certified, and what he has presented has been effectively reviewed; that we're going to have consistency that from meeting to meeting and I can rely on it as in the past with Mr. Luciani and Mr. Stern.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that he had viewed their comments as somewhat procedural; how will you handle environmental consultants, or how do we determine if someone's really qualified or not.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski continued that there's nothing in the Ordinance about any traffic studies. He asked what thought process would be taken if a Preston comes in with 450 tractor trailers.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that there are certain restrictions in terms of noise in certain hours. No trucking company could do business within the time frames in the ordinance.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson stated that a trend is taking place where people are trying to interpret ordinances. Attorneys are accompanying their clients, and they provide their interpretation of the ordinance. The ordinances must be iron clad.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the points were very well taken. He would like to have something in writing to start working on at the next meeting. Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Stern whether he could provide information that would allay some of the concerns.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he probably would not have information to allay the concerns because there are comments which have not been included covering some of what had been stated. In addition, Mr. Stern indicated that the comments made regarding some of the items would not change the ordinance. Mr. Stern mentioned the meeting to be held on November 23 (which was moved to another date) would include part of that discussion. Mr. Stern encouraged

each person in attendance to begin to say no to some of the requests. The exact language, no matter how we write it, will have more strength. Mr. Stern added that traffic had not been included because it is part of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski mentioned that, particularly at Caterpillar, there is not only one driveway where someone pulls out at Caterpillar, there are multiple driveways. Under the way we've been looking at Traffic Studies, traffic will need to be better scrutinized.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that criteria exists in the present ordinance for a traffic study. He stated he was unsure of whether the study would meet the criteria.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked that, in order to prepare for the meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, they bring their questions together in order to wrap up the issue.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that would change anything on the schedule that was already agreed to.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it would not change anything. The Public Hearing is on the 18<sup>th</sup>. It was advertised for action on the 9<sup>th</sup>, although it can be acted on within 90 days. Mr. Stern encouraged the Planning Commission to advise him of any questions so that he can prepare responses. He commented that Solicitor Yost had given him a list of comments so that Brian Kauffman, the engineer, and I could respond. That way, come November 18<sup>th</sup> or December 9<sup>th</sup>, answers would be prepared.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson stated that the discussions at the last two meetings had been thwarted by an extremely long agenda.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 7 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
DEVELOPMENT ZONE WORK SESSION**

**OCTOBER 27, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a work session at 7:15 a.m. on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Ken Pasch  
Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Manager  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Louann Webber, YCEDC  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:20 a.m. The purpose of the meeting was to continue discussion regarding the proposed Development Zone.

**STERN** Andrew Stern provided an update regarding work completed related to the Ordinance portion of the Development Zone. Notice in the form of 150 letters and a map had been sent to all those included in the Zone, as well as those whose properties touch the edge of the Development Zone. An additional follow up letter had been sent one week later as there had been some misunderstanding of the original letter.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he had received some inquiries concerning the letter.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that businesses within the Development Zone indicated enthusiasm for the proposed zoning. Mr. Stern advised that on Thursday, November 4 at 9 a.m. he would make his presentation to the public. On November 18<sup>th</sup> and December 9<sup>th</sup> additional (advertised) meetings would be held. The only item remaining to be done is to post and list properties to be included.

**STERN** Mr. Stern presented a Development Zone map showing in different colors the various areas of development.

Hot Pink – Sites identified imperative to be included (vacant or abandoned)

Orange – Sites which might be okay on their own without development but which should be included.

York Market Place – Sam’s, Home Depot, Vacant Lots next to apartments – not a priority.

Green was identified as residential, ones on Industrial Highway touching residential. The map indicated that Industrial Highway was the dividing line.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether all of the uses that are within the zone now shown as “not a priority” and the green “not included” would be included in the flexible zone. He suggested that, rather than go back and change it later, whether the whole thing should be included.

**GUERRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that Sam’s Club would be in the middle.

**STERN** Mr. Stern recommended that everything except what appeared in green be included. He added that the Board of Supervisors should choose the parcels.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch cautioned that the Board should not back off of little pieces.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he thought it wise to keep the green area as Mr. Stern proposed. He questioned several areas on the map and mentioned traffic backup.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the Board was focusing on whether the existing uses would then be incorporated into the same zone. She commented that she was focusing from a different perspective that in the new proposed zone, the things that would be allowed would possibly be set on Market Street. Not that the existing uses wouldn’t be there because they can be there in the proposal, but beyond what is here. This study included industrial uses right up to Market Street. Chairman Mitrick indicated she had a grave concern about that. She stated that she felt that was a negative imposition on the central thoroughfare. One map indicates that only a few residential zones are incorporated, but go across the street and not very far away is Eastern Boulevard. There are a few vacant spots, but this is largely developed and productive. She further stated that the Board could sit and think optimistically and look at some other parts of the Township that have been developed in a way that is advantageous to the community and not offensive to neighboring districts. There was a very broad opportunity of uses within the proposal. The whole issue began as a focus on how are we going to help the redevelopment of the Caterpillar property. Since then, the concept has grown to a point where she was afraid of what it might do to the residential areas. We are not extending it into an area that is not somewhat developed. Mrs. Mitrick would not want to stand in front of the public and say she thought it was okay that along Market Street we may have an industry that is going to look very much industrial. Mrs. Mitrick asked the Board to please consider reducing the map.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that the area to be excluded is all developed.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated he thought it would be better to leave the area of York Mall, Home Depot and McCrory's included in the Development Zone.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented on Mr. Stern's recent response to the editorial in the newspaper where Springettsbury was somewhat slammed for its sprawl. Andrew was extremely defensive (rightfully so) of his efforts on development. He focused on the specific areas in question and the potential for further redevelopment of the few pieces sitting vacant Mrs. Mitrick had confidence especially when weighing it against possibilities of putting industrial use there.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the paradigm of what industrial means has changed. It no longer is sooty smokestacks. Much of the Meadowlands is industrial and is a very nice looking facility. Mr. Pasch would have no problem, if he lived on Eastern Boulevard, with that being a block away. Within the Ordinance itself, Mr. Pasch believes the Supervisors can control what type of industrial facilities want to come to Springettsbury Township.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that the land value would control that more than anything else.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that the people living on Eastern Boulevard, before they ever see Market Street they have to look at the back of Hardee's, the former Boston Market, and neither of those sites are particularly beautiful.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she agreed with Mr. Pasch about the Meadowlands, but asked what would happen if the township would not get that.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that we have Meadowlands because of the restrictions in operation. Heavy industry is fading out of the U. S. and going to Third World Countries.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the challenge was to figure out how to decide the issue.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck suggested that one way to decide is to provide maps for however way the Board envisioned the matter and vote them down. He would modify the map.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
DEVELOPMENT ZONE WORK SESSION**

**OCTOBER 27, 1999  
APPROVED**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that most of the concern over Market Street might not happen as its use is well established and will be there for a long time. The map could be changed, and it would not make any difference. The only piece that may make a difference would be the piece behind Home Depot. It should be included.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that those three placed together would be comfortable for him.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the problem with reducing the zone is that valuable property with access to major highways not being considered leaves a large parcel of the proposed zone threatened to not be developed. To proceed with that type of caution in her opinion would be responsible to the fact that this is a new concept, and we can think optimistically but we may have to live with a pessimistic reality. There always is the potential in the future as necessary to expand the zone, which would not hurt property values.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the possibility would be inhibiting economic development in some of the areas. Just because something is developed now doesn't mean that, whether it is included or not, it is totally benign.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she was concerned about the problems being created.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated in agreement with Mr. Pasch, the Market Street properties would be there for some time and zoning would not change that.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch reiterated that the use of those properties would remain on Market Street, and he would have no problem with taking a step approach.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what the problems would be to change the zone later.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the property would have to be posted, advertised in the newspaper, have a public hearing, and go before York County Planning Commission. It would be a 3-year process.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that would be a more difficult process.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that Solicitor Yost should review the matter.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that there are great arguments on either side of the issue.

**WEBBER** Louann Webber commented that an industrial group or manufacturing group would not likely come into Market Street, because there are no structures to handle the traffic. The same zone would exist because it is somewhat controlled by the market. The problem with not including them in the zone is that if it was in the zone, you would give it some flexibility but still have some control within the Ordinance.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that was his thinking in that the Board can control the matter by what it allows.

**WEBBER** Louann Webber continued with agreement and added that the Development Zone would at least give people opportunity. She referred to the old Hechinger building, which was basically a box building with good infrastructure. There are many things that can be done with box buildings. Such a matter, if within the Development Zone could be voted down, but if it were outside the Zone, there would be no opportunity for development. Developers take Ordinances and Zoning seriously.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick cautioned about possible traffic issues. There are projected traffic issues with Home Depot. Included in that is the possibility of the need for a signalized intersection to Mill Street and Eastern Boulevard because of the increased traffic. In some instances there is limited control.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri agreed that no matter what is done, there are traffic problems.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that the "Commercial Highway" zone would have the most intense traffic. In that instance the flexible zoning makes more sense as the potential is having less traffic.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick referred to the Meadowlands traffic and while there may not be as much automobile traffic, there is more tractor trailer traffic.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch did not disagree. It's just as easy to do this and get it done, and had no objection to it. He would include Hechinger's.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri would be in favor of leaving the map as it is.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that his only concern was the corner in the initial map showing green (not included). He would recommend keeping driveways and entrances as far away as possible.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there would be a problem with property owners if that particular corner were excluded because of the affect on property values.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
DEVELOPMENT ZONE WORK SESSION**

**OCTOBER 27, 1999  
APPROVED**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there are any other modifications that the Board would like to suggest.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated he was trying to rationalize in his mind the difference on Market Street between Commercial and Flexible. He was concerned about “what is seen” and what is different.

**STERN** Mr. Stern asked whether that was as far as uses or the design. The uses you are limited to are retail or business services, offices, car dealerships. In flexible zoning you can have anything, industrial, agricultural, residential such as condos, truck terminals.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that a truck terminal would not be able to operate in that zone because they would be restricted by the Ordinance and the hours of operation.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented about York Coca-Cola. The Coca-Cola space is of no impact. It is an industrial use, and McCrory’s was industrial with trucks in and out.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck’s concern is in the area of the smaller parcels where Joe Landowner’s property value may change. The property value would drive much of this. The location is one of the most important issues of property values.

**WEBBER** Louann Webber commented with regard to the Caterpillar site. When that site is developed it would be upgraded. There would be nice landscaping. The Ordinance would set the standard. Other surrounding properties around it would be influenced by it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Stern from an economic development standpoint if this zone had existed along Market Street a year ago, what type of projects he may have been approached to put in.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it would be a mix of commercial and industrial somewhat different. The property is zoned commercial so they are stuck and people are scared away from using other parts of it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck proposed a scenario such as if Coca-Cola wanted to convert into upscale condos, that would not be permitted.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it would not be permitted. His guess would be that it would be commercial. The site has value because of its location on Market Street.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO APPROVE ANDREW STERN'S ORIGINAL MAP  
(EXHIBIT A). MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND.**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Stern concerning the proposed parcel designated in red and whether that anticipated rezoning.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it was commercial with the exception of McDonald's, which is commercial highway.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that the motion only related to the map that was being discussed.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch requested that this be reviewed by Solicitor Yost regarding the corner property of residential properties.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the only challenges that might arise would be where property lines are not followed.

**MOTION CARRIED. MRS. MITRICK VOTED NO.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she strongly opposed the move and that she hoped that future developments prove her wrong. She stated she could not favor the map because she felt it is a disservice to the residents of the community.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that on November 18<sup>th</sup> the map will be reviewed during the Public Hearing.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that there would be an Executive Session immediately following the Work Session.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 8:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

The Board of Supervisors held a work session at 7:15 a.m. on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Ken Pasch  
Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Attorney Don Yost  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Joy Lauchman, Administrative Coordinator  
Brian Kauffman, P.E., Hyder Consulting  
Louann Webber, YCEDC

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:20 a.m. The purpose of the meeting is to further discuss the concept of the Development Zone.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that this is a continuation of the last meeting. There are a few items that were left unresolved or needed clarification.

**KAUFFMAN** Mr. Kauffman discussed the changes to the requirements for an environmental impact statement.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned the definition of an environmental professional.

**KAUFFMAN** Mr. Kauffman commented on the varied backgrounds of environmental professionals.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned if it is possible to have a professional engineer say that the environmental professional is qualified.

**KAUFFMAN** Mr. Kauffman noted that they must submit a resume of their qualifications.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that that individual still may not be qualified.

**STERN** Mr. Stern said that they would have to prove that they are an expert witness.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch said that the word “proves” raises a question in his mind.

- KAUFFMAN** Mr. Kauffman commented on the types of people working on various items such as noise and air quality. Some people have a P.E. and some do not.
- STERN** Mr. Stern updated Mr. Yost that a statement was going to be added that has a professional engineer certify that the environmental professionals are qualified.
- KAUFFMAN** Mr. Kauffman spoke of other minor revisions.
- STERN** Mr. Stern spoke of landscaping and screening requirements that were done by Harry Roth. Landscaping and beautification requirements were added as a result of the last meeting.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned the nature of landscape strips.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the requirements seem like overkill. People will not be able to see through all the trees to the properties.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said that number seven is overkill. These landscaping requirements are going into the zoning ordinance and will not be able to be waived like they can presently with the Land Development and Subdivision ordinance. He thinks Mr. Gurreri's point is correct.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned if number seven requires that many number of trees because it is called a front yard.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned if the front yard was modified would it affect any buffering on the side yards.
- STERN** Mr. Stern replied no.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned if interior landscaping can also mean small shrubs.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that the Land Development and Subdivision ordinance has a mixture of the two.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that a 15 foot landscaping strip is not a huge strip.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that it is not that people oppose trees. Rather it is that they do not want them in their front yard area.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick asked Mr. Stern for his recommendation.

- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that if number seven is left out, than it would revert back to the Land Development and Subdivision Ordinance, which is restrictive but presents the opportunity to ask for a modification or waiver.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop then commented on fixing the Subdivision ordinance, which needs done anyway.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the entire landscaping section would need re-done due to the charts.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick expressed her concerns for eliminating section number seven due to the fact that they don't know where the district boundaries are yet. Mrs. Mitrick then commented on the importance of East Market Street.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the ordinance does provide for front yard buffers. He then commented that there are situations where these buffers would not need to be waived.
- STERN** Mr. Stern then referenced Home Depot. They are an example of modifying buffer requirements. Twenty trees that were to be placed in the front yard area were placed on the east side by the apartments.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that if we revert to the ordinance almost anything can be waived. He then commented on how this is a new approach.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop said that the downside of having the buffer yard requirements in the Zoning Ordinance is that you can't waive it. A variance from the Zoning Hearing Board would be needed and most likely not granted.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on this concept being something different.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said that he prefers the flexibility of the Land Development and Subdivision Ordinance. There is no give and take with the Zoning Ordinance.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that he is worried about trees blocking the view of businesses.
- KAUFFMAN** Mr. Kauffman suggested having a list for industrial uses only.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that it would be a little easier, however, how would you decide what to choose?
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch said that an eyesore is in the eye of the beholder.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned if streetscape wording should be used instead of buffer strip.

- STERN** Mr. Stern clarified that streetscape requirements are the same requirements as buffer requirements.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch said that what needs done is to change the streetscape within our existing ordinance and come up with a solution because we are allowing a lot of the waivers anyway.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick expressed concern for what might possibly be developed along East Market Street.
- STERN** Mr. Stern spoke of buffers between zones.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that if protective measures aren't added in now, then the Township will have to live with what they get.
- STERN** Mr. Stern inquired about showing landscaping on plans, however, not having to plant them unless given six months notice by the Township.
- YOST** Attorney Yost stated that it could be done, however, it is not a good idea.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch said that there is a justification for delaying sidewalks. For landscaping it would be up to the Board to say no to the waivers.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick said that when you allow flexibility, you have to live with some things that you didn't intend.
- STERN** Mr. Stern suggested the Board turn down waiver requests that they feel are not appropriate. Mr. Stern also referenced a section where the term "business" was taken out when dealing with night time hours of 9pm to 7am. This was taken out because the wording implied it eliminated third shift business.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned eliminating trash pick up at pre dawn hours.
- STERN** Mr. Stern replied that that would have to be prohibited for the entire Township and not just this zone. Mr. Stern then questioned if the Board was ready to move to the Public Hearing phase. Mr. Stern also discussed holding a meeting prior to the Public Hearing to explain the Development Zone. This would educate interested parties so that they would be able to attend the Public Hearing informed and with questions for the Board. He then commented on York County needing revisions around the week of November 11, 1999.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**OCTOBER 5, 1999  
APPROVED**

**The Board of Supervisors scheduled a work session to discuss the development zone map on Wednesday October 27, 1999 at 7:15 a.m. and a Public Hearing for November 18, 1999 at 7:00 p.m.**

**MITRICK**                    Mrs. Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 8:30 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

The Board of Supervisors held a work session at 7:00 a.m. on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Ken Pasch  
Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Brian Kauffman, P.E., Hyder Consulting  
Cindy Zawrotuk, Hyder Consulting  
Louann Webber, YCEDC  
Joy Lauchman, Administrative Coordinator

**MITRICK**

Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:00 a.m. The purpose of the meeting is to further discuss the concept of the Development Zone.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern introduced Mr. Brian Kauffman and Ms. Cindy Zawrotuk of Hyder Consulting, and Mr. Harry Roth of Gehring-Roth Associates. Mr. Stern then informed the Board of the changes to the new draft ordinance for the Development Zone as follows:

- Definitions have been added for new uses.
- Definitions for performance standards
- Permitted uses
- Conditional uses added in residential and agricultural
- Environmental design standards are all from Hyder Consulting, with the exception of two sections from Harry Roth.

**KAUFFMAN**

Mr. Brian Kauffman of Hyder Consulting stated that they prepared environmental performance standards that addressed any type of development in the Development Zone.

**ZAWROTUK**

Ms. Cindy Zawrotuk of Hyder Consulting provided a general overview in regards to what they had done for Environmental Performance Standards. The areas they were asked to look at were: noise, vibration, heat, fire explosion hazards, residual and hazardous waste, erosion and sediment control, storm water management, air quality, wetlands, light, glare, landscaping, and integration.

Ms. Zawrotuk spoke first of noise. This is primarily for noises between the hours of 9 pm and 7 am. She then spoke of the list of prohibited noises which include loud speakers, construction equipment outside, motor vehicles repaired outdoors, loading and unloading trucks within 100 yards

- ZAWROTUK** of residences. Sound pressure levels in places of public assembly were noted as being limited to 90 decibels. A quiet zone can be developed based on potential uses in that area. Ms. Zawrotuk then spoke of the noise readings that were performed in the proposed Development Zone. Ms. Zawrotuk also noted that provisions could be made for emergency work.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurerri questioned the time of day these reading were taken.
- ZAWROTUK** Ms. Zawrotuk stated that certain areas were taken during the week between the hours of 3pm and 6pm. The other areas were taken on a Saturday around noon.
- Ms. Zawrotuk then spoke of vibrations. The maximum allowable particle velocity levels were listed. It primarily limits blasting through construction activity. Fire explosion, residual, erosion and sediment control, storm water management, wetlands, and air quality are all based on state and federal laws. Light and glare have several provisions which include parking areas to the one half foot candle. Entrances and exits will be lighted to a minimum of two foot candles and lighting is to be reflected away from adjoining properties.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that they are anticipating having litigation, and thus inquiring if there is any leeway in the requirements. He then questioned how measurements would be conducted.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned provisions for noise that exceed the levels.
- ROTH** Mr. Harry Roth of Gehringer – Roth Associates stated that section H 13 has a section on deviations that would cover this.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned whether sound can accurately be determined as to where the source of the noise is originating from?
- ZAWROTUK** Ms. Zawrotuk stated that it was listed at the property boundary. An alternative that can be used is 50 feet from the source.
- KAUFFMAN** Mr. Kauffman stated that it can be a judgement call.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that in litigation that would never hold up.
- ROTH** Mr. Roth asked for an example of what Mr. Schenck is referring to. He stated that there is no better instrument for noise than the human ear. Mr. Roth suggested recording noises.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned why construction was on the list.
- ROTH** Mr. Roth stated that typically construction activities exceed these limits.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck made reference to the quiet zone.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that this section will be used at the Land Development phase and later as enforcement.
- ROTH** Mr. Roth spoke of adding qualifications for people who can submit expert testimony. Mr. Roth then spoke of landscape aesthetics as relating to health, safety and welfare issues. He spoke of strips to help avoid traffic accidents that will also help provide compatibility. This must be provided but only to the extent to which it helps you comply with the other standards of the zone.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick referenced the Caterpillar property. She then noted that she would like to see those requirements as specific as possible.
- ROTH** Mr. Roth suggested imposing a buffer around the entire district. He then stated that this is not uncommon for municipalities.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he can't imagine any business that would go into the Caterpillar site that would be worse than what was there previously.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented on buffering in respects to buffering between businesses; he doesn't see what good it is doing.
- ROTH** Mr. Roth said that the zone has to be developed based upon the worse case scenario.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that this does more than the current ordinance. He also noted that he doesn't know of a single plan that has met the Township's landscaping requirements, anyway.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch noted that if this is the minimal landscaping, then shouldn't it be more?
- ROTH** Mr. Roth agreed but also stated that what is truly the purpose of this district. He commented that he thought the Board made a decision regarding the flexibility of this zone.
- STERN** Mr. Stern expressed his concerns for the arbitrariness of this.
- ROTH** Mr. Roth noted that a lot more could be done. He commented that shared parking lots, loading spaces, signs and so forth should be promoted instead of single lots. This would allow for more flexibility to provide some beautification.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick commented on not being opposed to the development zone but being very protective of the areas that are around it.

- ROTH** Mr. Roth then spoke of integration with streets and utilities. He then spoke of coordination issues. Pedestrian travel through the zone was promoted with the exception of industrial areas.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned why that would be exempt.
- ROTH** Mr. Roth said that some heavy industrial uses would conflict with pedestrian movement.
- KAUFFMAN** Mr. Kauffman suggested taking that statement out. If needed a business could ask for a waiver from that.
- WEBBER** Ms. Louann Webber of YCEDC commented that a Land Developer would not fight with the Township about the ordinance. It would not be to their benefit to go against the community, rather they would go somewhere else.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that they have experienced that with small lot owners.
- WEBBER** Ms. Webber stated that whoever takes over the Caterpillar property will serve as a catalyst for that area.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that he agreed with both Ms. Webber and Mr. Schenck. Outside developers will use site selectors to choose a community. These companies will know the requirements prior to choosing a community and will not fight the requirements. However, local companies may fight the requirements as they have less opportunity to go to another community.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop said that he can not think of any industrial business that he would not want pedestrian access to.
- STERN** Mr. Stern then spoke of conditional uses and inquired as to what direction the Board wanted to go with it.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop inquired about what the down side of having conditional uses was?
- STERN** Mr. Stern said that the downside is that you don't have any opportunity to look at any of the criteria. He commented that it is still permitted, but with criteria.
- ROTH** Mr. Roth commented on conditional uses being permitted, but there is a concern so criteria are imposed that need met to grant the use.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck said that what Mr. Roth said would work, however, every one of the conditional uses would need detailed.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop spoke of trying to protect residential and agricultural uses.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that he sensed a concern about mixing uses together without conditional uses.

**ROTH** Mr. Roth stated that he would not recommend special exceptions.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck agreed that special exceptions are a waste of time.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented on how many of the special exceptions should not be.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he doesn't have a problem with the residential and agricultural mix. He said that he was hoping for it.

**THERE WAS A CONSENSUS OF THE BOARD THAT THE USES PROPOSED AS CONDITIONAL USES IN THE CURRENT DRAFT BE PERMITTED BY RIGHT.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern then spoke of the Route 30 westbound exit ramp proposal. He explained that First Capital Engineering had been asked to put together a proposal in February of 1999 and has yet to start. Mr. Stern requested a proposal from Tom Austin at TRG, who would have been subcontracted by First Capital Engineering for this project.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned in light of the route 30 issues at West Manchester Township, is the timing bad for this project?

**WEBBER** Ms. Webber stated that regionally this is a good thing. This project is much different than West Manchester Township, where a private developer wanted their own personal exit ramp.

**MR. BISHOP MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO EXECUTE CONTRACT WITH TRG IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$4,500 FOR THE ROUTE 30 WEST BOUND OFF RAMP CONCEPT AT MEMORY LANE. MR. GURRERI WAS THE SECOND. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented on the former Lowe's building on Industrial Highway. Earlier this year the Board had approved the placement of signs on this site attracting persons to contact the Township about development opportunities at the site. Within two weeks of installing the two signs, which cost \$150 total, he had 12 inquiries and 2 offers for the former Lowe's site. He stated that he believes one of the proposals will be accepted within a few weeks.

- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned the progress of the connector road proposal.
- STERN** Mr. Stern explained that the connector road is included in the TIP (Transportation Improvement Program) for 2000. He and Mr. Amic have met with Mike Lapano from PennDot to discuss this project. Mr. Lapano indicated that RFP's were being prepared for design specifications.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick also spoke of being cautious of the impact on the surrounding areas of the Development Zone. She noted that once an ordinance is approved, the Board can go back and make modifications. However a lot can develop in the time frame in between the two. Mrs. Mitrick felt that the ordinance should be appropriate and correct at the onset. Mrs. Mitrick then questioned having a border buffer.
- ROTH** Mr. Roth spoke of what is typical for buffer zones. Some methods of buffering and screening are: set back requirements, prohibition for outside activities, and off – street loading regulations. Mr. Roth then commented that he was under the impression that was not what the Township was looking for.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned if any of the zone abuts residential property.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said that there is one small part that abuts apartments.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick expressed her concerns for the area around Market Street and commented on wanting a nice border.
- ROTH** Mr. Roth stated that the ordinance does not achieve that level of protection. He then commented that he can add a paragraph or two to consider.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that screening would help developers to meet other requirements.
- CAREW** Mr. Mike Carew of Carew Real Estate commented on the compatibility issue. He stated that this area would not attract the heavy industrial uses. Mr. Carew then expressed his concerns regarding the attractiveness of the site. He stated that he is not as concerned with the borders as he is with the attractiveness of the zone as a whole.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick scheduled another work session for Tuesday October 5, 1999 at 7:15 am.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**SEPTEMBER 21, 1999  
APPROVED**

**The meeting adjourned at 9:00 am.**

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP  
WORK SESSION**

**JULY 26, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a Work Session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania. The purpose for the meeting was to review and meet with fundraisers for the Springettsbury Park.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
R. Bruce Bainbridge, Director of Recreation  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**FUNDRAISERS:** Ed Newcomb, Secor Associates  
Gordon A. Freireich, The Newton Group  
Harold Harper, The Newton Group

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the Work Session to order at 7 p.m. for the purpose of speaking with potential professional fundraisers for the further development of Springettsbury Park. Chairman Mitrick requested Mr. Amic to review the matter of park redevelopment.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Springettsbury Park development project dated back several months ago. Mr. Amic apologized that so much time had gone by and requested that Mr. Ed Newcomb review his approach to a fund raising campaign, which he had previously discussed with Mr. Amic in April, 1999.

**2. SECOR ASSOCIATES PRESENTATION:**

**NEWCOMB** Mr. Ed Newcomb spoke for his firm, Secor Associates based in Allentown, where he serves as President. There are three partners in the firm, Secor, which was founded in 1987. Mr. Newcomb stated that 95% of Secor's work had been through referrals. All three partners are involved in every project in which the firm becomes involved.

- Secor first would do a Feasibility Study for a capital campaign to let potential donors help set the goals and priorities.

- Secor differed from other firms in their approach to Feasibility Studies. Most will come in and sit down with you for a few days, write what's called a "Case for Support" and discuss the best prospective donors, schedule interviews. He stated that most of the questions and concerns are the same. If there is involvement their responses will be the same.
- Secor recommended four months for the Feasibility Study to be completed. There may be a need for some extra time in order to recruit a Steering Committee of 15 individuals (affluent and influential). They will identify where 2/3's of the money comes from. These 15 individuals will devote 4 or 5 meetings 90 minutes each to make sure that the campaign takes shape properly. Interviews will be conducted with potential donors to help set reasonable goals. Strategy and Timing are important. During the first half of the year there are fewer requests. All major donors will have tell you when they would like you to apply, how much they would like you to ask for, and what part of the effort interests them most. There are no cold calls on the top prospects. The people to visit the donors are matched.
- During the first four meetings the "Case for Support" is developed, showing the reason for the park. People will give because of personal relationship and what will happen in the park, what the results would be, how the local residents will be helped.
- Contacts will be made at the school district, the hospital, PTA's based on the surveys previously done. People will also give because their family has been in the area for a long time, grown up here, and have a strong feeling for the Township. People will give to advertise and to be a good corporate citizen. Secor believes that taking the needs and the desires of the donors and matching those up with opportunities that are presented in the program is providing a service to both parties.
- Secor will come back with the results of that study and provide the plan. Springettsbury will either choose Secor for the job, and they would continue at the same rate for the campaign.
- At that point the Steering Committee is formed consisting of the people who have bought in and have ownership of the campaign. This group will be asked to contribute to the best of their personal ability. Mr. Newcomb advised that 100% participation is a necessity for the Board of Supervisors. Then the best prospects are chosen from the results of the Feasibility Study and the Steering Committee will meet with them. Sometimes people desire to do Challenge Grants. They will see the goal and indicate they'll do the last 20%.

- There would be some parallel tracts going – Campaign Brochures need to be developed, Naming Opportunities, Video (by corporations). When 50% of the goal has been raised, a public function is held, unveiling the plans. This will Kick Off the Community Coming together. All the donors who have not yet pledged will be invited to hear a presentation, see the video.
- There would be three divisions: leadership, major gifts, special and general gifts, all indicating a range of giving opportunities. Volunteers: How much is the volunteer giving; his or her company giving? Work is necessary to make sure the right people make the right calls. It is important to start at the top, and get the larger gifts first.

**NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb indicated that typically the Feasibility Study will take four months and in eight months the general gifts will be complete.

Additionally, Secor helps to look past the Feasibility Study towards an Open House, i.e., a celebration at the conclusion. Past contributors are the best prospects.

**NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb stated he was glad to see the emphasis on maintenance and making sure that the newly-expanded park is well kept and cared for, which is an item donors want to be sure is taken care of. Some types of fund raising are (1) Appreciated stocks and planned giving endowments. (2) Paid up whole life insurance, and (3) Annual gifts which touch the average working family which do not involve much money but provide for participation.

**NEWCOMB** Secor works as a partnership. Its reputation is hands on, and they will go with the volunteers on solicitation calls.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked when would be a good time to start the campaign.

**NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb responded that the earliest that this could be started would be the beginning of November. During the Christmas season there is little activity in the campaigning process. Recruiting the Steering Committee could begin, but it would be January before any serious work could be done. Corporations by late August, early September have established their giving budgets for the coming year. Capital campaigns most often encompass the pledge period of three years.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked how long the campaign normally would take.

**NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb responded a typical campaign study would be done in four months and the campaign complete in an additional eight months, a total of 12 months. Secor's charge is a flat monthly fee of \$3,000 for the campaign. You would be doing the Feasibility Study for \$12,000, which provides the plan. Most campaigns average between 5% and 6% of the goal.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that Mr. Newcomb had taken time to evaluate the project and stated that Secor had a reputation that is important. He asked Mr. Newcomb how he viewed the project from that point of view.

**NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb responded that it has a lot of basic ingredients that donors look for. This serves a large group of people regardless of their ability to pay. It contributes to the life of the Township, which is a growing area. People will want accountability for their money.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether Mr. Newcomb had experienced any major objections to governments asking for donations.

**NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb responded that there might be some that would object.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked about competing drives.

**NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb responded that there are always competing drives.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether a campaign drive could ever be properly timed.

**NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb responded that there are times when a very large community center would be campaigning. There are always colleges, Girl Scouts and other. Secor's attitude is to try to match donor wishes with opportunities. Have a good well organized plan, do your work, make your match and raise the money.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the percentage of bad debts when approaching the three years.

**NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb responded that in communities there are generally fewer bad debts because everybody knows everybody else.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the project could actually be started before collecting all the money. There would not be a big significant factor of money that you don't collect.

**NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb added that about 5% would be realistic.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated his main concern would be the timing, i.e., do you wait until all the money is in? In Mr. Pasch's church the Diocese said 50% cash had to be collected before starting. There is some concern that you won't collect everything that's pledged.
- NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb stated that unless the project would be changed drastically after all the money had been pledged, not collecting the money would not be a factor.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked that with special or general gifts that other political issues or decisions would affect the success of securing the money. For example, if this campaign were started and then there's a major increase in sewer rates, or something like that. Would that have an impact on the momentum.
- NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb responded that people who are giving for the right reasons are really concerned. If they are treated right and fair and there's a reason for raising sewer rates, that's not going to be a big issue. Based on the study the Board will have a real good handle on who is going to give how much and for what.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that memorials are important. The Township will want to be very careful that not to undersell memorials.
- NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb responded that one of the things done prior to the study is to outline some ideas for memorial gifts or naming opportunities.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned Mr. Newcomb regarding the basis for 40 people.
- NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb responded that to be basically a "rule of thumb." As an example, if everybody who could give \$15,000 or more over a 3-year period is interviewed, and you have 40 or 50, the more good interviews that are conducted, the easier the campaign goes.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether anything is in place to try to control the timing of the contributions. Mr. Schenck mentioned that the Township had done the playground next door including the fund raising. The real dollars didn't come in until right at the end.
- NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb indicated that as interviews are conducted, the spread is reviewed. A potential donor could be asked whether they could provide 50% of the contribution during the first year providing as much money as possible up front. Regarding a corporate contributions budget, that might have to start in the second year, but the interview will try to determine what that right time will be.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked when is the time to have a function.
- NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb indicated that as funds have come in and interest has been generated that's the time to have the community wide bandwagon event.
- GURRERI** York County Dutch people don't do anything until they make sure it's going to be done.
- NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb indicated that would part of the over-all strategy.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri mentioned the amphitheater. A lot of people attend the concerts, and Mr. Gurreri thought the amphitheater would draw people.
- NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb stated that the amphitheater is what they'll be excited about, but they will build it because of what is going to happen there.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the community typically expects the governmental body to contribute a portion of their capital reserves to the project, or whether it starts by going for the anticipated full cost of the project.
- NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb responded that with capital reserves they'd be more excited about donating if some of that were going into the project. They don't like to see money just sitting there while they're being asked to contribute. It would be good to have some of that contributed.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated she was glad to learn that there is a very organized approach to this. She added that she felt more secure about the project and asked if there were any further questions.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated the presentation had been very informative.
- NEWCOMB** Mr. Newcomb left some informational materials with the Board for their review. He concluded his presentation at 7:45 p.m.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the firm of Noble Smith did not respond within the time allotted.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that there would be a brief Executive Session regarding personnel following this Work Session.

**2. THE NEWTON GROUP PRESENTATION:**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he had met with Messrs. Gordon Freireich and Harold Harper several months ago. Mr. Amic apologized to The Newton Group for the delay in having them make a presentation to the Board.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick welcomed The Newton Group.

**FREIREICH** Mr. Freireich stated their appreciation for the opportunity to provide a verbal presentation of their written material previously provided to the Board.

The Newton Group believes very strongly that Planning Studies are critical to the success of campaigns providing information such as who the donors are going to be, who the volunteers are who will make this happen, how much money will be able to be raised and how that affects what you want to do.

Mr. Freireich indicated that their firm works in a very organized fashion through volunteers. They do not make calls during the campaign. They work with the volunteers. The Planning Study is of utmost importance to find those people interested in the project. They do not do “dog and pony shows.”

Mr. Freireich stated that relative to the Planning Study the first item of business is a Statement of Needs, which crystallizes exactly what the project is. It will tell people exactly what the Township wants to do, why, and how it plans to do it. The Newton Group, working closely with the Township, will pick names of people to be interviewed, send out the Needs Statement to those people asking them to review it before a contact is made.

When studies are done, they are done in a conversational manner. There are no checklists of items. Extensive notes are taken and great care is taken to listen to what people ask. The Newton Group acts as a representative of the Township.

**HARPER** Mr. Harper added that the basis of everything is done face to face. There are no anonymous letters and no advertisements in the newspaper. The Newton Group would work with the Township to identify all 40 or 50 community business and civic leaders and individuals in the Township to be involved. Those individual’s interests, opinions and thoughts regarding the project will be important. An invitation would be sent to them, followed up with a phone call; then we go and sit down and have a 30 to 40-minute conversation with them.

Discussion will take place about the Township’s plan, how people feel about that, the campaign, recreational activities, the amphitheater, and the things you want to do. From their answers potential donors are identified, as well as volunteer leaders. The volunteers will be trained to ask their colleagues and contemporaries for their support. Completion of the

Planning Study would identify at least 30 individuals, which gives a pretty good sample of folks. A written report would be provided to the Township in a statistical fashion which would provide comments from those interviewed. A confidential relationship would be maintained with them. The Planning Study would provide three conclusions:

- A green light says everything is in order. There is a pretty good understanding of what the Township wants to do; there's a desire on the part of the folks in the township to be supportive and that everything seems to be in place to move ahead.
- There may be a caution light. There may be folks who don't really understand what the Township wants to do; they may not understand exactly where you want to do it. There were some options in the plan and people may want to know more about that. Consideration might be given to holding an awareness event.
- There may be a red light with some problems, which need to be addressed before proceeding.

**FREIREICH** Priorities need to be clear and questions may come up which require answers. There would be 30 or 40 people interviewed for just the Planning Study, not the campaign. We want to identify where the major gifts would come from and place the most energy where the bigger bucks are.

A six-week calendar of studies would be completed to determine whether \$1.6 million is available. If the results say let's go ahead, the next step is to put together an appearance before the Capital Campaign Review Board.

The CCRB is a group of businessmen who organize capital campaigns within York County, a philanthropic hoop to go through. This group directs that there are no more than two capital campaigns plus the United Way campaign. CCRB members have businesses within the Township.

**FREIREICH** Mr. Freireich suggested to avoid mid-August or mid-November in order not to compete with the United Way Campaign.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how the 30 or 40 people are identified and whether the Supervisors are requested to provide names to be included.

**HARPER** Mr. Harper responded that people who are active in the community for a long time would be candidates. Businesses and corporations must budget and prepare.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that the project is not very well known, and this involves a major upgrade to the park. He asked how important it is that the message get out to the community.
- HARPER** Mr. Harper responded that an awareness program is extremely important, even to bring people on site. It is never too early to start to communicate.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that this type of solicitation is toward a smaller dollar. Corporations and business leaders provide a larger dollar.
- HARPER** Mr. Harper indicated that it is important to meet with people face to face.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what the general feeling of corporations is toward government projects.
- FREIREICH** Mr. Freireich responded that it is impossible to pre-judge as far as the social service agencies and different mind sets.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated the park is unique in that even though it is located in Springettsbury Township, it is like a county-wide park and will bring in a lot more people.
- FREIREICH** Mr. Freireich indicated that there is a sense of pride in the Township toward the park and this would become a premier facility.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned how they would come across to the general public. She indicated that there is a lot of focus on the needs and the age for the next 10 years toward balancing active recreation.
- FREIREICH** Mr. Freireich stated that he did not know what people's opinions are going to be.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the study would take six weeks to decide what direction to go in. He asked how long the campaign would take after the study is completed.
- HARPER** Mr. Harper responded that it would be a short term focused activity and probably be no longer than six months. If they determine that they are getting drawn, out the CCRB schedules only two in the spring from January to April and April to mid-August. They would spend time before they put leaders in place to get early solutions and determine large donors. The Volunteer leadership is usually willing to commit to three to four months rather than one to two years.

**FREIREICH** Mr. Freireich added that the staff responsibility is important. Letters will be written and sent from the Township. The staff time is intense for a week to 10 days.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the Review Board and clarified that there were two campaigns in the spring along with United Way. He asked how many the CCRB might turn down.

**FREIREICH** Mr. Freireich responded that a great unknown at this time is the Strand Capital. The Review Committee is looking at that, which is a \$4 to \$6 million project and they are not sure when they will campaign.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that if you begin in September or October, for six weeks, would you start the campaign in January.

**FREIREICH** Mr. Freireich indicated that if the planning phase is done during September and October they would begin immediately. They meet as needed and do background input in December. They would plant seeds using the media, they would confirm pledge cards. A review of the calendar would provide what is planned into the spring. A public event could kick off the project and a conclusion could be forecasted for April/May. He added that one of the benefits of having The Newton Group is that they are located right here in town.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked how The Newton Group came up with a \$1.6 Million figure.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he set that figure but that it hadn't been decided yet. The Master Park Plan indicates a figure of \$2.1 Million.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how the decisions are made with regard to benevolent gifts versus marketing.

**HARPER** Mr. Harper responded that the name of the amphitheater for \$1/2 Million gift could be a benevolent gift. These are decisions the Board needs to make.

**FREIREICH** Mr. Freireich stated that they welcome the opportunity to do this study. The Newton Group is very interested in the project.

**The Newton Group concluded their presentation at 8:50 p.m.**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that one of the things to consider is whether to explore additional land to complete the parcel.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Amic for setting up the meeting.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that there are strong benefits for both groups.

**3. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**JULY 26, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a work session at 7:00 a.m. on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Ken Pasch  
Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Paul Amic, Township Manager  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Joy Lauchman, Administrative Coordinator

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:00 a.m. The purpose of the meeting is to further discuss the concept of the Development Zone. Mrs. Mitrick thanked Mr. Stern for getting the packets of information out so quickly.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the RFP's went out to about ten engineering / planning firms. One of the ten indicated that they wouldn't be submitting a proposal.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned if 30 days was enough response time for the proposals.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that no one commented on that. He stated that the only comments involved doing business on retainer rather than by contract. He then spoke of the new aesthetics statement in the proposed ordinance.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch said that the only comment he had was that the statement is a very arguable position of what meets it and what doesn't. In terms of whoever is sitting on the Board at the time, they would have different ideas of how to interpret that statement.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that Mr. Yost informed him that the statement either needs to be very broad and open or very specific.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he would rather see the statement more open as to allow for more leeway.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned why residential was on the list of prohibited uses.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on high density residential, and commercial mixed with residential.

- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that he agrees with where Mr. Schenck's point was going.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that she questioned that too.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned allowing residential as long as it's not next to industrial.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that if someone buys a large parcel, such as Caterpillar, and wants to put Townhouses in the middle of it, with something else on the outside, he doesn't see why there shouldn't be a way to accommodate that.
- STERN** Mr. Stern then spoke of having conditional uses.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the conditional uses needing to be in compliance with all other areas of the zoning ordinance.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick referenced that item six on page five of Mr. Stern's handout references the Comprehensive Plan, which soon expires.
- STERN** Mr. Stern clarified that the Comprehensive Plan doesn't expire. However it is recommended to revise the plan every 10 years or sooner.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that a lot in the Comprehensive Plan hasn't changed. It would not require an entirely new look.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he needs a recommendation as to what items need to be changed.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed that it needs re-done.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that his feeling on the Development Zone is to start with a broad concept and clean it up as you go along.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic expressed his concerns that the zone will end up with more and more regulations and if that happens, what is the point?
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned how the requirements for the Development Zone compare to the Business Park.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that it is similar and that all the uses permitted in the Business Park would already be permitted in this zone.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that we need to be very flexible for people to show an interest in the property.
- STERN** Mr. Stern questioned if institutional uses such as schools, day care, churches, and elderly care homes should be a conditional use.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that day care should be a part of this.
- STERN** Mr. Stern clarified that day care within a facility for employees is an incidental use.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick clarified that the last two prohibited uses, which are residential and institutional are now moved to conditional uses.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on the Caterpillar site being storage for pieces of equipment. He stated that it is too hard to change an existing building into something that would be needed.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that this site may end up being the biggest opportunity of All for the future of Springettsbury Township.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned automobile and trailer sales in regards to square footage.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the ordinance seriously lacks definitions. He needs clarification from Mr. Yost that if other new uses are added, then definitions will be needed for them. Mr. Stern also added that if the Comprehensive Plan is revised then the Zoning Ordinance will need revised as well.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on not seeing a problem with keeping the York County Planning Commission informed as long as they don't control the process. He also stated that we should get as much out of their capabilities as possible.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned a minor notation on page seven regarding exceptions granted by the Zoning Officer.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that that part is coming out.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented on setting up a timeline for this project.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on developer's waiting and watching this.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned if there was a review process for checking if the environmental standards are within reason.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the writers should cite where they researched their information.
- STERN** Mr. Stern also noted that the York County Planning Commission could review it.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**JULY 26, 1999  
APPROVED**

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented on the fact that the development zone is based mostly on environmental standards.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop inquired about holding a public hearing at some point sooner as opposed to later to get input.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri questioned what the name of the gentleman was from the Planning Commission that spoke of noise.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated it was Mark Robertson
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick asked if Mr. Stern was keeping the Planning Commission updated.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop expressed concerns for having the RFP sub-contracted. He stated that the Township is looking for the best product, not the lowest bidder.
- There was a consensus of the Board to allow staff to select a firm to draft environmental standards without prior review of the firms by the Board.**
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick announced there would be another work session scheduled on September 21, 1999 at 7:00 a.m. to further discuss the Development Zone.
- The meeting adjourned at 8:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**JULY 7, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a work session at 7:00 a.m. on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Ken Pasch  
Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Paul Amic, Township Manager  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Joy Lauchman, Administrative Coordinator

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:05 a.m. The purpose of the meeting is to further discuss the concept of the Development Zone.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented that he had no new business to discuss, however, had a list of unanswered items from the previous meeting.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that one of the main issues was the size of the development zone. She made note of the fact that she is opposed to bringing the development zone up to Market Street. This would be setting the stage for future harm.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he would prefer a list of permitted uses.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick reminded the Board of Mr. Hodge from YCEDC, and commented on it being close to impossible to redevelop this area in a reasonable time with only a list of permitted uses.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop said that if the development zone is so terrible that it can't be along Market Street, then he doesn't want it at all.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented on not seeing a problem with it being along Market Street.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he is hung up on the definition. He stated that he can't get past allowing whoever to do what they want.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated the Board needs to make the decision of what will be allowed and what won't.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that there are a lot of properties around Caterpillar that are of more concern.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented on the fact that if a property is not already zoned for what they want, the developers will move on.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned if the definition has changed yet. He also inquired about getting some controls.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that there are currently no aesthetic requirements and no performance requirements. With the development zone, the controls would be whatever you add in it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned what part the Township could play into this regarding the aesthetics and interactions with neighboring properties.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that Mr. Yost had reservations about that.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented on that being unrealistic.

**STERN** Mr. Stern made referenced to Historic District regulations.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck spoke of a planned community in Gathersburg, MD.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that you can do more in Maryland, however most of Maryland is pre-planned. We don't have that type of luxury here.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned if they could do just Caterpillar without it being considered spot zoning.

**STERN** Mr. Yost said that it probably could be done

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick spoke of reducing the size of the zone.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he thought we were going to have the environmental controls.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned to what level are we going to be able to control sound.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that we will be able to control sound more than we can now, at least. He also questioned what the Board envisions the controls are going to be.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick commented on expanding the environmental controls.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he likes Mr. Stern's last point, of adopting the ordinance first then put properties into it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he wants this done right.

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri said that if you make it too stringent, then you defeat the purpose and you might as well not be here.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented the chances of someone putting in something ugly is pretty slim due to the land not being cheap.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said the high prices are prohibiting the sites being developed now. He also commented that McCrory's needs to stay in the zone due to the building being Industrial in a Commercial zone.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented on there being a lot that he would like to see that can't be done now.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented on the Township not knowing what the marketplace is like. That is what the developers know.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch referenced the Kinsley properties.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said that Mr. Kinsley does set the rules; he owns the properties. He also mentioned how businesses are getting smaller.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented on zoning getting them where they are now. He stated that it forces people to drive everywhere. He made reference to the zoning not allowing a barber shop in the middle of a residential community.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned the overlay zone that was discussed at a previous meeting. She also questioned aesthetic requirements.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that it would be possible to have aesthetic requirements only if they would have an objective list of such requirements. He then asked "If the Township had aesthetic requirements now, if Caterpillar would come before the Board with plans and asked to build what they already have now, would you let them build it?"
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck replied no.
- STERN** Mr. Stern then referenced his Development Zone list of seven items.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned, in reference to uses, having a list of both inclusive and exclusive.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**JULY 7, 1999  
APPROVED**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck spoke of the Township needing help with writing the performance standards.

**It was the general consensus of the Board for Mr. Stern to get proposals for writing the performance requirements.**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck inquired about adding a very strong statement regarding aesthetics.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch concurred with putting in a very strong statement regarding aesthetics. This way the Board can at least speak with developers about it.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 8:15 a.m.

**There was a brief executive session following the meeting regarding a personnel matter.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**JUNE 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a work session at 7:00 p.m. on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Ken Pasch

**MEMBERS NOT  
IN ATTENDANCE:**

Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Paul Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Township Solicitor  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Joy Lauchman, Administrative Coordinator  
Alan Maciejewski, Planning Commission  
Mark Robertson, Planning Commission  
Larry Gibbs, Planning Commission  
Larry Stets, Planning Commission  
Don Allison, Planning Commission  
Mike Shaffer, York County Planning Commission  
Randy Beck, York County Planning Commission

**MITRICK**

Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. The purpose of the meeting is to further discuss the concept of the Development Zone.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern introduced Mr. Shaffer and Mr. Beck of York County Planning Commission.

**BECK**

Mr. Beck stated that the County is not opposed to a mix of uses in a zone, however, the majority of mixed uses are in smaller communities. Performance zoning has not been too popular in this area due to the fact that it is something that is enforced after the fact. Standards would be measured when there is pending litigation rather than up front. There will not be any “test” or “on site verification” with flexible zoning.

Mr. Beck suggested getting the County transportation and planning department to take a look at that aspect of the proposal. He referenced Caterpillar, whose facility will most likely be divided into several parcels and traffic movement through there. He stated that the Land Development plans will be much more critical, as well as traffic studies done.

Mr. Beck spoke of performance requirements. He commented on noise, vibration, and odor being regulated at the district boundary. That is a very broad assumption when you’re talking about an array of uses that might

occur in the zone. He stated that this is a subject that is open to a lot of interpretation.

**STETS** Mr. Stets questioned if there were any examples of this in Pennsylvania.

**BECK** Mr. Beck stated that he would have to research that for Mr. Stets.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson commented on the baseline for noise being route 30.

**BECK** Mr. Beck commented on having a noise meter reading completed around the Township at peak and off peak times. Mr. Beck stated that he was curious about the aesthetics questions. He stated that the Township can encourage people very strongly, however that is about it unless you have an historic district.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that the reason for concern over aesthetics is due to that section of the Township being the most visible and also located in the center of the Township.

**YOST** Attorney Yost stated that aesthetics doesn't have to be a bad word. The difficulty is setting aesthetics standards that can be applied objectively as opposed to what you or I think they should be.

**BECK** Mr. Beck stated that they could get in some of their concerns depending on what standards you choose to apply.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson referenced a rail yard in Pittsburgh in Station Square where it is zoned commercial in the middle and has other businesses next to it.

**STETS** Mr. Stets expressed his concern for flexible zoning in reference to when you state anything can go in except these few uses, it leaves a wide spectrum open. He stated that he doesn't believe that they could presume to think of everything that we don't want.

**ROBERSON** Mr. Robertson commented on a business that gives back millions of dollars to their employees every year because it is so profitable. Would we want to turn down a business like that coming in?

**BECK** Mr. Beck questioned if Caterpillar was still in full employment, would the Township still be considering this?

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson made reference that from an economic standpoint, manufacturing plants bring in three dollars of income for every one dollar of manufacturing. There is a wide plethora of various types of industrial manufacturing.

**BECK** Mr. Beck referenced an industrial park with interesting uses.

- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick spoke of a meeting at Caterpillar, in which they spoke of a time frame for selling it as a whole.
- BECK** Mr. Beck stated that the nature of the design of the Caterpillar facility doesn't lend itself to someone going in and just setting up shop.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that the issue that is major to her is that the development zone is right up to Market Street, near residential areas.
- BECK** Mr. Beck questioned if this zone was too expansive. How is this zone going to interface with surrounding zones.
- SHAFFER** Mr. Shaffer questioned why the commercial area by Market Street was included in the development zone.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that when this project was started in 1996, Market Street was in need of redevelopment. Since then Wal-Mart has expanded and Home Depot has decided to move into McCroy's. Mr. Stern also pointed out that the McCroy's site is now a perfect example of mixed use, with a warehouse and distribution facility at the north, retail at the south, and possibly light manufacturing in the center.
- As far as other areas around Caterpillar, Mr. Stern referenced the former Lowe's building which is in a commercial zone and as of now there will never be a commercial user. They have had several contacts for industrial uses.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that it was suggested to him by the Board that they look at this particular area because of Caterpillar being in financial difficulty. At that time, they were concerned with the York Mall and problems with McCroy's. Mr. Amic also stated that conditions have changed since then.
- YOST** Mr. Yost spoke of spot zoning and not creating an island.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that the rail line that goes through becomes a natural boundary. The cut off line Mr. Maciejewski spoke of was North Hills Road and out around York Container using the railroad.
- BECK** Mr. Beck commented on the Board determining how close they want the development zone to be to the residences.
- SHAFFER** Mr. Shaffer questioned if it was intended to be an actual zone.
- STETS** Mr. Stets questioned if there could be bonuses given in the overlay districts.
- BECK** Mr. Beck believes that that concept would be possible in this zone with the caveats that there are regulations to that. Within the proper context, an

unlimited amount could be done. With the overlay approach, the decisions need to be made that which regulations apply and which will they be exempted from.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski expressed concerns for Caterpillar selling only half of their land. The Township doesn't have control of this property.

**BECK** Mr. Beck spoke of overlay restrictions and options.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned if a more clean development zone would be more marketable or appealing.

**STERN** Mr. Stern clarified not only more appealing, but less confusing.

**BECK** Mr. Beck stated that there could be a bit of a problem. With the initial contacts, you want to encourage people to give them a clean idea. If there was a clear purpose statement that might be an advantage. It depends on how you set it up.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch said that it has to be something that is simple. Any of these relocation outfits are looking for a simple solution where they can get in and sell it to their perspective client. They want to move and move fast.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick spoke of given consideration to shrinking the zone.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated the proposed change of size to the Development zone seemed like a clean break.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated the likelihood of the major properties changing in the near future is pretty remote.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated if the York Mall area was included in the zone you might see some new activity on the periphery. It might be in our favor to include those because it is not going to take away from what is there now.

**BECK** Mr. Beck commented on issues of balance and the impact to the area.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that Mr. Stern is looking for a consensus on whether to shrink down the zone. She expressed her concerns for the properties around Market Street.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it needs more discussion.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that drawing a map isn't the most difficult part.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick indicated that another work session would be scheduled.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**JUNE 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

**MITRICK**                Mrs. Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION – BIO-SOLIDS**

**JUNE 2, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Directors of Springettsbury Township met at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, PA on Wednesday, June 2, 1999 for the purpose of a Work Session on Bio-Solids.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Nick Gurreri

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Don Bishop

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Jim Noel, Wastewater Treatment Plant  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Mike Myers, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Pete D'Adamo, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the Work Session to order at 7 p.m. The purpose of this Work Session was to listen to a presentation on Springettsbury Township Bio-Solids analysis by R. K. & K.

**HALBERT** Robert Halbert presented an overall commentary on why R. K. & K. found itself in the midst of the Bio-Solids matter. Because there was no cost to the Township, a question arose as to how much value the study would be. Mr. Halbert recalled discussion at the April meeting of the Board of Supervisors where a number of items had been discussed, one of which was the Hopewell Township permit issues and the potential for Springettsbury Township becoming a host facility for pelletization under the Susquehanna umbrella.

Mr. Halbert stated that R. K. & K. felt a lack of total understanding of the situation of how things have changed over the past 17 years from a solids handling standpoint. At that time Buchart-Horn had designed a 12.3 mgd sewage treatment plant. The late Les Ritter and Mr. Halbert realized that if a minor change were made costing \$150,000, more liquid could be filtered through the plant by making one Change Order, which would result in an additional 2.8 mgd hydraulic capacity. That was approved following spending \$10 million for 4 mgd. The plant had been finalized, which flow eventually increased from 12.3 to 15 mgd but the solids

system remained the same. The team that had designed the entire plant designed the Bio-Solids handling. However, nothing had been done to upgrade the Bio-Solids handling. Now 17 to 18 years later, hydraulically there are no issues; but Bio-Solids are reaching near capacity. The Bio-Solids issues are growing, such as odors, and equipment breakdowns. Mr. Halbert commented on the fact that Springettsbury Township was looking at a public relations program for more land application of Bio-Solids and potentially contracting out for pelletization or having someone else handle the solids on site.

At that point Mr. Halbert had discussed this project with Mr. Amic, and in order to bring themselves up to speed volunteered their time to upgrade their knowledge. Mr. Halbert volunteered to do this as expeditiously as possible, look at the past studies that had been done, including Springettsbury's own evaluation and report back to Mr. Amic.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert then passed the explanation to Mr. Pete D'Adamo as his mission. Mr. D'Adamo previously had been heavily involved in Waste Water plants in Delaware, Maryland and Pennsylvania, is a licensed sewage operator and a PhD candidate at Johns Hopkins. Mr. D'Adamo was requested to evaluate the work that had been done over the subsequent years and some of the fairly modest work which had been done recently. In other words to perform a Bio-Solids evaluation.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo provided a series of slides to bring about an update as to how this particular point was reached. An evaluation was done by looking at the existing facility, reviewing the recent 537 Plan update, and the Bio-Solids Analysis done by the Township. Mr. D'Adamo's agenda was to describe the existing conditions, look at future conditions at the site, identify any deficiencies or things that need to be looked at given existing and future conditions, develop a set of alternatives some of which were built around the recent proposal made for a host facility, and what was offered in the recent Act 537 update. Cost analyses, life cycle costs were include to result in an implementation plan, which basically follows the format.

Aerobic Digestion Process – The purpose of this process is to use bacteria to eat each other. There is very little food in this process; they degrade each other, destroy solids made of organic matter and reduce the total solids in the plant. At the same time this is accomplished, it stabilizes the sludge. It also functions as a holding facility for other Bio-Solids processes which occur afterwards. In the Springettsbury plant the process which occurs afterwards is called the Dissolved Air Flotation Thickener. These are mainly used for treating solids from a biological treatment process. Air is injected under pressure and then released into a tank – sometimes with or without power – and as the bubbles are released into

the atmosphere they form underneath the sludge bringing it to the top in sludge blanket form. The scum is floated off into a hopper. The idea is when waste solids are transferred from the secondary waste treatment process it is very dilute (.7% solids). The idea of this process is to remove some of that water so the next process could treat and remove more water. The idea is to get as much water out of the sludge as possible and render it into a condition where it is not objectionable. This process is designed to take solids from secondary treatment that might be .7% solids and generate 3 to 4% solids. It is still 96% water.

Dewatering Process – Belt filter presses are currently in place using mechanical components and belts to squeeze more water out of the sludge. A polymer conditioner is added which helps to remove the water that resides around the particles and helps all the particles come together and then with pressure squeeze more water out. Generally in Springettsbury's present process the material will change from 2-1/2 to 4% solids to about 14% solids which still includes a lot of water. It's a cake, but it's doesn't stand well by itself. This process is used to reduce the total volume necessary to haul away.

Lime Stabilization/Land Application – In this process lime is added again to stabilize the solids to destroy bacteria and destroy odor causing compounds. This material is mixed with the dewatering solids and applied to the land as an amendment to the soil. This process is used at various land agricultural locations and has become a cost-effective practice.

Composting – This is mixing dewatered solids with a bulking agent such as wood chips and composting in a stack pile arrangement which accomplishes a similar thing, i.e., to stabilize the sludge, destroy bacteria, pathogens and render the final product something not objectionable. In this instance in terms of regulatory issues, it can be used in more locations than the lime stabilized sludge. Presently Springettsbury has about a 50/50 mix between these two processes, lime stabilization and composting with composting occurring more during wet weather times when fields are not opened for land application.

Existing Conditions – Average flow presently is 11 mgd. The plant was re-rated for a design flow of 15 mgd, but this does not really address the Bio-Solids portion. Approximate present flows of Bio-Solids generation is about 2600 dry tons per year with the water removed. If one views wet tons at 14% solids that equals 18 to 20,000 wet tons/year. The more water processed out, the lower that number becomes which factor is applicable in the entire analysis. Projected Bio-Solids generation at 15 mgd is about 3,400 hydraulic tons per year. Review of the Act 537 Plan indicates analysis had been done on projected flows with a futuristic look at what's going to happen with development in the township and the connected

municipalities. Projecting that out for approximately a 20-year period a potential flow of 22 mgd was revealed. A review of the impact to Springettsbury's facility was made into the future based on possible scenarios if flows needed to be developed such as this and actually and treatment were necessary from Springettsbury's site. If the flows were to double, other things would have to be addressed at the plant. Projected into the future this would mean 4700 tons per year.

Deficiencies – One of the things found is that there is very little volatile solids reduction in aerobic digester. The objective is for the bacteria to eat each other, destroy each other, convert themselves into carbon dioxide and water and to use each other for food. In that process the volatile solids are destroyed and the solids reduced throughout the system. Generally this results in somewhere around 3 to 7% depending on the time of year. If the digestion process were used for stabilization only, the figure would be upwards of 38%. However, solids are not being destroyed. There are reasons for this, and the aeration capacity is limited. In the 537 Plan a discussion appears on the dry aeration capacity in the size of the basins. DEP has a requirement indicating that so much cubic feet per minute of air must be provided per thousand cubic feet of basin capacity. There is a standard of 25. The analysis in the Act 537 Plan indicated that Springettsbury's digestive tank capacity was half of what it really is. That applies only to one tank, but there are actually two. The analysis on the amount of applied air assumed that was the total tank capacity, which showed it was underestimated as to how much air would be needed. It indicated at that time that DEP requirements were met; however, the requirements are not met. It is written that you have to provide that much with one blower out of service. Project that into the future – 15 mgd or 22 mgd there are some serious issues to address. Bio-Solids are not being destroyed. It takes the bacteria and the oxygen to do that. If there is insufficient oxygen then there are odor issues. In the Act 537 Plan an analysis was done to identify sources of odor resulting in a rating system. Besides the composting area the digester is rated the highest as generating odors during certain times of the year, particularly when oxygen levels are low. If the solid concentrations get too high it can't be mixed properly in addition to having oxygen applied.

**NOEL** Jim Noel asked whether Mr. D'Adamo would clarify what was meant by not meeting DEP requirements, i.e., that this concerned requirements that would be a part of a new plant construction. DEP is well aware of our physical plant processes. Mr. Noel wished to make the Board aware that the Township is not operating in non-compliance.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated that Mr. Noel was correct. If a new plant were to be designed today, more aeration capacity would be required based on

DEP requirements. The present system is not working the way it was intended and the odor problem will only get worse.

If new construction were being done, a requirement is in place that indicates so many pounds of Bio-Solids per size of the basin. Springettsbury is right on the upper limit. If there were a new plant planned today, Springettsbury is right at the top requirement. Upwards to 15 mgd or further it would be beyond the allowable limit.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked for clarification whether Springettsbury is at that limit with the gallonage being handled right now.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo clarified that as far as the Bio-Solids handling, that was correct.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert added that the consequences are downstream influences and odors.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked whether the next few slides would indicate what needs to be done.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated that he would provide slides showing each of the processes:

Bio-Solids Thickening. Present operating strategy in terms of the number of hours that the unit is operating are slightly over the original design with respect to solids. It's a little bit under load with respect to hydraulics or gallons per minute flow. Maintenance issues are becoming a bigger and bigger concern with the unit which has some age. Looking at future conditions, that system becomes another limiting aspect of Bio-Solids processes.

Dewatering – Some rehabilitation is needed to the existing filter presses. An estimate of \$200,000 had been made to completely overhaul the units which have aged. A bigger concern is a 14% solids cake coming off of the belt filter presses. The sludge is not very dewaterable and part of the reason for that is because the digester is not doing what it's supposed to be doing. When you have just biological sludge, it's just not as dewaterable than if you had primary treatment as well. The biggest reason is the digester is not functioning properly. The belt filter press is producing on the low end of what would be expected of a belt filter press resulting in the additional wet tons of material that must be mixed with wood chips or add lime to it and then take it to the fields. An example that will make sense later if you go from 14% solids to 20% solids that's a 30% reduction in the wet tonnage that you have to dispose of. It's significant. A limiting factor now and especially in the future would be in stacking the cake. It's

not soupy but when spread, a 14% cake spreads out so that limits how much can be stored. If you wanted to store winter time solids for composting and lime stabilized solids then it really limits how high you can stack the material and limits the available storage capacity. If a 20% cake were processed, it has a consistency much more like dirt, and it can be piled up and stored.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo summarized with a slide showing the reflection of specific items of concern to the township and those involved in the solids disposal business with land application issues. One of the original reasons for doing analysis was that the odors were becoming more of a concern, and the public was becoming more vocal to the township. Sludge composting has always historically been a difficult process to deal with from the standpoint of odors. Limitations of the digester and the ability to stabilize sludge doesn't help in terms of the raw material that is used even though the composting is supposed to stabilize material. It would work better if what was being provided there was a better material resulting in odors. The sludge cake has too much water in it for the belt filter press. Fields are not available in the winter time for disposal which forces composting which is a source of odor and complaints. General concern in terms of land application is acquiring land disposal sites. Facing that and dealing with other townships not wanting sludge from other municipalities despite other overriding regulations are issues of major focus, especially when Bio-Solids issues are addressed and alternatives are sought. Future increases in Bio-Solids production indicate the need for additional disposal sites.

#### **A list of Alternatives**

Alternative 1 – To upgrade sludge digestion, thickening, dewatering facilities, land application, which is a variation of what is in the Act 537 Plan. Sludge digestion was added because that's the big problem.

Alternative 2 – This encompasses what's in the Act 537 Plan, which is to deal/upgrade thickening, dewatering and go primarily to land application and minimize composting.

Alternative 3 – This is a proprietary process actually similar to what is presently being done. This takes dewatered solids and adds lime into the process. Depending on the amount of lime the temperature has built up, solids can be generated that can be classified as what is called "B" disposal solids or "A" disposal. Right now the lime stabilized sludge is "B" and the compost is "A". This is generally run by an outside entity like Bio Grow or a firm like that which comes in and does the financing, construction and operation of the facility or the township would build it and then contract out to those people to operate it. They secure all their

own permitted sites, so they deal with it and bring the trucks in and haul it away. The municipality doesn't have to deal with acquiring sites.

Alternative 4 – This alternative had been discussed in 1993/94 by a consultant reviewing pelletization and composting. The IPS composting system is an enclosed composting system with the idea that the process can be controlled better; it's not subject to the elements. The process can happen faster and gases can be collected and the odor dealt with.

Alternative 5 – Upgrade the existing sludge processing facilities. A host facility sludge drying pelletization plant where the township would enter into agreement with Susquehanna or Bio Grow, etc. Your sludge would be sent there and a percentage of the net sales would be returned. That facility would be financed by an outside entity and operated by the outside entity interested in taking other sludge from other municipalities.

Alternative 6 – Similar to alternative 5 except under this scenario it would be township owned, so instead of an outside entity financing the construction, the township would finance. The Township would decide whether the staff would operate it or contract out to someone to operate it. This is a very complicated process.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked where that pelletized sludge ends up.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo responded that the larger cities, such as the City of Baltimore, Boston, New York use rail. They sell and ship down south to Florida to the citrus growers. The smaller producers are left out of that loop because of transportation costs. They sell it locally and sometimes give it away.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert commented that the consensus is that the larger cities involved in the pelletization process can ship mass to Florida. We all drink orange juice which is fertilized by palletized sludge; the smaller conveyors of this material were pushed out of the market. They originally got into a plan which charged \$36.00/ton to process sludge and then market that and for every percentage we get back is discounted. The market dried up when the large municipalities got into pushing sludge to Florida. Most of them are giving it away such as Hagerstown, Maryland. The product is a great soil conditioner and supplemental fertilizer.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked how that would be perceived as less objectionable than our composted sludge.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that the product is dryer and visually less offensive. It can be stored on the farmer's field in piles and spread or deposited. It doesn't look like sludge.

- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo commented that the product is 90 to 95% solids.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck speculated that in the future whether the same “not in my backyard syndrome” will be associated with the palletized material.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that palletization is a popular process where the product is dried with a huge dryer, which does make it a Class “A” product similar to compost.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the product will burn.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo responded that if the product is to be burned it would not be dried to that degree.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel commented that there will always be a negative mentality. In some of the negotiation processes, the public didn’t care whether it was Class A, B, or C or whatever, but did not want the product in their backyard. In Hallam Township there had been success in the negotiation for an exemption to the regulation for a Class “A” products so it depends on the mentality.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert commented that the objection is not necessarily in the end users, but will be with the stack with white billowing smoke even though it’s designed to not create a BOC problem. It’s the trucks going at all times, day and night, especially at night hauling in sludge, hauling out product. It’s more localized to source as opposed to distribution.
- MYERS** Mr. Myers stated that as a host facility there would be trucks coming from other municipalities bringing their sludge in.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated that the same smoke stack issue would be present. Upon entering one of those facilities the odor would be extremely offensive, but that is all treated with wet scrubbers. The same type of factors exist but there is less in more open places like Hopewell Township or Hellam Township.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel stated it looks like a fertilizer one could purchase at Lowe’s.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that Milwaukee had been producing this for 50 years.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that the Milwaukee product was a compost product.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo agreed with Mr. Noel. He designed a lot of disposal systems in Pennsylvania. It is a huge public relations educational process

to convince people that it makes sense and that it preserves open space. He added that there would always be an element that won't be convinced. Many believe that it represents more growth in the township which they don't want.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel mentioned that the mentality then is brought into the back yard and the impression that we are burning toxic hazardous waste in our backyard would be something we would have to provide a public relations work towards understanding.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated this would be a management problem.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo provided futuristic planning for each alternative as follows:

**Upgrade Sludge Digestion/Thickening/Dewatering Facility –  
Land Application.**

Mr. D'Adamo discussed replacing the dissolved air flotation unit with a gravity belt thickener, upgrading the digestion process with more modern, state-of-the-art digestion design, deeper construction, better oxygen transfer and allowing a higher percent solids in the digestion process. Having a belt filter press as a backup primarily relying on a centrifuge and again the advantage there results in a 20% higher cake reducing the wet tons from 20,000 wet tons/year down to about 14,000, which is significant.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what the centrifuge would replace.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated it would replace the belt filter press. You have two presently, smaller, self-contained units not opened to the atmosphere. What's happened is back in the early 80's belt filter presses were installed in a lot of plants, and they worked well. Centrifuges were always more expensive, more energy intensive, but they also had metallurgical problems because of the nature of the material which was gritty that there was a lot of corrosion, destruction, and abrasion. Through progress newer materials have extended the life of the systems. They are still more expensive to purchase and to operate, but the maintenance costs are lower, and they perform better. Springettsbury had a trial run done last summer, and the result was about a 21% cake, which for a centrifuge isn't that great. Part of the reason for that had to do with the nature of the solids. They also had to use a lot more polymer than what's typically used for a centrifuge in activated sludge. Discussions were held with the people that did the piloting, they felt it was the nature of the sludge that caused some of those problems. The costs do reflect that high polymer use is the cost being shown. Potentially with an upgrade in the digestion process you can improve upon that.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic asked whether it would be as high as 24%.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo responded that the two studies he had reviewed indicated 20.9 to 21%.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel commented that it was an average of 21%. When pilot tests are done they use three or four different polymers. If the digestion process can be upgraded, a 24% result would not be out of the question.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated 24% would be a dramatic change.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that would be almost doubling the present percentage.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert commented that in 1981-82 a pilot test run which revealed about 13 – 14%. The pilot test was consistent with what was anticipated based on the sludge.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic asked whether using this plan a belt filter press would be used as a backup system.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo indicated that would be correct.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented then that if one would go down for repair, then the centrifuge would be put in and the other used as a backup.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo stated that if you were a new facility redundancy would be a major factor. Having a backup filter press which is going to generate the lower percent solids is possible. If the centrifuge goes down for however long a period of time that is, a larger centrifuge could be put in, or two smaller centrifuges could be installed. R. K. & K. would normally recommend having redundancy in anything you do.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel commented that some type of redundancy is necessary because there are times of the year where the equipment cannot be down for seven days without some ability to dewater. There would be a great amount of difficulty trying to dispose of liquid sludge. There are not a lot of treatment plants out there designed to take the amount of material that Springettsbury would need to dispose of. He added that during a previous Work Session the consensus was to get rid of both presses.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert commented that it is not an easy process to just go from one to the other. One is a pump system and the other belt press, which is a different scenario. Instead of trashing both, keep one that is serviceable without putting a lot of money into it, but still have two centrifuges. There are a lot of reasons, not just redundancy, but it’s also trouble shooting.

When you have one set of problem, then you go to the other and find out why that one's still working and trouble shoot against the one that's got the problem. Use both to make a better maintainer of the facility. Cost numbers were factored in for two centrifuges maybe smaller than originally proposed.

**Lime Stabilization**

**D'ADAMO** This alternative relies on lime stabilization and land application not composting and then with the smaller quantity of wet tons produced per year it becomes more feasible to store during wet weather periods. This material could be stacked higher to come up with using an existing covered or enclosed area. If necessary odor control could be added to allow the operator a lot more flexibility during wet years.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert added that that alternative included odor control in the digesters, which would be covered and the air treated.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel commented that the major source of odors generate from the digesters. The solids end of the odor complaints are a different story.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that one of the comments made earlier about the digesters was that in comparison of our existing digesters and what's available today there is a very significant difference in terms of water taken out.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo responded that digesters designed with enough air and enough retention time given the climate and geography can reduce the solids. In the past they would be designed as a fill and draw batch reaction. Now the view is toward a series of flows where the materials flow into one reactor, stay a certain amount of time, and overflow into another reactor. The theory is that it's a much more efficient process in order to remove a lot more solids in a reactor.

Because of air pollution issues more and more people are covering the facility, but obviously the bacteria create heat when they degrade each other. Heat is good to a point because reaction rates happen faster, so the whole process happens faster in the same size reactor with a covered system. In the summer time it gets too hot because certain type of bacteria can only stand so much temperature.

Those are some of the issues of things being reviewed now. Springettsbury has a system to do biological nutrient removal in the waste activating process. That involves a mixture of aerobic zones and zones of just mixing where they call it noxic zones. Now they are designing digesters that do this because a portion of the bugs are degraded not using oxygen but using nitrate, and what that does is that it reduces the oxygen

demand to the system and also preserves the alkalinity and keeps a nice process in terms of maintaining pH. The bugs are happy. People had been focusing on the secondary process, the waste activating sludge process; now in more recent years people are looking at ways to treat digestion processes.

This is basically what is in the Act 537 Plan. Again it involves replacing DAF, the gravity thickener. It doesn't address the digestion process other than odor control. It's still an important issue. It involves replacing the belt filter press with the centrifuge and providing storage in the winter time for your Bio-Solids.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned what it means to have a 20% solids stack.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo responded that a stack could be 3 feet high.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel added that the current material is like a wet cement. It almost pours when mixed with lime. If the solids level could be raised it could be stacked like dirt.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch concluded that it would not be stacked in layers. It would go higher and could be scooped with a front end loader.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated with this option more polymers will be used and it is more difficult to reach the 20% level because of the poor material that we are trying to dewater plus with a covered digester you may want to switch processes. One of the areas of concern is the influence on the gravity belt thickener in the present system.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the gravity belt must be used with the centrifuge.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert commented that the whole idea is to produce less material, which using the gravity belt thickener accomplishes very efficiently.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo stated that if you don't have a process like the existing dissolved air flotation or a gravity belt thickener to meet the requirements you need bigger digestion tanks.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about requirements that need to be met for the removal of water.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that the water goes back to the liquid side of the plant.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch continued that the water gets treated before it gets dumped. He questioned whether the capacity to do that is in place now.

- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that there is a side stream balance calculation that a certain amount of water comes back through treatment.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo indicated the question to be valid because when you are taking a system that produces 14% solids and going to 20%, obviously more water is going to the side stream.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert added that when the Bio-Solids side of the facility is more productive, the balance needs to be checked to make sure that the liquid side is not overloaded.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that we have the capacity to increase the water flow and still meet all the requirements that are needed to be met.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether it would pay to use both belts, both sides or eliminate one belt.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that there are two items to consider: thickening which reduces the liquid a little bit and then there’s dewatering.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that would refer to a whole different belt unit, because there is a mechanical one now used as a press, and it is different for a belt thickener.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo indicated this is a belt on a roller, which has its own plows or rakes with fingers that move. Polymer is added to the material and the water moves out and goes through it. The moveable rakes allow things to break their paths and allow more water to go through. There is a lot of pumping involved, pressurization, forced air into the water, and scrapers.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel added that this process is much more labor intensive and much more energy intensive.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated that the comparison is 1980’s technology and 1990’s technology.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo indicated that with a gravity belt thickener you might be talking about a 3 hp motor. Regarding the water you’re talking about a .7 and 3-4%.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned whether the water that is used comes back through the plant again, when it goes through all its cycles, and whether it ever exhausts its usefulness.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated eventually the molecule of water would leave the plant.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated that if the material were organic it might be converted to carbon dioxide and go into the atmosphere.

**Upgrade Existing Bio Fix Process**

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo stated that the bio fix process, which is a proprietary process that is used, basically lime stabilization taking dewatered sludge mixing with lime, monitoring temperatures and creating at least a Class "B" material. The objective is to reduce the wet tonnage to any process. A gravity belt thickener and a centrifuge would be added as part of this alternative. This type of operation is usually contracted out where a contractor would come in and haul it all away, or the contractor could run the process, or even more depending upon what would be negotiated. This process is not that much different from what you're doing, but you don't have to worry about where it's going.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel interjected that would be in a "broad" sense because the township still has the responsibility for it.

**Upgrade Existing Sludge Processing Facilities – IPS –  
In-Vessel Composting**

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated that this had been reviewed by another consultant years ago, which showed a different in-vessel composting system. A common thread throughout this is to get as much water out through the gravity belt thickener, centrifuge, that this system would involve going to 100% composting in an enclosed facility with an appropriate odor control generating a Class "A" product, and then being sold.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert commented that, instead of having a concrete pad there with piles of compost mix, it would be housed in a building.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether composting it would still include forcing air through it even though it would be an inside facility.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that this would be done inside a building with large mixing units. Instead of turning the piles after a certain period of time it would be done automatically in a confined space.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that there would be more than one vessel in different stages.

**Sludge Drying Host Facility**

**D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo indicated there had been some discussion with a contractor and one of the points was accepting a 20% cake sludge. They would provide the township with a discount on a certain percentage of wet tons generated which worked out to be about 1/6 of the total annual tons generated. A discounted fee of \$35.00 a wet ton and anything over and above that would be their typical fee. Estimates ranged anywhere from \$70.00 to \$80.00 a wet ton. They would also give you money back from the net sales of anything sold which would include other entity sludge, but the viability of sales in the large cities are cornering a lot of the more lucrative markets. It’s questionable how much revenue will be received for the sale of that material.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert added that his sense of this host facility situation and the profitability of that operation discounting for sludge would be made up primarily from other communities and the fact that they want to process the rest of the sludge at a normal rate. The return on their sales would be questionable.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that would be before you get a percentage.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated that to be correct, and additionally, this may not be a large amount, and this would be a profitable operation for them based solely on their ability to attract other customers.

**D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo indicated that their discount had been factored in plus the reasonable estimate of what the tipping fee would be for over and above that discount. Also reviewed was the fact that side streams would have to be treated. There is lost revenue from tap ins and hookups in the future. That certain amount of capacity is taken up. The initial proposal that had been provided indicated it didn’t seem like a real bargain.

**Township Owned Dewatering Process**

**D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo indicated that the last alternative is a similar alternative except we’re looking at the township handling the sludge palletization plant similar to a plant in Hagerstown, MD. The Hagerstown municipality owns the design, built the plant, and contracts out to Waste Management to operate it. Waste Management operates the facility and is responsible for operating the drying process which is a big dryer that heats most of the water out of the sludge. The off-gas material is collected for treatment as well as any vapor to be dealt with or treated at the treatment plant. In this alternative the process will remove water so the gravity belt thickener is

still being used. There is a possibility for using the existing primary tanks, as potential sludge holding tanks and then a dewatering process. Instead of going back to the existing building, the dewatering facilities would be put in concert with the sludge drying process because they should be next to one another. The cake that comes off the centrifuge would go right into the sludge dryer, and everything is together. The high solids material would be generated and potentially the operation could be contracted out to a firm such as Waste Management that would be responsible for operating and disposing of the material. If a cost analysis were done to evaluate all these alternatives, don't just look at costs. Certainly capital and operating costs are important criteria, but especially with sludge it's not the final criteria because sludge is such a headache.

**Key Issues:  
Capital/Operating Costs, etc.**

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo continued with a discussion of key financial issues. There are a lot of communities that have opted for more expensive alternatives like contracting out operations to just eliminate dealing with it. Below are some important items for consideration:

- Flexibility is important, i.e., will the process be adaptable to changes in your flow stream over time, either hydraulically or organically to growth in the future.
- Different ways to operate a gravity belt thickener.
- Flexibility in operations is important in evaluating alternatives. Side stream impacts can affect the hydraulic processes for the host facility.
- Implementability. A plan may sound really good but if you can't implement it, it's worthless.
- Public acceptance is a big part of that such as trucks coming in day and night.
- Stack treating of gases generated, etc. and how that is perceived by the public.
- Administrative burdens of a contract operation and dealing with an outside contractor.
- Letting contracts, as well as the legal issues involved with township personnel involved.
- Township ownership and financing verses private enterprise ownership and financing
- Is it more beneficial for the township to totally step back and let some entity come in and build their own facility, accept other people's ways and be responsible for operating it, or is it better for the township to have more control.

**Township Ownership: Pros and Cons**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there would be any problem with that with the union contract.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that there may be a problem given the sludge hauling involved by the present Union.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel added that there are provisions in the contract which supposedly prohibit contracting out operations that are currently performed by township employees.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo indicated that the operators bring the trucks in, nothing gets stored on your site. They take it to wherever their sites are. As soon as you generate something it is transported out of the area. The potential storage problems are eliminated. It’s potentially easier if you have the disposal process to coordinate thickening and dewatering. You don’t want to get into a position where you are dewatering solids and then you’ve got to put it in a truck and drive it across the street to a palletization plant and dump it in there. It’s much better for it all to be done in one place.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo indicated that it’s more expensive and the numbers show that. Some municipalities opt to just pay the premium and not deal with it. You have to rely on the outside contractor and the solvency of that contractor and the potential that they could go out of the business. You sort of cut off your other options because you relied on this one process. If you had to get back in the business it would be difficult.

### **Host Facility Evaluation**

The pros as presented are potential cost savings. An advantage with the sludge drying is that it’s a Class “A” material which opens avenues for disposal. Potentially this could reduce complaints. Year round disposal is available and there is no need for storage facilities.

### **Low Operating Maintenance Demands**

There is an operating maintenance demand that has just been shifted to another entity.

### **Cons**

- Increased truck traffic. We don’t want to belittle that. It’s a major concern as well as roads.
- The Township’s acceptance of everyone else’s puts a certain perception in people’s minds.

- They're financing it, building it, and operating it. All the township receives is discount and a cut of the proceeds from the sale.
- If something happened to the entity, how do you get back into the land application business. It limits your options.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated quite a range of capital costs. The host facility reflects dewatering, thickening, upgrades, things like that, but the costs of the actual palletization plan cost is high. This reveals the highest operating cost based on the information provided. When you look at life cycle costs and present worth alternatives #1 and 2 are fairly close.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked for what period of time.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what the life cycle would be.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated the present worth analysis is based on forty years. The main difference is in operating cost, because with Alternative #1 with the digestion system upgrade, destruction of solids in the digestive system impacts downstream processes, and impacts the amount of polymer needed; it impacts the amount of solids you have to dewater and has a major impact on the final disposal and the cost of that.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked about the operating cost of Alternate #1 and whether that number takes into effect removal of equipment now in use.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo responded that this is the same operating cost showed before but it was different from the Act 537.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the difference between the plant as it exists now and Alternate #1 is that we just wouldn't have the capital cost.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo responded that all the alternatives reflect the capital improvements to the plant.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch whether the same operating cost would prevail if nothing was done.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated it would not be the same because that operating cost reflects the cost to operate a centrifuge a belt filter press.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert commented that it is not an incremental increase of total operating cost.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch mentioned that a problem exists with some of our digestion in the belt presses, and there is a need for some significant maintenance items to take place. What would be the effect in terms of capital if nothing

were done, or if items 1 through 6 were implemented, and would the operating cost actually change?

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated he did not have a calculation. He provided his opinion about it. If you did nothing you would not have odor control on the covered digesters; therefore, you wouldn't have all the maintenance and operating costs of controlling those odors that go into the atmosphere, thus the cost would be less. This is incrementally more because you're doing something different, i.e. adding to what you're currently doing. The other item would be as a contrast to that, replacing your dissolved air flotation thickener with a unit which has a lot less operation maintenance cost, so for that particular unit, the O & M cost would actually go down in comparison to what is presently being done.

Mr. Halbert continued that the cost to operate and maintain the centrifuge will go up compared to doing what you're currently doing now.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated that the recuperation there is on the disposal end because you've got less to dispose of.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that review of this on a unit-by-unit basis indicates that some costs will go up, some are new, some are going to go down. If you did nothing your overall operating cost would be less. The only one you're really saving money on is the DAF. Everywhere else is providing a higher level of treatment.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo added that money would be saved on disposal because there would be less sludge volume.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel added that in the Act 537 Plan part of the justification for spending money was for the centrifuges. The up-front capital cost are high but they can be recouped. The point is that it is cheaper to buy the centrifuge than it is to keep and rehabilitate the belt filter press.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that in all these scenarios you're eliminating compost.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that one thing that is necessary in terms of capital cost and that is to spend money for odor control of some type.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that cost is \$1.8 million for odor control in the capital budget.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated this is Bio-Solids. There was an odor control plan for the liquid side.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel stated that the \$1.8 million didn't even touch the solids end of it.

- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that he was not sure if anyone really has a complete understanding of what is included in the \$1.8 million.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel stated it was part of the comprehensive overhaul or upgrade of the facility that was reviewed at the beginning stages of the Act 537 Plan. They were looking at containing odors and whatever the total of \$1.8 million included, it would not even be involved in the solids end of the treatment process except for the digestion.
- D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated that we're looking at the solids ends and it just happens that the two work together.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the odor is coming from the digestion.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated that to be correct.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the one thing to be looking at if the \$1.8 is for the liquid side of it, and most of the odors are coming from the solid side, why are we going to spend \$1.8 on the liquid side.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that was the reason for tonight's discussion and felt that by presenting this for the Board it would make the situation more clear.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that part of that is when we're looking at the alternatives that are here; the other part is that we were contemplating \$1.8 for odor control which may go away, which also has an affect and becomes part of larger numbers.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated if we don't do that, it becomes part of the \$6,086,000.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert recalled an April meeting which left questions as to what the township had planned for the odor control. All the discussion was about solids.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Mr. Noel knew this all along and has been concerned about it.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned whether there is a space problem on the upgrade to the first scenario.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that there is space adjacent to the existing digester.
- D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated there are some existing utilities there that have to be considered.

- NOEL** Mr. Noel added that it could literally be attached to the back side of the existing digester.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that space presently being used for composting would become available where the dewatered product could be stacked.
- D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated they envision that stacking could occur confined by a cover in a much smaller area. The digester would make sense to put next to the existing one because they could be incorporated into the overall final digestive process, if anything just to be a holding tank where you pull solids from for your other solids or processes.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that all the land that the Township acquired to grow the trees to do the composting is being used now for some minimal land application. Mr. Schenck questioned whether a value should be placed on that asset at this time since the wood is not presently being used.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that would be a good plan which could offset some of the cost toward the plan.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert mentioned that he had been involved in the original discussions on that in which the township received 85% funding for that land. It was considered alternative technology.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that if we got rid of that land that funding would have to be returned.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that to be a correct statement. If the township continued to use it to apply liquid sludge, which you do periodically, it probably is fine. However, to market that property, the EPA would ask for a refund. The original intent was to use it as much as possible and worst case as a buffer to create a zone around the plant and be a better neighbor.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked how long had the township used the land.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated the wood chip idea goes back to 1983.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on Option #1 being \$761,000 in operating costs, which number had no net figure included. In a short time no one has made an analysis of what that might be.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated that could easily be done.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel commented that when the disposal alternatives for the 537 Plan were reviewed, a reduction in total solids generation was discussed and Mr. D'Adamo included that in those costs.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo stated that they had reviewed the current disposal costs for land applications.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated then that the \$761,000 figure is a net figure.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert further commented that what it didn't do was take your total operating budget and see the influence on this project. He provided a scenario to figure for budget purposes.

**HALBERT** We can compare that and say okay well our operating budget will change from this to this because you're processing solids, but you do have some capital of \$320,000 a year for recovery and then you check to see how that compares with the other column. That's an easy calculation and that's what you need to look at – is this going to have any influence on my contributing municipalities; is this going to have any influence on Springettsbury Township sewer users.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated that we follow the same assumption as in the 537 Plan which is your present level of acceptance of outside waste remaining the same.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel stated that the goals set for the 537 clearly established that there would be no capital investment to expand the truck waste program.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic recalled that the engineers suggested that one way to deal with this was to eliminate the truck waste.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he looked at that every year, and it's 10% of our revenue and 1% of our capacity.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed that was easy revenue.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel stated that there is opportunity to promote our ability to accept discrete greater volume of waste. He indicated that he did not think they were ever commissioned not to do it, but we were never commissioned to do it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck recalled discussions regarding the calculations on the total solids as the makeup of the waste coming in that that would increase with the percentage of the flow as we tightened up the system.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated it's projecting what we're using now and holding the outside truck waste constantly at its level now.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked how significant amounts of rainwater would impact the organic matter.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated it would have no impact. We are using the primary clarifier as the holding tank under the Springettsbury Township Health Hazard facility.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo added that a scenario down the road with extraneous water out of your sludge, the flows pick up, and the primary clarifiers co-mingle the sludge for your primary clarifiers, and instead of getting 23% out of the centrifuge the result would be 27 or 28%.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel added that there would be a greater potential for odors.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether any thought had been given to smaller scale palletizing rather than palletize 100%.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated that for all of our sludge it would be a very small facility.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. D’Adamo added that the equipment is very expensive.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel added that it is relatively expensive to operate too.
- D’ADAMO** Mr. De’Adamo summarized all of the options as discussed. One major priority would be to develop and implement a Bio-Solids Public Relations Campaign by making the public environmentalists, neighboring communities aware of the benefits of land application with an attempt to try to put things in as positive a light as possible. This can involve meetings, mailers, things like that, but it is something needed if the township is to say in the land application business and run its own facility.
- MYERS** Mr. Myers stated that some of the mailers and newsletters developed for a similar sewer project were provided to Mr. Amic for review. These coincided with public meetings and a large PR program.
- D’ADAMO** A second priority would be to perform minimal maintenance overhaul in the belt filter press; install new centrifuges (critical component).
- A third priority would be to upgrade the digester system and sludge thickener.
- D’ADAMO** A four priority and objective would be to having a more stackable/stabilized cake, combined with lime. Placing the centrifuge on

line is important to get a better handle on sludge production and get used to generating less solids and the storage issues associated with that.

Mr. D'Adamo added that there is significant lag time of six to eight months to secure a new centrifuge and in terms of priority, that is really the highest priority capital item on this list.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated that realistic timing is to have them installed by this time next year.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated that there are two manufacturing facilities, one is Alpha Sharples in Warminster. They produce a limited quantity some in storage in Pennsylvania and is first-come, first-served. If that quantity is depleted then the product is manufactured overseas.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that this is not a custom product; it's an off-the shelf product.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned whether, as you come up with a dryer final product of this sludge, that changes how the land application is done.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel stated that it is based on nutrient loading, and it becomes more cost effective because not as many trips are involved.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked if the existing equipment would handle it.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel responded that additional equipment would be needed if we committed 100% of our sludge production to purchase additional equipment similar to what we have.

**D'ADAMO** Mr. D'Adamo indicated that those figures are included in the estimates.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that he appreciated the presentation.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he was very pleased with what he had seen. There was a lot of effort that went into the presentation. There still is some additional work to be done in terms of the analysis of everything, but it's something that should be worked on post haste. We could get involved in spending all this money for odor control and \$1.8 million for something that is not needed.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Mr. Bishop had asked that a rate study be done. In that rate study it will include these kinds of things for future capital needs. Mr. Amic hoped to have that finished by the end of July. Mr. Amic appreciated the presentation as well.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that when rate studies are done, it must be done not only for the residents of Springettsbury Township, but also what is charged for everybody else.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the 537 Plan included the \$1.8 million for odor control.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that it did include that, but the plan would have to be amended based on the Board’s decision and then DEP would have to approve the amendment which is administrative work.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the 537 Plan as it progressed, whether there was a thorough justification presented for the expenditure of \$1.8 million on the other side of the plan.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel responded that when the 537 Plan first came about, the diversion pump station was not a predominant part of the conversation at that point; it was an option.. There was a lot of time and energy spent on upgrading existing facilities, more so than the diversion pump station, so when they were looking at the \$1.8 million for the odor control, it was to be done all at one time when they came through and upgraded the entire facility.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it went back to the whole concept of the matter with B-H and the direction of the plan being a recapitalization of our present plant and the upgrade of our plant 6-1/2 more mgd to 21-1/2 mgd . We then advised B-H that we were not interested in the recapitalization of this plant, but we are interested in maintaining and upgrading our present facility at 15 mgd.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri mentioned neighbors meeting with your group.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated those meetings were held after the plan was made.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that a few of those people have come to discuss the odors.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the regional upgrade idea in the 537 Plan would have included upgrades to the digesters and other parts of the plan.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that with the presentation he had received a very comprehensive view of everything that’s involved. There may be ways of spending the money that are different than what was viewed before. Mr. Pasch thanked R. K. & K. for the presentation. He additionally stated that, although he questioned getting something for nothing, this presentation was very worthwhile.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION – BIO-SOLIDS**

**JUNE 2, 1999  
APPROVED**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked R. K. & K. and adjourned the meeting at 9 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**MAY 12, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a noon work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch

**MEMBERS NOT  
IN ATTENDANCE:**

Nick Gurreri

**ALSO IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Ron Simmons, Building Inspector  
Greg Henry, Plumbing Inspector  
Joy Lauchman, Administrative Coordinator

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 12:10 P.M. with the purpose of intent to discuss the issues of residential blight and property maintenance.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that upon request of the Board, he developed a proposal for residential blight and property maintenance issues.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick requested that Mr. Stern discuss each area of the proposal with the Board.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented that concerns were for areas that have many problems, such as the Pleasureville area. In order to deal with areas such as these, properties and property owners would need to be identified and notified of what is expected of them in regards to the maintenance of their property.

**STERN** Property maintenance codes were the next issue of which Mr. Stern spoke. Our current codes are very general. Mr. Stern cited part of the code that states “the appearance of the premise and all buildings therein shall reflect the residential standards of the neighborhood.” If all the houses are in bad shape, they are then keeping with the standards of the neighborhood. Currently, the property maintenance code is not related to other codes the Township has adopted. Therefore, Mr. Stern suggested adopting the BOCA property maintenance code which is more specific and to the point. The BOCA property maintenance code is easier for the staff to use as well as for the residents who receive complaint violation letters to understand.

**STERN** The next topic discussed was proactive inspections. The areas that would be identified as “high risk areas” would be inspected door to door by an inspector. The property owners would be notified of violation(s) in person,

by phone, or letter. The second attempt, if necessary, would be a letter sent both regular mail and certified mail. This is done because if the owner does not claim the certified mail, the district justice will accept the argument that the regular mail was received if not returned as well. The next attempt, if that fails, is a citation in which the fee is set by the district justice.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern discussed time periods to complete violations with the Board. He stated that time periods can not be set in stone due to the varying circumstances. Mr. Stern stated that the codes to be adopted have been amended to read that "the Board of Supervisors will serve as the Board of appeals for violations". The following three guidelines should be considered when granting an extension of time to a code violation:

- Property owner diligently pursued compliance
- There was a force of nature outside of the property owners control.
- The property owner presents a schedule of work to be complete.

Mr. Stern also mentioned that rehab grants are available through the York County Planning Commission.

**STERN**

Additional employees would be needed if this program is adopted. Lastly, the desire to not accept anonymous complaints was discussed. This is in order that the Township will know the complaint is a legitimate complaint, the code enforcement officer has a contact person to call if they have additional questions, and to filter out neighborhood disputes.

**BISHOP**

Mr. Bishop suggested that Mr. Stern draw up a proposed policy for this Board to adopt.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern stated that he would like all complaints to be forwarded to the Township in writing.

**SIMMONS**

Mr. Simmons stated that the majority of the time, the information received over the phone is not specific enough.

**HENRY**

Mr. Henry commented on people writing more detail in letters.

**PASCH**

Mr. Pasch expressed his concerns for only accepting complaints in writing. He stated that he feels the Township will miss out on a lot of valid complaints.

- SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons commented on the City having a formal complaint policy. He stated that a good deal of the complaints that deal with grass are situations where the property owner has a contract for having their grass mowed. Complaints usually come in after it rains, when contractors are working behind and by the time the owner receives the letter, the grass is already mowed.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned how the complaint process works.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the individuals name and phone number is taken down along with the complaint. If they refuse to leave a name we still take down the complaint.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned the difference between written complaints and phone complaints.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the complaints in writing are more serious. If they took the time to write it down, it is most likely, serious. If they call it in, it's too easy. Mr. Stern also clarified that complaint letters would not be public record.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented on not having a problem with not accepting anonymous complaints. However, he questioned only accepting written complaints. Mr. Bishop questioned if there could be a different magnitude of response. As of now, the response is the same no matter what. He suggested if receiving a phone complaint, responding with "A" and if receiving a written complaint responding with "B".
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck suggested asking the resident if they would prefer to file a formal complaint, because as of now, the complaint will be looked into when they are in that area next.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick commented her concern that the Township would loose a lot of the valid concerns if we made them put it in writing.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he is opposed to demanding written complaints. However, Mr. Schenck stated that he doesn't have a problem when dealing with neighborhood disputes, with the Township saying that we are not coming out on another inspection with the two of you. We have had it, we're done with you.
- SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons questioned if the Board would support that.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that if a resident would come in before the Board with a situation like this, he would expect documentation from Mr. Stern's office of all the phone calls between the feuding neighbors and action taken. Mr. Bishop stated that he does not have a problem with a policy that states the

Township will not get involved with complaints between neighbors for civil matters.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick suggested writing a letter that would state that the Township has done all that they could in this matter.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented on the last part of the proposal; fines. He stated that once all else fails, fines are levied. Costs are for an extra employee. The cost of the extra employee would not be returned in revenue from the fines. Mr. Stern then referenced how the Board of Supervisors sometimes receives complaint calls at their homes, thus making it more difficult for Mr. Simmons and Mr. Henry.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick commented that when she gets phone calls of that nature, she does not always believe what is said as being true.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated maybe it's the way it's being stated. There is a difference between saying "Andrew will take care of it" and "Call Andrew and see what can be done within the ordinance"

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented on how people will hear it the first way, even if the second way is said.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned if the figure for postage was in addition to what is currently being spent.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick asked if there was a way to look at this extra employee as seasonal or part time to see the impact.

**STERN** Mr. Stern expressed his concerns for hiring a seasonal employee. He commented on having to spend time training the employee.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he is concerned about seasonal help telling somebody they have to put a new roof on their home. That is a pretty subjective call sometimes.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked if this program would really address and correct this problem.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that this is a long term program. Results would not be able to be seen for 5 to 10 years. He referenced the Woosey Moose on Market Street which took 3 years to see results. The big problems will be here for awhile.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick inquired about wrecked cars in the Pleasureville area on cinder blocks in referenced to how long it will take for the impact to take care of that.

- STERN** Mr. Stern said it would take a long time. As soon as you take care of that problem, something else will pop up because to them there is nothing wrong.
- HENRY** Mr. Henry commented on a situation in Pleasureville where a resident has a racing car in his back yard. He stated that the resident races it every Saturday. How is that any different from any other recreational vehicle, such as a boat?
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned if there was any way to adopt something in our code to prevent future occurrences.
- HENRY** Mr. Henry referenced a property on Mount Zion and Druck Valley Road that he is in the process of issuing a citation for. He also commented that the code is written in a very subjective manner.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked if the BOCA Code would fix that. He also suggested, in regards to high-risk properties, prioritizing based on the number of violations.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented on the Township spending a lot of time on the wrong items, such as grass complaints.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the majority of the complaints are for the minor items.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop suggested that they figure out a way to do them quickly. He said it sounds out of whack to be spending a lot of time on grass complaints.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on overlooking some of the stuff that is not a serious violation until you do get a complaint that someone is willing to put it in writing.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick suggested in situations where it has rained, telling the resident to allow for some time for the grass to be mowed.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch referenced the Eastwood property. He also commented on wanting examples of some of the hassles with subjectivity.
- SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons referenced the property on Throne Ave.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch spoke of certain items being subjective and others are not. An example being the ordinance states downspouts are required. He stated that when you get into the subjective issues, there will be legal actions.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that it is the Township' s obligation to step in when it

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**MAY 12, 1999  
APPROVED**

is a health or safety issue. Those situations should be obvious. Mr. Schenck questioned if anything was learned from the Stull case. He stated that he didn't want the Board to kid themselves if they can't make a difference.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented on amending the proposal to reflect the Board's comments.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on three areas of concern for him: identifying the high risk areas, code being vague, and funding for proactive inspections.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he has not heard a compelling argument for hiring a new person. He also suggested Mr. Stern proceed with coming up with a new policy.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick said that it is not a problem to explain to the residents that numerous calls are received.

Mrs. Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 1:55 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS / PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION**

**APRIL 27, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a noon work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**BOARD MEMBERS IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Nick Gurreri  
Bill Schenck

**BOARD MEMBERS NOT  
IN ATTENDANCE:**

Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

Alan Maciejewski –Chairman  
Mark Robertson  
Larry Stets  
Larry Gibbs

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE:**

Don Allison

**ALSO IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Andrew Stern – Director of Economic Development  
Joy Lauchman – Administrative Coordinator  
Kevin Hodge – YCEDC

**MITRICK**

Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the proposed “Development Zone” in Springettsbury Township.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern stated that Flexible Zoning was first discussed when he started here in 1996. The big Flexible Zoning book was from November of 1998.

**ROBERTSTON**

Mr. Robertson commented on flexible zoning, in regards to how the Caterpillar plant is setup now, necessitating that someone buy the entire property.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern stated that Caterpillar is definitely the center of the proposed Development Zone, however they included everything around it as well, from Route 30 to Market Street. The issue relating to Caterpillar with the zoning ordinance now is the potential for multiple tenants with multiple users. This would create problems because there would be no setbacks between buildings and lot frontage couldn't meet current requirements. The premise is the zoning ordinance is based on 1926 case law and is not geared toward looking into the future. If you have a list of uses, what about the uses that weren't listed that are new technologies or haven't yet been developed.

- GIBBS** Mr. Gibbs questioned why other industrial zones weren't looked at.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that it was too big of an area to start with. They wanted to pick a smaller area that was central and isolated. Once zoning requirements were established, then we could start looking at other zones. The other thing was this zone is contiguous, meaning other uses (residential and institutional) aren't mixed throughout the zone.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski said that one of the big things that they looked at was the availability of rail facilities. Access to the rail gave this area an even greater advantage. Mr. Maciejewski stated how a lot of companies would like to have access to rail.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that most groups liked the area that they started with. Mr. Stern commented on the different zones and uses being all mixed up. Mr. Stern commented on leaving the south side of Industrial Highway from Memory Lane to North Hills Road C-Commercial due to the fact that the lots are all too small, the lots are all developed, and there are houses on Wallace Street abutting this area. The area along Mt. Zion Road and East Market Street with the apartments and offices currently there would be zone AO - Apartment Office.
- Mr. Stern introduced Kevin Hodge, Development Manager with YCEDC (formerly YCIDC). With the recent departure of Randy Campbell, Mr. Hodge will be spending much time with the Caterpillar project.
- Mr. Stern showed maps of other proposals including a railroad crossing and extension of Industrial Highway from Northern Way to Mt. Zion Road, and a fully accessible interchange at Memory Lane and Route 30.
- STETS** Mr. Stets asked if the problem with the Industrial Highway connector was still the grade crossing for the railroad?
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that currently the rail crossing is not the problem, funding is. A recent grant application was denied. The rail crossing may become a problem later this summer, once the transfer of the railway to Norfolk Southern takes place.
- HODGE** Mr. Hodge said that the grade crossing was a concern for Norfolk Southern. That is something that would have to be addressed. Norfolk Southern is concerned about the possibility of rail cars blocking the crossing while "stacked", waiting to be used by whoever might purchase the Caterpillar plant.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that everybody loves the connector road idea and that PennDot has it in their 5 year plan. He is concerned that the project will not move up in the 5 year plan and may never happen. He is searching for

alternative funding sources, including the use of private resources from such companies as the York Mall and Home Depot.

**MITRICK**

Mrs. Mitrick commented on Home Depot and Wal-Mart's willingness to contribute money and land for this project. Mrs. Mitrick also mentioned long term plans for wrapping Concord Road around to East Market Street through the York County Pleasant Acres property. This would require another rail crossing near the rear of the East Market Street Shopping Center (Food Lion).

**STETS**

Mr. Stets commented on this rail line being the same one that passes through where the bridge was torn down, thus there would be the same limited amount of train traffic at the other two proposed crossing locations.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern spoke of the interchange at Route 30 and Memory Lane in regards to not being able to exit Route 30 westbound onto Memory Lane. The idea is to make Whiteford Road loop the whole way out to the new intersection at Pleasant Valley Road and Memory Lane Extd. The existing portion of Whiteford Road which remains from Memory Lane Extd. west to the intersection at Memory Lane, Whiteford Road, & Pleasant Valley Road would be tied into a new piece so that people can use this section to exit westbound Route 30 and enter westbound Route 30. This change would also discourage people from using Whiteford Road and to encourage them to use Pleasant Valley Road.

**MITRICK**

Mrs. Mitrick commented on the Route 30 and Memory Lane exit ramps being in the preliminary stages. Township Engineer John Luciani is preparing a feasibility study on this project.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern commented on the last slide, vacant lands and buildings. The idea is to encourage the use of those properties.

Mr. Stern referred to the proposed ordinance establishing a Development Zone. At the last worksession he had been asked to provide sample environmental standards. Mr. Stern commented that in 1995 the City of York updated their zoning ordinance. The City hired consultants to write the environmental standards. Mr. Stern spoke of those requirements as being minimal, in order to prevent businesses that don't belong, but without preventing all businesses. Mr. Stern used Donlee Technologies as an example. Last year Donlee had been testing equipment which generated extremely loud noise. Donlee voluntarily installed a muffler, although there were no noise requirements in effect at the time.

- ROBERSON** Mr. Robertson commented on technical issues related to noise. He further pointed out that Route 30 noise levels might be higher than the maximum levels we are proposing for the businesses. He stated that noise is distance related. A base line needs to be established and quote a boundary. Certain noises cancel each other out. The ordinance might have to be written to be specific for certain corridors because of ambient background noise. You would have to see what your peaks and averages are.
- STETS** Mr. Stets questioned if the base line is 80 decibels and they are putting out 70, do you end up with 150?
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson stated that he was talking about a frequency spectrum and that noise is not black and white. You don't wind up with 150, the 80 will win and you could get some cancellations. Just remember it is distance related and you could get some reflected off of the road.
- HODGE** Mr. Hodge stated that the environmental requirements would be set up to what is attributable to the actual zone and not to Route 30. You would have to separate out what portion is the noise from Route 30.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski commented on how wind direction plays a big part in it.
- STETS** Mr. Stets stated that there is a residential area on North Hills Road.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick commented that the Board is very protective of keeping good quality in the community.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that the Board should not make requirements that would prohibit businesses from going there. If they do not want these businesses they should say so. Yes, there are houses on the north side of Route 30, however, that is not a reason to prevent businesses from going on the south side of Route 30.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson said that there are ways of limiting noise. There are two parts of noise control, one is absorption and the second blocking materials that absorb noise.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that the one thing we don't do is put up buffering walls that keep noise out.
- STETS** Mr. Stets asked how these proposed requirements would apply to existing businesses.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that if the use and noise are already there, then they are "grandfathered" as preexisting nonconformities. If the use and noise would change, then they are not "grandfathered".

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented on the possible need to hire a consultant to come in and modify environmental requirements to suit our specific needs.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski asked if this Development Zone project, including flexible zoning was the most effective way to market the Caterpillar facility.

**HODGE** Mr. Hodge commented that he likes the idea, in that it allows for more flexibility. He stated that their intention is not to put in something in Springettsbury Township that you don't want. It's a matter of understanding what you want and finding a way for you to meet those goals. Mr. Hodge stated that a problem that YCEDC runs into is that when they are dealing with companies, the companies want to see the zoning already established. The consultants look for the easiest thing. If your site doesn't meet all the requirements that they have, then they move along to the next site. This proposal would allow for more "tools" for YCEDC to work with. Mr. Hodge commented that if the Township waits too long to act, they might lose a good company due to bad timing.

To answer the question, Mr. Hodge stated that yes, this project will provide a large advantage to the marketing of the Caterpillar plant.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski commented on wanting to make the property of interest to someone. He commented on not wanting to make it part of a problem.

**HODGE** Mr. Hodge said that this project would expand the opportunities for Caterpillar.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick asked where we were today with Caterpillar.

**HODGE** Mr. Hodge stated that Caterpillar wants to sell. There are problems and limitations, and that all of them are solvable. He said that the chances of one user buying and using the entire Caterpillar property is very remote. It will almost definitely be a multi-use facility.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson questioned the multi-use.

**HODGE** Mr. Hodge said that there are different ways that you can look at it, such as leaseholds, condominiums, subdivisions, etc...

**STERN** Mr. Stern referenced the former Caterpillar facility in Davenport, Iowa that had multiple users move in once it was sold.

**HODGE** Mr. Hodge said that it will take some time to market the property. There is about a 3% chance that it will be a one user. The reason for this is that York does not have the labor force here. The economy is good and unemployment is very low. Mr. Hodge also mentioned that the building is not suited for distribution due to low ceilings and a limited number of dock doors.

- STETS** Mr. Stets expressed his concern for design standards.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said that although we have not discussed aesthetics related to this project, Mr. Yost has stated in the past that unless there is a justifiable specific zone created, you can't regulate design standards. An example of a justifiable zone would be a historic zone, such as the City's HARB.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick agreed with aesthetic design being a concern, and that Mr. Yost has said to them in the past that they can't speak about it.
- SCHENCK** Referring to the proposed 100 foot height limit, Mr. Schenck asked what use in Springettsbury Township would need a tall building.
- HODGE** Mr. Hodge said that one example would be a portion of a manufacturing process that is vertical and has a process tower. He also stated that you are not going to run into it very often. Mr. Hodge commented that maybe you don't want anything tall on the borders of the zone, however allow it for the middle.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned how tall a building could be in the Township now.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that our ordinance currently allows a height of 35 feet plus one additional foot for every additional foot of a setback, with no maximum.
- HODGE** Mr. Hodge commented that around a 30 story tower could go in the middle of Caterpillar using current requirements.
- ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson said that the site is big enough. He referenced a heavy industrial plant needing over 100 feet.
- MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski questioned the permitted uses. If it's not listed under prohibited uses, then it is permitted. He expressed his concerns about this.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that with any list, things are always forgotten. If you forget something on the list, then you just lost a business because they won't go through the hassle of getting an approval. In addition, new technologies are created every day. It is impossible to list uses which have not yet been developed. He then referenced the City of York who successfully adopted this flexible zoning. Mr. Stern also referenced a recent inquiry by a company which is in the process of developing and patenting a new technology and is looking for a site to use the technology. This new technology is so different that he had no way of figuring out what use it would be considered.
- HODGE** Mr. Hodge, who was aware of the use Mr. Stern referred to concurred. Mr. Hodge also stated that a company you don't want won't meet Federal,

State, and local environmental standards anyway. Flexibility would allow for new technologies. He stated that uses will change and that environmental standards will not.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski stated that if you can't put your finger on a prohibited use, then it's allowed. Do you get into arguing what that business is. How does one legally define a use.

**HODGE** Mr. Hodge stated that if they were to think of everything that they didn't want in the Township, it would come back to environmental standards for the reason as not being allowed. He suggested making the environmental restrictions tight enough to keep these types of businesses out.

**ROBERSTON** Mr. Robertson commented on listing what businesses we don't want. He stated that if a business is borderline, then they could move into the middle of nowhere, where there are no restrictions. You can't put everything down in black and white. You have to put in guidelines.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski expressed his concern for nuclear type businesses coming to this area.

**HODGE** Mr. Hodge said we must be careful with preventing such uses. You can't prevent everything involving nuclear materials. Hospitals, for example, use nuclear materials.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented on the fact that they could brainstorm and come up with some pretty nasty uses. He expressed his concerns for this.

**GIBBS** Mr. Gibbs said that the main focus is on Industrial and Commercial uses.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck said that this proposal doesn't focus into that.

**STERN** Mr. Stern suggested that they make a list of what uses they don't want. They would find that all of these uses couldn't come here anyway because they wouldn't fit into Federal and State environmental standards.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented on Caterpillar being low impact. It is a whole different look than other places with bag houses, towers, processing accessories hanging off of it. It's a whole different look than the box look of Caterpillar.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski commented that you will see more stacks now due to environmental regulations. They may be for air quality emission requirements or processing. We also need to think that this is for Industrial Highway and Mt. Zion Road as well. He commented on being torn between what is permitted and what is not permitted.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson stated that if they are having problems with processing plants, that they have several things to look at. They would need rail lines

and the ability to get people in and out for shift changes. Mr. Robertson commented that it's not about the aesthetics of how places look, but rather it's about tax dollars, long term growth, and income. Jobs, businesses, and industries support the Township. When that goes away we're dead. Residential uses do not economically support the Township.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick said that even though we have to focus on the economics of it, we have to look at the advantages of the Caterpillar site. With the existing assets that it has right now, it is still an attractive site. She stated that she doesn't want to compromise what the Township has right now. She stated that they need to look for the optimum. The Development Zone encompasses a lot more than just that one property.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson asked the Board to think about what direction they want to go in. Do they want a smoke stack industry or technology industry. He suggested giving Mr. Hodge some guidelines. People and businesses can't violate DEP, EPA, and all the other agencies. People have to build their businesses around them. He commented on letting existing regulations do their job.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck said that he has to look at what is the worse we could get.

**STETS** Mr. Stets asked if there is a community that has had this in place for ten years or so. What have they encountered?

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented on examples he found. Mr. Stern cited many areas of Texas as an example of not having any zoning. These areas use environmental standards as the only restrictions to development.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick asked what Mr. Stern would like to see occur.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that he needs direction from the Board members. The Board sets the policies in the Township. If the Board thinks we are headed in the wrong direction with this Development Zone project, he needs to know.

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Robertson stated that the Board needs to decide what they want in that zone.

**MACIEJEWSKI** Mr. Maciejewski said that this is a mini comprehensive plan.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented on the existing comprehensive plan not being of any use.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick said she'd like to keep this on the front table.

**STETS** Mr. Stets asked if there would be any advantage to separating out Caterpillar and focusing this project on their site only.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS / PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION**

**APRIL 27, 1999  
APPROVED**

**HODGE**

Mr. Hodge said that some of the land by Lowe's has not been ruled out. If Caterpillar was not an issue, Mr. Hodge would still recommend Flexible Zoning for this area. Also adopting a separate zoning district for just one property in the Township might be spot-zoning.

**MITRICK**

Mrs. Mitrick asked that another work session be scheduled at the next Board meeting. There was a consensus of those present that another joint Planning Commission – Board of Supervisors work session would be the most beneficial.

Mrs. Mitrick requested that detailed minutes be provided as soon as possible.

Mrs. Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 1:50P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**APRIL 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a Public Hearing on the above date in the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. ORDINANCE 99-02:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the purpose of the meeting was for a Public Hearing on Ordinance 99-02, "V-Shaped Sign Measurement Requirements." Chairman Mitrick stated that the purpose of a Public Hearing is for input from residents and interested others regarding this amendment. Chairman Mitrick asked whether there were any comments. Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern whether there was any comment to the Board regarding this addition.

**STERN** Andrew Stern responded that he had no comment unless there were questions.

**GUERRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the size of the V shaped signs would change.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the size of the sign would not change.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he had observed the sign in question and stated that in his opinion it really looked good.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there were any further comments.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that, in his opinion, there was nothing ambiguous about the previous ordinance and that he viewed the

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**APRIL 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

time spent toward this particular issue as ridiculous and unnecessary.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri voiced agreement.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked for further comments.

**3. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**APRIL 15, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a noon work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Ken Pasch

**MEMBERS NOT  
IN ATTENDANCE:**

Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Betty Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Andy Hinkle, MIS Technician  
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
Jewel Frey, Receptionist  
Joy Lauchman, Administrative Coordinator

**MITRICK**

Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 12:10 P.M. The purpose of the meeting is for final review of the future administrative complex.

**DITTENHAFER**

Mr. Dittenhafer presented for review the materials and finishes for the future administrative building. The exterior, interior, and lighting will be presented. Mr. Dittenhafer started by presenting the exterior materials.

**Exterior:** The following items were mentioned in reference to the exterior of the building.

1. Mr. Dittenhafer displayed different options of brick that were different from the current administrative building but yet still compatible. He then noted the different colors of bricks that were chosen for different areas of the building such as the meeting room.
2. Stone was suggested for the meeting room facade in a buff color.
3. The windows were noted as being a major part of the exterior and thus selected a maintenance free Anderson window.
4. The visible roofs are “sloped standing seam metal roofs” whereas the non-visible roofs will be “membrane roofs”.
5. Also mentioned was a landscape area for flagpoles.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned the location of the pavers at the door.
- DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer replied that they extend out 20 feet.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick asked if the sidewalks were going to be tinted.
- DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer stated that they went with a joint pattern system.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned the stone on the meeting room in reference to it being chipped or damaged.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned the material of the sign.
- DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer stated that it was stainless steel lettering.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented on the an area reserved for the seal, and he feels the seal is outdated.
- DITTENHAFER** **Interior:** Mr. Dittenhafer then proceeded to present the material for the interior of the building. He stated they wanted a timeless interior; something that was warm and friendly. Mr. Dittenhafer commented that all the selections are to be submitted at one time. The following items were mentioned in reference to the flooring.
1. Walk-off mat material for the entrance in the vestibule.
  2. Tile pavers in the lobby.
  3. Carpet for the majority of the floors in a warm color with perhaps a little pattern used throughout the building. The only exception would be the meeting room which would have a slightly different carpet or color/pattern choice.
  4. Tile would be used for areas such as file rooms, storage, and copier rooms. Ceramic mosaic 1 x 1 or 1 x 2 tiles were suggested as well as epoxy flooring which is less expensive.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned if a pattern would be available on the epoxy floor.
- DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer stated that stripes and borders could be done, however, small patterns would not be available. He then concluded flooring selections with a discussion on marmoleum sheet vinyl for the break room.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove presented the following on the Meeting room to the Board.
1. Panels in the Meeting room making their way up to height to the front

wall.

2. 7" riser for Meeting room table.

3. 102 seats in the meeting room.

**DITTENHAFER**

Mr. Dittenhafer stated that 90% of the ceiling would be 2 x 4 suspended ceiling. He commented on it working well with the lighting.

**Lighting:** The following items were mentioned in reference to the lighting.

1. Most of the lighting is squares and rectangles.

2. Standard fluorescent 2 x 2 fixtures with parabolic lenses to cut down on glare.

3. The meeting room, lobby, reception area, and break room were presented separately. Suspended lights and zones of lighting were discussed.

**MITRICK**

Mrs. Mitrick questioned the type of dimmers that will be used.

**GROVE**

Mr. Grove stated that commercial dimmers will be used.

**AMIC**

Mr. Amic questioned bid options in reference to prices being different.

**DITTENHAFER**

Mr. Dittenhafer stated that they will specify 1 to 3 manufacturers or approved equals. This will not create any significant increase in cost.

**AMIC**

Mr. Amic stated that he needs a week to review the specs and that the motion to advertise the bid would need to be done next Thursday at the Board of Supervisors meeting.

**DITTENHAFER**

Mr. Dittenhafer added that an addendum can be added if needed.

**LUCIANI**

Mr. Luciani questioned the deadline for completion.

**AMIC**

Mr. Amic stated that he doesn't want a short lead time because then that might cause certain prominent builders to choose not to bid the project and thus risk costs going up. A longer lead time will help avoid these problems.

**GROVE**

Mr. Grove commented on the 8' x 10' communications room in the basement as being where the vault was. The vault was moved south of the mechanical room.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**APRIL 15, 1999  
APPROVED**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned the lighting in the basement.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove stated that it is minimal fluorescent lighting.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 1:40 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**APRIL 8, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Bill Schenck- Vice Chairperson  
Don Bishop  
Ken Pasch  
Nick Gurreri

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic- Township Manager  
John Luciani-Civil Engineer  
Andrew Hinkle – MIS Technician  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck called the work session meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. The purpose of this meeting is for the engineer from Rettew Associates to review the HVAC and mechanical drawings for the new municipal building as well as the renovations to the existing building and farmhouse.

**ALDINGER** Mr. Doug Aldinger, P.E. introduced himself. He is the Manager of Technical Engineering for Rettew Associates and has been working on the mechanical and HVAC plans for our new municipal building and the renovations to the existing building and farmhouse.

Mr. Aldinger reviewed the mechanical and HVAC drawings with the Board members. He pointed out that the drawings have not yet been updated to reflect recent changes made by the architect, including the addition of a third enclosed bay at the rear of the existing building.

Mr. Aldinger showed the basement plans for the new building. Eight HVAC units as well as the dehumidifier units will be placed in the basement. The units will be gas forced hot air. The condenser units will be placed at grade on the north side of the building. The basement will have some minimal climate control, but it will be designed for a storage use. The current drawings show a separate HVAC unit for the telecommunications room in the basement, but this will be removed as it is not needed.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked if there will be a separate HVAC unit for the Board room. The Board room currently cannot handle a large number of people without getting very hot.

**ALDINGER** Mr. Aldinger indicated that there will be a separate unit with separate controls for the Board Room. The system will be designed for maximum capacity and should not allow major fluctuations in temperature.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that he has spoken with people at other new municipal buildings and they are not happy with their HVAC systems.

**ALDINGER** Mr. Aldinger assured the Board that the HVAC systems being designed will work very well and will not create the problems we are currently experiencing or other municipalities may be experiencing. This is because there will be multiple units with separate control systems.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani suggested restricting access to the thermostats. He indicated that some problems related to HVAC systems are caused by employees constantly changing the thermostat settings.

**ALDINGER** Mr. Aldinger stated that he would provide several alternatives to the Board.

*Moving to the existing building* – the HVAC system on the lower level will be redesigned and have one unit and one zone. The main floor will have new roof top units and duct extensions. The majority of the existing duct work will remain in place and be reused. As such, we may still experience temperature fluctuations in the existing building.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop suggested that the addition of windows as well as less traffic within the existing building may help with temperature fluctuations.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the windows within the Board room of the existing building will be uncovered and operational.

**ALDINGER** Mr. Aldinger indicated that the police chief did not want the windows uncovered as the room will be used as a training room.

*Moving to the farmhouse* – HVAC drawings have been started but are not quite complete. The plan is to provide HVAC for the two first floor rooms, the three second floor offices, and the restroom. Plumbing drawings for the farmhouse have not yet been completed.

*Moving to the new building* – hose connections will be located around the building so that a 50' garden hose can be used around the entire perimeter of the building.

**HINKLE** Mr. Hinkle questioned the sprinkler system within the network/MIS room in the new building. He asked if a dry HALON type system would be used.

**ALDINGER** Mr. Aldinger indicated that this kind of a system would be extremely expensive. He further pointed out that there would probably be extensive damage within this room prior to the activation of a sprinkler head, as sprinkler head activation is caused by intense heat. He suggested the possibility of using a sprinkler head in this room with a higher temperature rating so as to prevent accidental activation caused by over heated computers.

*Moving to the existing building* – Mr. Aldinger is trying to find a way to avoid having to continue the use of a sewer pump from the basement. This could be achieved if the sewer lateral elevations work out as planned.

Mr. Aldinger brought up a request by staff to include a central vacuum system in both the existing building and the new building. He pointed out that each system would cost \$5,000. These systems would be a light industrial version which has limitations, such as only being able to use one outlet at a time. He indicated that about 21 outlets would be required, as the maximum length for the hose would be 35 lineal feet.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned how the central vacuum system made its way into the plans.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that it had been a request from Charlie Lauer. Mr. Lauer had suggested that the buildings would have increased carpeted areas. The Township would also now have another building which would have to be cleaned. Mr. Lauer had thought that a central vacuum system may cut down on cleaning time and expense.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck suggested that after a few years the system would either have problems or simply not be used.

**There was a unanimous consensus of the Board members to remove the central vacuum system from the plans for both the existing building and the new building.**

**ALDINGER** Mr. Aldinger pointed out that there will be two 4” schedule 40 pipe conduits run between the existing building and the new building. These pipes will be used for telecommunications and network cabling. He indicated that we only need one pipe for now, but the cost to install a second pipe at this time is extremely low, compared with installing the second pipe later down the road. This is because the major cost involved is for the trenching, not the pipe itself.

The lighting plans for both buildings still need work as they must be integrated and coordinated with the drawings and fixture selections from the architects.

A small generator will be specified for the new building. This generator will provide emergency power for code required emergency systems, including lighting, plus other systems determined important by the Township, such as telephones and some computers. Mr. Aldinger will be meeting with Mr. Hinkle to determine which systems are important to the Township.

The generator in the existing building will provide emergency power for code required emergency systems, including lighting, as well as selected areas defined by the police chief, such as the training room. The HVAC system will also receive emergency powered by the generator.

*Moving to the new building* – the basement will have surface mounted electrical outlets and electrical conduit. Lighting in the basement will be minimal “task” lighting. This will be enough to see and to work in, but not enough for offices.

The camera system and monitors for the Board room will not be included in this project. If the Board desires to add them, it will be a separate project.

Rettew Associates will be providing specifications for the security system for the buildings as well as the audio system for the new Board room. Catalog specification sheets for the proposed systems will be provided to Mr. Hinkle in the near future.

*Moving to the existing building* – a new fire alarm system will be specified for the existing building. The existing building will not be retrofitted with a fire sprinkler system.

**Mr. Schenck adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/abs

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**MARCH 30, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a 1:00 p.m. work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Ken Pasch  
Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Dave Eshbach, Chief of Police  
Andy Hinkle, MIS Technician  
Betty Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Joy Lauchman, Administrative Coordinator

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. She indicated the purpose of the meeting is for the final review of the future administrative building. Mrs. Mitrick added that Mr. Gurreri would like to discuss a budget for the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri requested a \$5,000 budget for the 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary committee. Mr. Gurreri stated that he needed something so that he could commit to things.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick commented that when Mr. Gurreri started with the 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary committee, he had a go ahead and was to come to the Board with a reasonable figure. Mrs. Mitrick also stated that she doesn't see a problem with this.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether it was permissible.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that under the Second Class Township Code it was permissible.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented on the fact that he would be more comfortable if the committee had a charter or a detailed list of what they were spending the money on. He doesn't want to give them \$5,000 and say go ahead and do whatever you want. He would like to see some guidelines.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that they need the money to commit to a bus tour.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick asked if the Board would be more comfortable if the committee asked for the funding per expenditure.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented on having an event in the park and having to pay the Park and Recreation Directors for working a Saturday.

**MR. GURRERI MADE A MOTION FOR THE BOARD TO ALLOW THE SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP 250<sup>TH</sup> ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE A \$5,000 BUDGET.**

**MOTION DIES DUE TO A LACK OF A SECOND.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on wanting to know the specifics of where the money is going to be spent. He also suggested taking this matter up later after the regular work session.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick tabled the item.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer, of Murphy and Dittenhafer, stated that he wanted to walk through the plans. The final construction drawings and specifications are 90% complete. All the different disciplines are being coordinated now as well as having detailed discussions with the staff. The drawings will be available for bidders on Friday, April 23, 1999.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove of Murphy and Dittenhafer commented on the fact that there shouldn't be anything new here. The entry vestibule door is shown as right off the parking lot as well as the side door out into the canopy. Also shown is a display case in the lobby with glass doors on it. The ceiling is 9 feet high with acoustic tile.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer stated that the duct was incorporated and had places for electrical panels.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove pointed out the storage closets, meeting room with head table for nine.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned why the table was for nine.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated one of the reasons is that future Boards could be larger.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer stated it was for the Supervisors, Township Manager, Engineers, Solicitor, and stenographer. It was to accommodate as many people as possible so they could eliminate the tables out front.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick commented that she was more comfortable with the stenographer's table remaining where it is currently. This enables her to have eye contact with the stenographer to make sure she has picked up on certain items for the minutes.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove commented on the following:

- ceiling
- caucus room
- reception area with separate work area and a back area
- stair to the basement
- corridor
- MIS Technician accommodations
- building and zoning area
- file rooms
- break room
- door to a patio area
- kitchen area.
- 

Mr. Grove inquired if there was need for a dishwasher.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick said that a space should be allowed for one.

**GROVE** Mr. Grove then proceeded and spoke of the janitor area, cot/locker area, conference room, finance office, vault/mechanical room, and the need for an emergency generator.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the need to provide an energy source came from the staff.

**ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach stated that theirs doesn't provide for 100% and that they cannot function in the basement without it.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the cost of the system being very expensive.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he feels more strongly about having the emergency generator in this building than in the future Administrative building.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on how this building will contain the Emergency Coordinator which is Sergeant Harvey.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch said that \$40,000 is a big expense for a "what if".

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the need for at least one generator.

**ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach stated that this meeting room is where the Emergency Coordinator would operate.

**HINKLE** Mr. Hinkle commented on the need for a generator for the new building for the heating/cooling system, lighting, and communications.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**MARCH 30, 1999  
APPROVED**

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned if there was a reasonable middle ground.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on doing partial zones.
- DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer suggested having some capability in the new building and more in the existing building.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned if money could be saved for doing partial zones.
- ALDINGER** Mr. Aldinger of Rettew and Associates said that it would start at \$25,000.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck pointed out the need for a generator so that we would never be without a phone system. He also questioned if one generator could service both buildings.
- ALDINGER** Mr. Aldinger stated that it would probably be doable, however would not be practical.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove spoke of the existing building in regards to the reception area, new walls and treatment for the squad room and the third car bay.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach stated that the plan didn't have a third bay on it, however they spoke about it in regards to needing it for impounded vehicles.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove spoke of the new fixtures, outside materials used and made note of the Farmhouse.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the Change Order that was sent to the Township.
- GROVE** Mr. Grove spoke on the detailed drawings of the cabinetry, walls, and entranceway materials. He referenced materials and colors used.
- MIKTRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned whether the staff has been involved in choosing the paneling/door colors.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic noted that the staff made no color selections at all and questioned whether those particular details are in the specs. He would like the staff to choose colors so that they are not limited to what they purchase for furnishings.
- DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer stated that his firm chose natural, neutral colors.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned where the staff would be able to get a look at samples to make selections.
- DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer stated that he could provide the staff with a listing of other businesses they have worked with so that they could see color options, etc.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**MARCH 30, 1999  
APPROVED**

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani discussed parking details with the Board per Mrs. Mitrick's request.

**It was the consensus of the Board to schedule another work session with Murphy & Dittenhafer on April 15, 1999 at noon.**

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick adjourned the new building discussion and brought the matter of the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration financial support back to the table.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented on his preference to not have a budget.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch said that without further information, \$5,000 is a lot of money.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that the money is to secure a bus for a historical tour of the Township for residents.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick asked Betty Speicher, member of the 250<sup>th</sup> committee, to speak about the activities for the 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration in Mr. Gurreri's absence.

**SPEICHER** Mrs. Speicher stated that there were three items that were discussed: Supervisors participation in a parade, historical bus tour of the Township, and a community picnic. Mrs. Speicher said that Tom Schaefer would be doing the bus tour for a fee.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that all three activities are fine.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated his approval, but he wants to know the details.

**SPEICHER** Mrs. Speicher commented on Mr. Schaefer submitting a proposal and the possibility of charging a small fee for the bus tour.

**It was the consensus of the Board members remaining that this item should be discussed at the Regular Board of Supervisors Meeting to be held on April 8, 1999.**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck adjourned the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Township Manager

PWA/jel

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**FEBRUARY 26, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a noon work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Ken Pasch  
Bill Schenck

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Nick Gurreri

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Andrew Stern – Director of Economic Development  
Ron Simmons – Building Inspector  
Greg Henry – Plumbing Inspector  
Joy Lauchman - Administrative Coordinator

**MITRICK**

Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 12:10 P.M. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss residential blight inspections and permitting requirements in the Township.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern started his presentation by informing the Board of the many duties the Economic Development office does on a routine basis as well as the major projects that are currently going on. They include the York Mall, Home Depot, Caterpillar, Galleria West, and Meadowlands. Mr. Stern then discussed residential blight.

Mr. Stern noted the following code issues as being seen on inspections:

- Outdated electrical systems
- Structural cracks in the foundations
- Outdated plumbing systems
- Peeling paint
- Sidewalk and driveway deterioration
- Smoke detector problems
- Unsafe door locks

Mr. Stern then spoke on Functional Obsolescence, which are issues that affect the value of a house:

- Limited bathrooms facilities
- Small bedrooms
- No garage / carport
- Old siding / deteriorating brick
- Small outdated kitchens

Mr. Stern then spoke on some proposals for the situation. The first being mandatory apartment inspections. Every rental unit would be inspected

once every three years. The inspector would inspect the property and list what problems found and require a follow up inspection to verify it was corrected. These inspections would affect the interior and not have an impact on the visual appearance of the property.

**BISHOP**

Mr. Bishop questioned what impact it would have.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern commented it would have an impact on code issues, which could be brought into compliance. The next proposal is Single Family Dwelling inspections. Every property would be inspected and brought into compliance with codes. The third proposal is exterior inspections of every property in the Township on a routine basis. For all three proposals, one to three additional inspectors are needed. The fourth type is re-sale inspections, which is requiring a property to have an inspection prior to settlement. This would have a minimal impact.

The advantages are listed as follows:

- Slow down / stop blight
- Protect tenants from unsafe conditions
- Increase property value
- Preserve historic integrity

The disadvantages are as follows:

- Additional costs to the Township
- Intrusions into the properties
- Almost impossible to conduct mandatory internal inspections
- Must have long term commitment
- “Irony of Codes” Most property maintenance problems are in areas where lower income family lives.

**SIMMONS**

Mr. Simmons spoke of some problems he was finding in houses he went for inspections.

**PASCH**

Mr. Pasch questioned what problems were Township issues. He stated he understands if it is a safety issue, but not for issues such as heating.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern commented that it was for property value reasons.

**SIMMONS**

Mr. Simmons stated that it was more a suggestive thing than mandatory.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern listed priorities and recommendations as follows:

- Housing inventory
- Updating property maintenance codes
- Increase inspections based on systematic approach

The following were not recommended:

- Rental inspections

- Thorough inspections
- Mandatory re-sale inspections

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked if there were any owner occupied areas that were switching to rental properties.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated it was areas where housing was more affordable such as Pleasureville or Yorklyn.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck inquired if converting a house into apartments was allowed.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated no.
- HENRY** Mr. Henry stated that would require additional tap-ins.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick commented on having a balance on expectations and requirements. She commented on the deterioration in areas of Pleasureville and being active to prevent any major problems.
- HENRY** Mr. Henry commented on code issues he is dealing with in the Pleasureville area.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that codes have nothing to do with property maintenance. Those who want to take care of their home do. There are those who just don't care.
- SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons stated that some are probably doing the best that they can.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick spoke on the concept of "Urban Sprawl". She noted that standards are needed to be set and enforced otherwise we will be the undesirable area.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck referenced an area in York City that was re-done to look nice, that had programs in place to accomplish that, and is right back to where they started.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented on how that area was doomed to begin with due to the surrounding blight. He stated that Springettsbury doesn't have pressure all around us. Mr. Bishop commented on how quickly results are expected.
- SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons spoke of short term issues such as grass, weeds, etc. The long term issues include painting, roofs and are in the area of 6-8 years before you start to see the results. Mr. Simmons expressed his concerns with dealing with the magistrate's office with out legal representation due to the way people are today.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he feels that there needs to be a better way to deal

with this other than a system based on complaints.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on that there are few areas, which are even approaching blight. He stated that if we go into this with too big a club, we will have angry residents. Some may have to be told to protect others, but it needs to be done on a gradual basis.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that there are a lot of problems that could be fixed for a little bit of money. She stated her concerns for starting a program that will cost the homeowner a lot of money.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested giving them an incentive such as a tax break.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck inquired about how well pride programs worked in York City.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that there was only half participation.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick commented that in severe cases perhaps we should pursue legal action.
- SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons stated the problems with citing a corporation.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on sending letters to managers at large companies.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked if they feel like their hands are tied to do any real enforcement in residential neighborhoods. He would like to see the areas that have the problems and a plan to go about this. He stated that he doesn't have a problem setting standards. He also noted that he doesn't want to go into people's houses and look for a problem. However, going after what you can see is a different problem.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that she agrees with Mr. Bishop and is in favor of getting a plan.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he would endorse a progressive fining problem.
- SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons stated that Kessler sets the fines, however, you can list if it is a first or second offense.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick asked for a draft plan by the next meeting.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**FEBRUARY 26, 1999  
APPROVED**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mrs. Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

The Board of Supervisors held a 6:30 p.m. work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri  
Ken Pasch

**MEMBERS NOT  
IN ATTENDANCE:**

Bill Schenck

**ALSO IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Joy Lauchman, Administrative Coordinator

**MITRICK**

Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the Development Zone. Mrs. Mitrick also mentioned of a timely matter from Carol Tanzola to be placed on the agenda for Thursday night.

**STERN**

Mr. Stern presented to the board his Development Zone report. He discussed the following:

- Introduction
- Township demographic rankings
- Future trend projections
- Goals of the project
- Development Zone outline, districts, vacant land & buildings, etc.
- Comparisons of Development Zone and the rest of the Township
- Comparisons of the largest buildings, properties, & employees in Development Zone
- Land Use
- Discussion of Caterpillar, including the problems associated.
- Introduction to Zoning (past and present)
- Questioning future technology that might not fit into current zoning
- Discussion on flexible zoning and performance zoning
- Flexible zoning lists prohibited uses, not permitted uses
- Case in point noting the benefits, existing conditions, market conditions, and land use classification
- Proposals including site available for Development signs by the Township, west bound Memory Lane exit on Route 30, property maintenance code for Commercial and Industrial zones, pre-approved Land Development, and Foreign trade zone
- Conclusion

Mr. Stern commented on how the Flexible Zoning and the exit ramp for Memory Lane were the most important items for the Board to look at. The others were just policy items.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on how it is important to take logical steps. He stated that the area has a lot of jobs in the lower end of the pay spectrum and he would like to look at attracting top-level jobs.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned the amount of retail space that will be needed in the future.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop said that we shouldn't be making those decisions.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented on new ownership's in the Township and the expansion of Wal-Mart in the Township to be the world's largest Wal-Mart.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that there will be problems that you won't know about until they come up. He also stated that he feels that flexible zoning is a good idea.

**STERN** Mr. Stern suggested sending this "concept" to the planning commission for review.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested a joint meeting with the planning commission.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that he would like to see what PennDOT thinks of the Route 30 exit.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop suggested getting Mr. Luciani to do a feasibility study on the exit ramp at Memory Lane before taking anything to PennDOT and commented on moving forward with the flexibility zone.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the exit ramp would effect the strip mall at Whiteford Road and Memory Lane negatively.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick commented on the flexibility zone, in regards to it seeming practical.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that they should figure out how to move forward with the flexibility zoning.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch said that the planning commission should be brought into the loop.

**STERN** Mr. Stern asked them where in the continuum they would like to be. Mr. Stern stated that residential zones have the most performance requirements. If the Board would like structure with performance

requirements, then he suggested bringing in an outside consultant. He commented on requirements that are currently too hard to meet, such as landscaping requirements. There are items that are hard to control such as noise and odor, as opposed to air pollution which is safe guarded by outside agencies. Mr. Stern then asked the Board what standards they wanted.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick asked if it was wiser to bring someone else in to look at this.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that experts on this subject all have different views. However, if they were looking for stricter standards then he would recommend a planning firm.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented on how it makes sense not to tell people what they can do. He does not, however, want to see their quality of life destroyed.

**STERN** Mr. Stern said that there are standards that can be replicated.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that they should be a little bit open to a negative impact, but not to allow so many things that people are turned off. He then stated that there are always those that will be offended.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick commented on complaints dealing with traffic, noise, and odor.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop said he would like to see property maintenance in place in the new zone as well as currently.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that she is very interested in this and requested a timetable for the new information, expectations, and asked Mr. Stern to start on the leg work. She also mentioned setting up a joint meeting with the planning commission. A cover letter and booklet are to go to them for review. Lastly, Mrs. Mitrick spoke of moving forward with the feasibility study for the exit ramp.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop said that he likes the idea of Township signs for property that is available for development.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mrs. Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**FEBRUARY 1, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a work session on the above date at noon at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick , Chairman  
Bill Schenck , Vice Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Nick Gurreri

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Don Bishop

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
David Seiler , Parks and Recreation Board  
Sherry Nichols, Parks and Recreation Board  
Cindy Osborne, Parks and Recreation Board  
Lou Skeparnias, Parks and Recreation Board  
Eleanor Pioli, Recreation Department Secretary  
Joy Lauchman, Administrative Coordinator

**CALL TO ORDER**

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the issue of communications between the Park and Recreation Board, the Board of Supervisors, and Mr. Amic's office.

**OSBORNE** Ms. Osborne spoke of the lack of communication and not knowing where it stems from.

**NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols stated that the communication has been better lately and that she has been trying to make items clearer in the minutes.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that there is a process to work with and that a better line of communication is needed.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic referenced a past meeting that he thought went well and spoke on the regulations regarding projects over \$10,000. Also noted was the Kingston Park in regards to its non-usage.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the Parks and Recreation Board should put in the minutes how they feel about issues, even if they think the Supervisors won't agree.

- OSBORNE** Ms. Osborne stated that they don't always understand the reasoning behind the Board saying no to a project.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned what changed in the past that caused the problem.
- NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols stated that things were left in limbo.
- GURERRI** Mr. Gurreri expressed to the Parks and Recreation Board his understanding of their frustration on how things work since he is a newer member to the Board.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick moved the meeting to the subject of park usage.
- OSBORNE** Ms. Osborne commented on policy in regards to how to address requests in a large number.
- NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols commented on the lack of green space for soccer, the growth of organized sports and mentioned the land behind the Pleasureville Fire Hall.
- OSBORNE** Ms. Osborne stated that she would like to see open space used for organized sports.
- SKEPARNIAS** Mr. Skeparnias commented on how it would be too conservative to say that Springettsbury doesn't want anyone outside the Township to use the parks for organized sports at all. He then commented on some land he saw.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on using land that the Township does not own.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick suggested asking the Township Solicitor first about the legal aspects of using land that does not belong to the Township for Recreational Parks.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the fields would require a lot of upkeep.
- NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols stated that upkeep is a problem that should gladly be accepted.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic clarified that he was referring to the fact that fields cannot be used every year and must be rotated.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested using County land.

- NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols mentioned park noise and that it is inevitable if you live near a park and that it is unfair to take away green space because of it.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on how the feelings of the people that live in that area are just as important as the feelings of the people in organized sports.
- SKEPARNIAS** Mr. Skeparnias commented on the need to look at the main park first before looking for other areas. He also commented on how after people's children are grown, they aren't as sensitive to the needs of those that use the park.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on the fact that organized sports have been getting all the attention.
- NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols commented on the money that was spent on tot equipment and that soccer fields is a new demand.
- PIOLI** Mrs. Pioli spoke on the policy of requesting a field.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that Township residents should be given first consideration.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he thinks it a good idea to look into land elsewhere.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick suggested the Park and Recreation Board get together with Eleanor to design a new form for field sign up and then have Mr. Amic look over it. Also noted was that the policy should be in place for this fall.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that there are two issues. We should look at the immediate problem first and then the long term problem which is the need for extra fields. Mr. Pasch also suggested looking into a fee schedule.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that she would like to know the cost of field maintenance, would like to see user fees, commented on the scheduling of fields, and mentioned that she would like the Park and Recreation Board to look into passive recreation.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**FEBRUARY 1, 1999  
APPROVED**

**The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**JANUARY 7, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a noon work session on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Lori Mitrick – Chairman  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**MEMBERS NOT  
IN ATTENDANCE:**

Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch

**ALSO IN  
ATTENDANCE:**

Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Andy Hinkle, MIS Technician  
Betty Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Joy Lauchman, Administrative Coordinator

**MITRICK**

Mrs. Mitrick called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m. She indicated that the purpose of the meeting is to discuss the future municipal building and the existing building renovation.

**DITTENHAFER**

Mr. Dittenhafer first discussed the new estimates for the new municipal building, the existing building, and the farmhouse. The new building cost was reduced by \$250,743 by eliminating the basement. However, 1,330 square feet of storage was added to the first floor totaling \$153,000. The existing building costs were reduced by not quite \$300,000 by changes in the front canopy, window reductions, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and site work. The farmhouse remained at \$65,000. The total estimate of the three projects came to \$2,494,900.

**GURRERI**

Mr. Gurreri questioned the size of the basement in the other plans.

**GROVE**

Mr. Grove stated that it was 6,468 square feet.

**AMIC**

Mr. Amic stated that the savings to the new building would equal close to \$100,000.

**GURRERI**

Mr. Gurreri spoke of his concern for storage problems.

**AMIC**

Mr. Amic questioned whether any changes to the new building included the exterior.

**DITTENHAFER**

Mr. Dittenhafer stated no.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORK SESSION**

**JANUARY 7, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he doesn't want to go over \$2.5 million dollars and inquired about bidding both ways; with the basement and without.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer said that in the past when it was done that way, the differences were insignificant.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned the changes to the Police building in regards to the offices and the HVAC system.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer stated that at least \$100,000 of the costs is for the HVAC.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick inquired about the police doorbell at the rear of the building. She wondered how the remodeling was going to affect its location.

**It was the consensus of Mrs. Mitrick, Mr. Gurreri, and Mr. Bishop that they would like to keep the basement in the new municipal building.**

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer reminded the Board that they are aiming to get this out to bid by the end of February.

**The Board asked Mr. Amic to contact Mr. Schenck and Mr. Pasch to give them an opportunity to view the latest plan from Murphy & Dittenhafer and get their thoughts on the basement. The Board also instructed Mr. Amic to place this item on the January 14, 1999 Board of Supervisors Meeting agenda.**

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick asked if the glass doors leading to the receptionist area could be double doors.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer responded yes.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani spoke of the vehicle flow for the new municipal building. Mr. Luciani also noted that when the trailer is removed visibility would be better and that there is minimal work needed to the parking lot. He also made note of the signal light in front of the existing building in regards to getting more green time if warranted.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mrs. Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/jel

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a public hearing on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Don Yost, Solicitor  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m. She stated that the meeting was a Public Hearing on Springettsbury Township's On-lot Sewage System Rehabilitation proposal. She added that Mr. Amic would present information during the Public Hearing, following which Ordinance 99-11 was stated on the Board of Supervisor's Agenda for action at the General meeting following the Public Hearing.

**2. PRESENTATION OF SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP ON-LOT SEWAGE SYSTEM REHABILITATION PLAN**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided a recap of the situation where the Wastewater Director and he brought to the Board the need to do a 537 Plan. The Board had previously authorized the 537 with a two-phase approach. Phase I came forward and was approved conditioned by the Board and was sent to DEP. Phase II of the Facilities Plan for Springettsbury was completed in January of 1999. The plan had been forwarded to DEP for review. DEP met with Mr. Amic, who became concerned about getting approval for the pump station and access system to the City of York, which was part of the plan. The plan was, in fact, denied. The reason it was denied was the subject of on-lot septic problems. Mr. Schober of Buehrt Horn and Mr. Amic had been successful in convincing the DEP to approve the portions of the 537 Plan that related to the construction of the facilities. In the original plan that B-H prepared regarding the collector systems, 15 years were allowed to correct with the problem. DEP has not instructed Springettsbury to build any collector lines. What they objected to was the length of time we had in the plan. Through discussions DEP had directed Mr. Amic to design a plan for the collector systems to correct the most serious

problems of which the township had knowledge. Tests were conducted for a number of the on-lot systems, and it's rather obvious where most of the problems are. Mr. Amic then began to create a plan, and in the meantime asked for an extension from the DEP in order to get it in front of the Board to answer questions about the proposal.

Solicitor Yost created an Ordinance for consideration as the plan was created, which will be sent to DEP if approved. Based on the original 537 testing the worst area will be area A and completed first; next is area B and finally are C. DEP will insist that we address the problems that we know about which are the most critical at this time.

Mr. Amic provided a color-coded map showing the areas to be addressed. In the year 2000 instead of just testing a percentage of the on-lots, he had indicated to DEP that he wanted to test most or all of them in order to know the condition of the area. If building systems were needed they could be designed in the year 2001 and built in 2002. The action would be completed by the year 2003. We've cut the time that troubled DEP in half, and if we come back in two years and say we need to build a sanitary collector line here there will be enough evidence to put before you the need will be obvious. There are 439 sights to be evaluated and the condition of all of the sights is unknown. The Township evaluated 257 of the sights. No malfunctions were observed in 110 of these, and there were 37 confirmed and 10 suspected malfunctions; therefore 30% were either confirmed or suspected as malfunctions. That's straight out of the 537 Plan. A comprehensive analysis will be performed, and upon securing the necessary data a determination of what we think should be done will be brought before the Board.

Mr. Amic indicated that some of the things that might surface are shown on the last page of his report. Should it be determined that the on-lot systems cannot be corrected, there are five or six projects that may cost a couple million dollars. Provided we determine there is a way to deal with one or two of these projects, we'll save a lot of money other than build collector lines. Mr. Amic mentioned some of the things to be done are soil probe tests, percolation tests, and isolation distances. There may be more malfunctioning on-lot systems and the area of the lot is polluted and the lot isn't large enough to place another on-lot system. Mr. Amic indicated his concern that some of the very small lots, if they are malfunctioning, could create a real problem. DEP is fair enough about this to let us do our work and if a whole lot of money needs to be spent it would be spent wisely with justification. DEP wanted to be assured of the fact that something would be done on schedule. If not, the end result is that they would limit the township to 15, 20 or 30 tap-ins in the plant, and no more sewage this year. They'll put a block on new sewage tap-ins as their way of enforcing this as stated in EPA law. Mr. Amic continued that this would be a systematic approach to

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

dealing with a problem that must be faced. First of all it's a health problem; second of all it's strictly backed up by Environmental Protection Agency regulations in the Commonwealth. Mr. Amic stated that DEP had been reasonable at this point, and it's time to do the work and have the right data for the Board to make these critical decisions. Mr. Amic pointed out the various areas of concern.

Mr. Amic requested the Board to consider passage of Solicitor Yost's Ordinance 99-11, as well as an accompanying motion that the Township Manager be permitted to file the Township plan, including the map, Ordinance 99-11 and the Manager's short narrative. Mr. Amic would then schedule a meeting with DEP. Provided they approve, then B-H can apply for the matching funds, which is now well over \$50,000 for this plan. We have that money out there to match this plan, but we can't get the money until they're satisfied with our plan. They know they can trust Springettsbury. We have worked hard to get DEP's trust. We've only told them the truth and have cooperated every step of the way through all these problems. Mr. Amic had no reason to believe that that trust won't carry forward.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the township would be checking the systems ourselves with our own people.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the township has an SEO officer, who will cost us some money as he would be working a lot more. We might have to back him up with another person.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that actually none of this work would be done by plant employees.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the administrative paperwork, and Ed Sauer's work, would be done internally.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the township could get someone else to function as an SEO to help with some of the inspections.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated an additional SEO could be hired.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that if we tell the SEO that we need all of this done, it would be reasonable to expect that he's going to be able to do it.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that if he can't do all the work, we'll be back here shortly saying, what else could we do to meet it. Once they approve this plan, we intend to finish in the second year. I'm not real sure we can do all of this in one year. The administration end we can handle; the tests, the

accumulation of the data per lot along with all of the other requirements in the Ordinance due to the number of properties included, is a big job.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the property owner or the township would bear the expense.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the testing would be done at the township's expense.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the property owner would have to pay if they have to fix a problem.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that, if a sanitary line must be built, we'll be sitting here talking about all the things that have concerned you for the last year or two about the cost per home, etc.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked that through the Ordinance, your letter, approval by DEP we have some failures. The Ordinance allows us to compel those failures to be corrected.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was correct, provided it was possible.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what that meant.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that there might be a need for a replacement area.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that there may be a small 50 X 80 ft. lot or a 50 X 100 ft. lot, which may not have enough square footage to place a new system on it. The old system may have polluted the property. Some of them very well may not. Mr. Amic stated that his objective would be to focus on the worst case scenarios. He added that the Commonwealth has set up mechanisms to help individuals to finance the costs.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked about the evaluation phase which would identify every single system and determine whether they are functioning or non-functioning. He asked whether it would determine whether it is non-functioning and advise that it can be repaired. He stated that the Board should not be placed in a position to make a decision on whether there is sewer to be installed in the area until the whole picture is made known. He would not be in favor of mandating that someone fix a system and then two years later run a sewer line.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that was correct and that his goal was to suggest that the Board of Supervisors look at the data, indicating the work, the testing, etc. had been done in Area A; The Board would be advised of the potential for correction. It's a very ambitious plan; however, the objection

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

DEP had was the 15 years it might take to complete. Mr. Amic's focus was to get half of that time, because it will take half of that or we're going to be out of building lines based on tests of a percentage of the area.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that just knowing the geography and the land use in some of those areas, a quick glance indicates they don't appear to be areas that should be sewerred.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Mr. Schenck's point was well taken.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the purpose of the Ordinance is something that the township should have had years ago. It should be a part of any sewage facility plan. DEP does not have a bias against on-lot systems. On-lot systems are fine, but all this is doing is imposing on the township the obligation to see that they are properly maintained and hopefully reduce the number of failures.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that this was the issue discussed and was a concern.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri agreed that it should be taken care of.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that one thing the Ordinance would do is that any future development would be in compliance in having an on-lot system which would be acceptable.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost added it would have an area for replacement.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch continued that there would be procedures for inspection to make sure they don't get polluted, which, in itself is a big help.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked about when an on-lot system fails and whether the property owner would have to replace it with a sand mound.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it is not necessarily done with a sand mound. If you have a larger-sized lot, a replacement could be installed. It depends on the condition of the soil. If the soil is polluted it must be decontaminated.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked about the cost.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that it would be about \$5,000 or \$10,000.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that if we can fit them in, it would be cheaper for the resident. Additionally, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has very low interest loans for people with low-income levels where they can borrow to

repair their system. DEP's motivation is to get the unsanitary unhealthy condition out of Pennsylvania.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented on the preliminary study where it was indicated that 37 systems are already confirmed as malfunctioning.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that Buchart-Horn did some of the testing, along with our SEO.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Amic anticipated that DEP would say the ones that are confirmed must be fixed.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the township would go through the list of malfunctioning systems and start the process of telling the residents that they must do something with their system. Mr. Amic added that according to Solicitor Yost's Ordinance, they would have to repair them.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether that would be immediate if there are spotted malfunctions in a given area.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that if there were 20 in a given area, that could be sewerred more cheaply than they can be repaired.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the Supervisors don't want them to pay twice.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that the Ordinance stated that once it's bad it has to be fixed, but the Ordinance does refer to the plan. The plan says that you're going to study the whole area and determine the state of the area.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it would be tragic for someone to put in a new system and then go back and bill them double for a sanitary line.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that then for a given amount of time you anticipate that DEP would allow those systems to continue to malfunction.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they won't like it, however, he would not emphasize it. He indicated he would emphasize it will take a year to look at this area and then do something about it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked about an item on the plan. The very last numbered paragraph, the second number seven was rather undefined. There are no costs or narratives.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that was intentional; he would rather tighten it up later. He was buying time as he wanted the seven years. In three years the

problem is over; it's solved one way or another. Prior to this study it was being discussed to correct within 15 years.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether much was tested in Area C or whether they just did not find problems.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they did do tests there but there aren't that many.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked about the 537 Plan and running the sewer line and whether Barwood was included. Mr. Gurreri stated he had received a call from someone at Barwood, and they would like to see the sewer be installed. They have a lot of on-lot systems that are failing.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that what was on that system was Druck Valley Road, Stoneridge Road, Deininger Road, Locust Grove Road, Ridgewood Road.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated the plan would be to test every on-lot system, so if there are failures on Barwood they will surface. Those natural boundaries also coincide with our collector system.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic further emphasized that the plan is very ambitious. He planned to advise DEP that he would take a year to test what exists and make conclusions from that in the second year. If the need is to build it would be done in the third year, but ultimately the problem would be corrected by the third year. Mr. Amic indicated he thought DEP would be impressed what had been done thus far. He planned to request a meeting when he forwards the Ordinance and his letter, in order to sit down and discuss their concerns. He would expect some stronger language and modifications; however, they may state that the Ordinance meets the requirements and the narrative is nice to have.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked how, following DEP approval, is Springettsbury Township going to notify each one of these 439 property owners.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that that was an administrative activity that would have to have some sort of courteous procedure where it would be explained in understandable language that an inspector would be coming by to inspect at a specific time. The letter will be very important because there will be those individuals who won't want to cooperate. The emphasis must be made that the inspections are being made for public health.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that there had been difficulty with the Druck Valley/Rocky Ridge issue. A public meeting was held, and there was a tremendous turnout.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that a public meeting could be held in addition to the letter. The public will be interested in what it's going to cost them.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that at that time many residents panicked because, even though they received a letter, they didn't understand it, and they didn't know how it was going to impact them. A public meeting really is helpful.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that, at the very least, the majority of people who do understand it would get the facts.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the Ordinance does not impose immediate obligations on them. Everyone in Area A needs to have their system pumped in the year 2000 and every three years thereafter.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that there might be some systems working well that don't need pumped in 10 years.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that the Ordinance provided for those. If the property owner can document the fact that they don't need to pump that frequently, then they can get an exception.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it would be a big job, and offered to respond to any questions. He added that Mr. Schober could answer questions as well.

**3. CITIZEN COMMENT AND QUESTIONS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked for comments from the public, and there were none. She stated that the Ordinance 99-11 was on the Agenda for action during the General Meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

**4. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the Public Hearing at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a Public Hearing on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Nick Gurreri  
Don Bishop

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. She stated that the meeting was a Public Hearing regarding Ordinance 99-09, Flexible Development District. This covered an Addition to Article 16 to the Springettsbury Township Zoning Ordinance and the Springettsbury Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Chairman Mitrick provided a brief history stating that over three years ago a new concept was presented to the Board and to other members of the staff regarding a new development district. She stated that Mr. Stern had put in a tremendous amount of research and effort into the proposed Flexible Development District. York County Planning Commission, Township Solicitor Don Yost, and Springettsbury Township Planning Commission had reviewed the concept. The Board of Supervisors have had numerous work sessions reviewing the concept as well.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick addressed the public in attendance and stated that the purpose of the hearing is very important in that the Board of Supervisors hear from the residents before anything would be enacted into law. The draft Ordinance is due for consideration at our general meeting of the Board of Supervisors on December 9<sup>th</sup>, which would not necessarily mean that action would be taken. Chairman Mitrick requested that as each resident was recognized each would give name and address for the record.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick turned the meeting over to Andrew Stern to further present the concept, the specifics of the Draft Ordinance, as well as the map relating to the Ordinance.

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided a brief overview of the Ordinance. He advised those in attendance that copies of the Ordinance and maps were available. He

explained that the boundaries would be Rt. 30 on the north, Mt. Zion Road on the east, down to about where single family houses and offices would be, behind the apartments back down to East Market Street, headed west to Haines Road and Memory Lane, north to Industrial Highway, along the north side only of Industrial Highway and North Hills Road, up North Hills Road to Rt. 30, it would also include the property of Nissan and the GPU substation.

Mr. Stern continued that the general idea of the Ordinance is to change this area's zoning to what we call Flexible Development District. Flexible Development District is different from traditional zoning. Traditional zoning, which we have now in the whole township, would list specific uses in the district. In the Industrial District there is industrial use and in the residential district there is residential use. In the proposed area, there would be much greater flexibility in the practical uses that are listed in the proposed ordinance and would include industrial, commercial, residential, agricultural, and institutional uses. Along with that, however, there would be environmental standards, which would control some impacts, which might be created by allowing this flexibility of uses. For example, if you have a retail shop next store to an elderly care facility next door to a machine shop, there are provisions in here to address issues such as noises, heat, vibration, wet lands, storm water, buffering, landscaping compatibility so that all of those uses could survive next to one another and prosper.

Mr. Stern stated that also included in this draft Ordinance are definitions of all of the uses, some of the technical noise terms and other environmental terms and what a decibel is in noise. Some had been rated and tested.

Mr. Stern opened the forum up for questions and comments.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick invited comments from the public. She advised that one of the biggest frustrations of the Board and any governmental body is the many times when nothing is heard from the public before an Ordinance is enacted, but after it has been enacted their displeasure is voiced. She asked that the public be very comfortable with questions and comments because that was the purpose of the meeting. The Supervisors want the public's input before it becomes finalized.

**ANSTINE** Michael Anstine, 3705 Carolee Drive, York, asked if there were any examples of this type of zoning to which one could relate. He asked if this had been done, where and how; secondly, in an attempt to envision what the township would have 10 years from now, what the picture would be because of these changes.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he did not think there would be a lot of changes as far as uses. The area that we are proposing is already industrial, commercial and commercial highway, with the exception of a small parcel zoned Office. The overall general picture would be to have the same uses, which you have now, i.e., a mixture. What the Township hoped is that there would be less or no abandoned properties such as the Caterpillar facility. Hopefully you would see other properties such as Donlee and the properties behind Donlee develop to some viable use. Some mix of uses, perhaps a village type development, perhaps at Caterpillar or perhaps along Industrial Highway where people could live, work, shop in close proximity. There aren't any examples that are identical to this.

**CAMPBELL** Dick Campbell, 3755 Springetts Drive stated that he was at the previous meeting and brought up the question of traffic.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that his guess would be similar to what you would have 10 years from now without this change since you already have all the same uses in this zone. Traffic studies are part of our Subdivision Ordinance and part of the Land Development process.

Mr. Stern added that the flexible zoning came out of a bigger project called the Development Zone Project and there are two transportation projects under consideration by the Board. One is a road connector which would go from Mt. Zion Road by the BonTon Distribution Center, across the railroad tracks behind York Mall and connect to Industrial Highway, and the second one looked at the feasibility of a west bound exit ramp from Rt. 30 to Memory Lane. Both of those would be to get traffic to the main roads and Mt. Zion Road and Rt. 30 and get the traffic away from Industrial Highway and North Hills Road.

**EISENHART** Ms. Jan Eisenhart, 25 North Manheim Street stated that she had similar concerns relating to off street parking.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that parking requirements had been addressed. As an example if there were a retail business, one space is required for every two hundred square feet regardless of whatever district you are in. These requirements would still remain as per the Zoning Ordinance.

**EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart asked an additional question as to how the flex district would accommodate the needs that are there for the vacant Caterpillar property.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated there had been great interest in the Caterpillar property based on this Flexible Development Zone. Caterpillar had spoken to several international brokerage firms and consultants earlier during the process. One of the concerns that was raised through that process was that the property was zoned industrial. It is 1.8 million square feet and it

wasn't likely that a single user would come forward for that magnitude of property and that size of building. Once the proposal was announced in the newspaper Caterpillar received over a half a dozen inquires by developers and investors for the property based on some form of flexible development. Mr. Stern stated that this would prove positive for Springettsbury and Caterpillar.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether Ms. Eisenhart's question related to off street parking and the affect it would have on parking outside of this zone.

**EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart stated that it did not, but she continued that if Industrial Highway became more developed she was concerned about the surrounding residential areas. If a company would move into a site and not have stringent controls placed on off street parking for that facility; there could be overflow into a residential area.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that all uses must follow the rules for off street parking and those are by use not by zoning.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that there would be essentially no change from the current situation.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that regarding the possible growth of a given business, if a business expanded its facility because of growth, additional parking must be planned.

**SPANGLER** Mr. Warren Spangler, 2085 Whiteford Road stated that he observed a need for some requirements for noise. He commented that he was pleased to see that and hoped that would be adopted the final Ordinance. He commented that for 30 years when Caterpillar was there they had oscillating conveyers, and all night long it would drop articles, metal to metal. It had disturbed his sleep.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that those living in the Fayfield area might have heard some of the loud noises that were experienced within the last year or 18 months with Donlee. Mrs. Mitrick asked Mr. Stern to address that because it would alleviate some of the concerns.

**STERN** Mr. Stern advised that Donlee's process involves testing of large boilers and when they release the air pressure from those boilers they make a loud noise and that is probably an understatement for those of who live there. The Township has no noise ordinances or environmental ordinances other than stormwater management and pollution which are required by the state so there was nothing that the Township could do other than ask Donlee politely to fix the problem, which they had done. Mr. Stern added that the new ordinance would have prevented that. Had Donlee either been a new business or was putting in a new process they would have had to comply

with this ordinance and would have had to put in some sort of device to limit the noise.

**ARIGO** Ms. Dorcas Arigo, 136 North Rockburn stated that she was concerned that Rockburn Street is the only street there that will go from Industrial Highway to East Market Street. She stated if there were any more business there on Industrial Highway, she could imagine how much more traffic that would cause for that one street. She asked whether that had been considered.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the particular traffic on Rockburn Street had been discussed. There was no immediate solution; however, it is part of the Rt. 30 exit ramp idea that would get people to Rt. 30 and also to 83 without coming through your neighborhood. Regardless of this zoning change, that was a concern.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that as Mr. Stern mentioned the corridor, the connection between Industrial over to Mt. Zion Road, that would also take traffic off of East Market Street. Motorists use Rockburn just to try and avoid other traffic areas that are problems. She recalled that there were residents in that area in the past who had come asking if the Supervisors could possibly make some of those streets in your neighborhood one way to alleviate or to change traffic patterns so that traffic wouldn't move as quickly and would attempt to reduce the amount of cars that cut through you neighborhood. That matter had been referred to Police Chief Eshbach who then had to work with state regulations. In many issues related to what we think might be reasonable, our hands are tied and it is not a decision that we can make at this level.

**TROUT** Mr. George Trout, 33 N. Manheim Street stated that years ago when he had been active in the Little League he spent many night trying to figure out where the terrible smell was coming from at his home. It turned out that some Little League people were burning trash in 50-gallon drums at the ballpark and so up and down Manheim Street it smelled. He continued that this practice is not done anymore because somebody complained. He stated that the Board had done homework certainly on the noise matter, but asked about aromas.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that there were two parts: one is in this Ordinance and one is not. To specifically address the burning two months ago the Supervisors adopted a burn ordinance which is a state law banning the burning of trash. It would allow for other kinds of burning but specifically would not allow this kind. Mr. Stern directed Mr. Trout to page 17 on Air Quality regarding the specifics.

**TROUT** Mr. Trout added that he mentioned the Little League would have stuff burning intermittently, but manufacturing would be a constant smell. If a

product is produced, baked or manufactured it can cover a large area of the area that is not in the zoning.

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether Mr. Trout was referring to Stauffer Biscuit Company and added that it smelled pretty good.
- TROUT** Mr. Trout commented that he was not and that he did not wish to offend Mr. Gurreri, but he was referring to the pizza smell. Night after night pizza manufacturers produce 24 hours a day for shipping.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that there are filters available to take that smell out.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that filters are available, but he could not promise they work. He added that more information would be available on that at the York DEP office.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether it would be fair to state the proposed ordinance would regulate that sort of thing more tightly than the current ordinance does.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that for air quality, not specifically, no. He added that the Township is not permitted to go above state and federal laws.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Township was even ‘there’ at the present time.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the Township is required to be ‘there’ now but it is not specifically part of the review process that we do so right now. If someone came in with a new factory right now, the township would not review air quality requirements. The Township would assume that someone at the state level would do that review. The new ordinance would require that the developer would prove to the supervisors that they comply. The Township is not necessarily raising the standards but raising the requirement to prove compliance.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked if the Township was getting more involved.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the Township was getting more involved.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern to explain that part of the Ordinance, particularly about people being qualified for the recommendations and evaluations that they are giving the Township.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded and provided a synopsis of what would be required to submit to the Township before proceeding with any development. An environmental impact statement would have to be submitted which would address methods of compliance for each and every environmental standard listed in the Ordinance. An environmental professional, which means

someone who has sufficient education and related experience to evaluate the proposed use in accordance with all the standards in the Ordinance. The Township also will have the opportunity to have the Township engineer or another engineer chosen by our Supervisors to review all the qualifications of the person who prepared the plan and the plan itself to be sure that these requirements are met.

- KUNKLE** Ms. Deb Kunkle, 120 N. Rockburn Street asked what percentage of Springettsbury Township was residential and what percentage was commercial.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he would be able to provide an answer from the comprehensive plan for 1990.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that one could get a pretty good idea by looking at the zoning map.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that would show how things are zoned, not necessarily how they are used.
- STERN** Mr. Stern focused again on the zoning map. He explained that the light yellow represented rural residential which are larger residential lots and farms. Gold would be a low density residential, which also had some farms and also had the larger residential properties. The brown/gray represented medium density residential where most of the houses would be, where the neighborhoods are, and would be a medium residential area. Orange would be a high density residential, townhouses, condominiums, and apartments. Purple would be industrial. Red and dotted red represented commercial and commercial highway where retail and businesses would be and darker gray and browns would be offices, some of which are mixed with apartments.
- EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart asked whether the Flex District just misses old East York.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that was correct that the proposed district would be on the north side of Industrial Highway only. It would not include anything on the south side.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented about the traffic, a problem about which all of the Supervisors are concerned. Many times when businesses come to our community they do things like repairing the intersections or placing a light that actually improves the traffic condition. Home Depot is spending \$400,000 to improve the traffic in our Township. Mr. Gurreri added that that alone would not cure the traffic problem because they bring a lot of traffic, but it actually can improve it.

**EISENHART** Ms. Jan Eisenhart asked about the traffic coming in from 83 heading north that now comes off at Exit 8 onto E. Market Street and then crosses over onto North Hills road. She asked whether there would be a study or an application through PennDot to alleviate or redirect that. She added that there was a lot of truck traffic passing there and that the removal of Exit 9 alleviated a lot of noise.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether he was familiar with the 12-year plan and whether that intersection was involved

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he knew of no plan for Market Street and North Hills Road that would be included in the 12-year plan.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the truckers had learned that that is a short cut and they use it going both ways. Mr. Pasch stated that he would not envision PennDot closing down that ramp because, on the other hand, 462 is another state highway and the Township has no control on state highways.

**EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart stated in thinking ahead, if Industrial Highway would be developed, then hopefully it would alleviate the bottleneck that would occur down the road if that submission were made now.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that if one of our roads were involved, we can control truck traffic, but when a state highway would be involved, the Township does not have any authority over those highways. That would have to be a state determination.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that our state legislators deal with state highways problems and that is all tied up in inter-state Congress laws and the restrictions placed upon the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that the Supervisors recently and very forcefully attempted to get the use of jake brakes prohibited in some areas. Residents who live near the exit off of 83 had complained about the noise of the brakes, and so far we have gotten nowhere with it. Todd Platts is working very hard with us, we have also taken another area along Rt. 30 between North Hills Road and North Sherman Street just to try to prohibit the use of jake brakes in that area. We are still working on it but sometimes we are told no and that's what it is.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Township could regulate North Hills Road.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that North Hills Road is a Township Road. Our officers could stop trucks on North Hill Road.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he did not think that this Development Zone really is going to significantly impact traffic along Industrial Highway, which seems to be the one thing that the residents are concerned about there.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the point that Mr. Stern brought up which is very important is that this is all zoned now in such a way that the businesses that are likely to develop in there would likely develop anyway. The traffic would not be much different whether we put in the flexible zoning or not because it is all zoned industrial and commercial highway.

**ARIGO** Ms. Dorcas Arigo asked why the Township is addressing the flexible development, if there is not much difference in what it is now.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that other things would be allowed to go in there. There would not be an elimination of what is already there, but an addition of professional, residential for a combination of many things. The concept Mr. Stern had mentioned is that a person could work there, live there, go to church there, go to your doctors, and it would essentially encompass almost anything that you would want to do and it is in a short area.

**STERN** Mr. Stern posed a scenario where when a company of the size of Caterpillar and a property of that size hires people to find out what could be here. Secondly if a large company wanted to decide where to move, the first thing that company would do would be to call the Township to find out whether that function would be allowed. And often times what has happened is people will call the Township and find out it is zoned industrial and something they want to do is commercial so they rule that property out and they move on somewhere else. Likewise, if an industrial user wanted to move into a commercial area they would call and find out if it is commercial and cross that property off the list. So, this gives more flexibility so the developers have an opportunity to make what they want to do fit with what we want them to do.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that by enacting the flexible zoning, there would most likely be more development but of a different kind because the Township had made it easier for property owners or potential property owners.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added to the understanding and stated that all that was being done was giving the developer of this property the option to use it in more than one or two ways.

**ARIGO** Mr. Walt Arigo, 136 N. Rockburn Street asked why, if only the Caterpillar property was being considered, why not just rezone that property into flex area and let the rest of it go. He asked how many acres were included.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there are about 588 acres.

- ARIGO** Mr. Arigo stated that the flexible zoning is not the whole idea, just to sell that property.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it was not the sole reason, but it was a reason.
- ARIGO** Mr. Arigo stated that he felt it was the only reason.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that it is a portion of it. He added that when this project first started Caterpillar was still operating and there was still some hope that Caterpillar would remain. There are other properties in this area, such as Caterpillar Distribution Center where there is no indication how long that will stay in operation. Donlee had been down-sized tremendously from what it used to be.
- ARIGO** Mr. Arigo stated that there's no access in the back.
- STERN** Mr. Stern provided further information that indicated the flexible zoning is not just for Caterpillar. There are vacant properties and other areas where developers have looked for development sites.
- ARIGO** Mr. Arigo stated the vacant site along Industrial Highway had been vacant since the beginning of time and nobody had bought in there.
- STERN** Mr. Stern added that one of the reasons is because of the zoning. The zoning for that property is commercial and commercial highway. It does not fit with the property. No one wants to build at this time for commercial use on that section of Industrial Highway.
- ARIGO** Mr. Arigo stated that those lots aren't big enough to do anything; they're not deep enough.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that with this flexible zoning those two properties could be used. The property could not be utilized right now because of zoning. The zoning is not flexible enough to allow these properties to be developed.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern to which properties he was referring.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it would be the Cronheim property next to the former Lowe's and there is the ICI Paint on a portion of this property next to the former Hechinger's.
- EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart asked about the major concern of sewage treatment. She mentioned the moratorium off and on through multiple counties with sewage treatment facilities. She asked how the sewage treatment facilities could be addressed.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that the Caterpillar properties had a specific sewage allotment. The state of Pennsylvania prohibited the Township from moving that sewage to any other property. We are not permitted to use that sewage allotted to the Caterpillar facility anywhere else because the state position is that someday it will develop and it is locked into the site. As far our long term plans, the Board of Supervisors have been working for about three years and has let contracts for the pump station which is being built in an access line to the city which will provide additional sewage for residential developments in our community.

**EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart asked what percentage increase that addition would create and whether the Township has an option to purchase more capacity.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that there are options with the city to explore additional sewage along with our long-range plan

**EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart stated that she was curious about some of the sludge from our facilities. She asked if anything had moved forward with approvals.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that there had not been any lost approvals. He added that there is a group that opposes land application of sludge and that is what you are hearing. But, we have not lost any of our approvals. Even though there is a group that opposes that on a grand scale, they would oppose that anywhere; we have not lost any approvals. Other than that vocal group that opposes it, we have not had difficulties. We have other means of disposing the sludge if we need to do it. We feel land application is the most cost effective and the most responsible way to handle it. We actually have farms that want it and they have to deal with the political climate in their community; i.e., get their neighbors to understand the value to them as a farmer.

**EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart asked whether the Board had considered spray irrigation facilities.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that that process is when a private facility is used and there is not need for private sewage facilities in our community with the plant we have and the line we have in the ground. The other thing you have to remember is that we are trying to drive this development in an area that is built to accommodate it. It has the public water, the public sewer. If we were talking about taking that bright yellow area there which is our rural residential and opening that up to high density residential then we might see somebody coming in and wanting to build a high density community in all those farms.

**SPANGLER** Mr. Warren Spangler stated that he heard Mr. Stern say something about a traffic circle at Memory Lane and Whiteford Road. He asked what the purpose of that would be.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded he did not know about a traffic circle. There had been reference to a westbound exit ramp from Rt. 30 to Memory Lane. At the present time a motorist cannot get off Rt. 30 in the westbound direction. The Board is looking at the feasibility of allowing an exit ramp that a motorist can get off west bound Rt. 30 onto Memory Lane.

**SPANGLER** Mr. Spangler wondered how that would affect Whiteford Road. He added that he had heard discussion about closing off Whiteford Road, which he would be opposed to doing.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded to Mr. Spangler and advised that it had been reviewed and was not feasible.

**SPANGLER** Mr. Spangler stated that was one of his concerns.

**ARIGO** Ms. Dorcas Arigo stated that she could see the benefits of the flexible development. She indicated that her biggest concern was the boundaries. It appeared to be such a big area and so close to the residential areas. She thought it would benefit Springettsbury Township.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that since the Supervisor's vote during a previous meeting certainly had been made public, when she looked at the map she totally agreed with Mrs. Arigo for two reasons: one this is a new concept and though it can be looked at it very optimistically, she personally felt a responsibility to look at the worse case scenario because we may have to live with it, we don't know. She added that she felt some of these boundaries imposed on residential areas in the community, and she didn't know why this district had to be as large as it is shown on this map. Chairman Mitrick stated that Mr. Stern had done a tremendous job in the last many months getting redevelopment into some of these sites. Consider York Market Place, which had been redeveloped. Consider the front end of York Mall and the World's Largest Wal-Mart, Home Depot. There had been positive activity regarding the purchase of the Lowe's building on Industrial Highway. That building had been a concern to all of us for a long time. Redevelopment is a concern for development of a few of these lots that have yet to be developed but Chairman Mitrick personally felt that with this district going into a more confined area than what the map presently shows would make some of these other areas more marketable.

**ARIGO** Ms. Dorcas Arigo asked why it would be necessary to start out on such a large scale. If it works then it could be expanded. She added that if the zone would be cut down a little bit and away from the residents a little more people could see that it's a good thing and would accept it a little more. She commented that she thought that they were in attendance because it is close to our front yards with traffic, the noise and the environment.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded to her comment that he could agree if he thought that this proposal was going to result in a significant increase in the intensity of the development that could be obtained. He continued that he believed that the Township would obtain better development, not necessarily more or more intrusive development through this proposal. The environmental factors are being regulated, which is important and people are being given the flexibility to do different kinds of development.

**ARIGO** Ms. Dorcas Arigo stated that if anyone had a crystal ball then the residents would know what would go in but the results are unknown.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that nobody had a crystal ball. He pointed out that no one knows what would go in now with the present zoning. What is known is that there would be better control of some of the environmental factors that have not been under control in the past so that we can make sure that noise and some of these other things are not going to be problems in the future. He added that hopefully the Township would obtain a different kind of industrial development than what was in the past because the owners will have the flexibility to do things a little bit differently.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether Ms. Arigo's concern related to Industrial Highway.

**ARIGO** Ms. Arigo responded that from Memory Lane to North Hills Road was her area of concern. She added that they are completely boxed in there.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the what's there now is commercial and some industrial.

**ARIGO** Ms. Arigo stated that area is not marketable. The way it stands right now, it sits there and has sat there for 20 years because nobody wants it. If the zoning is changed, it will be made more marketable.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that was correct but the zoning that is there today would be marketable if a developer came in today.

**ARIGO** Ms. Arigo stated that a developer would not be interested as it sits right now because it would not be marketable. That was the reason why it had not been developed. If the zoning makes it more marketable it could open up the whole area to ugly things as well as good things.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that her assessment was correct.

**TROUT** Mr. Trout asked about the ownership of that strip

**STERN** Mr. Stern asked which strip was being referred to.

- ARIGO** Ms. Dorcas Arigo stated that the area under discussion from Haines Road to North Hills Road was where their houses are, i.e. from Fayfield to Rockburn Street that and the other side of the creek there where the veterinary clinic is. If that zoning is changed, anything could go in there.
- TROUT** Mr. Trout stated he thought the property was owned by Donlee.
- ARIGO** Ms. Dorcas Arigo responded that right now it was owned by Donlee and it's zoned for industrial use.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the reason that had been developed is because they already have an on-going business there. If Donlee is in fact downsizing and decided they want to do something different with their business their property would be marketable. He added that the property that is not marketable at the moment is Caterpillar because it is so large. Donlee could move their manufacturing out to some industrial park and sell that to any type of business that none of us would want to see there right now.
- ARIGO** Ms. Arigo stated that there is a bigger unknown with what is being attempted with the flexible zoning.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that that is where he would disagree. He added that the Board had reviewed the zoning very carefully and found that the controls are a whole lot more stringent than what is there now.
- ARIGO** Mr. Arigo asked why the Board could not just the control without this.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that was part of the fundamental problem.
- ARIGO** Mr. Arigo commented that the township has no control but must follow state control. He asked whether the flexible zoning would get the control that is needed.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that for the specific control items such as noise, heat, glare, vibration and some of the other ones, we do not currently have requirements. If the zoning is not changed no one will want to develop in Springettsbury Township.
- ARIGO** Mr. Arigo stated he thought things had been better for the residents since Caterpillar left. Now the children can walk out in the street without getting run over on Rockburn Street. He added that when Caterpillar was working, many cars used Rockburn Street as a short cut
- GURERRI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the only problem with that scenario is the tax base. If Caterpillar remains dormant, it ruins our tax base and then all the taxes go up.

- ARIGO** Mr. Arigo responded that that's what the whole thing was about. He asked why not just rezone Caterpillar and let the rest go. He added that the area was too big, and all it was being done for was to gain the tax base that was lost.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the expenses still go on; the police and the firemen get an increase. If the Caterpillar tract were not developed, there would be no growth.
- ARIGO** Mr. Arigo stated that one big company isn't going to invest in that tract. He added that smaller companies would be a better solution. The tax base would come back. Big isn't always good.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that development brings in tax dollars. That tax base will be necessary in five to ten years down the road.
- TROUT** Mr. George Trout asked who owned the property between the former Lowe's and Sam's.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it is owned by a group, but it was represented by Robert Cronheim as one of the interests in York Market Place and Eat-N-Park. The exact owners are Stanford and Helen Eisenburg of Freedland in New Jersey.
- SPANGLER** Mr. Warren Spangler stated that he could see a lot of sides to this. He indicated an understanding of why the Township was concerned. There are some good points, but his concern would be to try to protect the residents as much as possible because of the encroachment on their quality of life
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the appeal to him was the potential which exists not for a development to occur that could have a higher density residential area right next to a light industrial complex, but that in the middle of the complex could be a restaurant and shops. Those things can't occur anywhere in the township today. Mr. Schenck added that he found that highly desirable. He was appreciative of the group that attended the meeting, because they are people affected immediately by this. The people from the outlying areas are sitting at home thinking that we're only focusing on an industrial area. Mr. Schenck stated that that what this was is a recycling of land. This is taking property that is there and under-utilized, and undeveloped and reusing it, and that was his attraction to the zone. Mr. Schenck added that he believed the map was a little big, and he was sure there would be some further discussion on the boundaries, but the potential was there to create what could be created anywhere else in the Township.

**CAMPBELL** Mr. Dick Campbell asked, if this would be approved and shortly after it was approved somebody came in and did something that nobody anticipated, would the Township would be locked in and unable to change it.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that as zoning works, whatever zone existed the day of application would be the zone. Those are the rules that apply. If an applicant comes in and says I'm going to build this and our regulations allow it, it's allowed. The township cannot deny any project because we don't like it.

**CAMPBELL** Mr. Campbell asked if somebody came in and did something and it had an adverse affect could the Township then do something that could prevent somebody else from coming in and doing something similar.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that absolutely that could be prevented, but they could not undo what had already been done.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that what was written into this Ordinance contains many protective measures, which would require the would-be developer to meet before the property were developed. Protective measures would still be available to enforce. Those are the things that are very appealing in the ordinance itself because there are not many available right now.

**CAMPBELL** Mr. Campbell stated that enforcement would be the key.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded that the Supervisors understood that, and he was correct in what he stated.

**EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart stated that it seemed that many of those in attendance spoke for a balance within the township. When commercial or industrial property would be developed that encroached on a residential property there is an added factor of our children's growth, such as safety in the roadways. She suggested that a bicycle trail the whole way around it the area. As the Caterpillar property would be developed, along with a number of those properties develop, put the bike trail in segments that pay for that, and set up an escrow account that creates the maintenance for that trail. Ms. Eisenhart stated that she viewed the situation from a residential homeowner, but also from a parent's perspective. There is no place that a child can really ride a bike unless driven. She concluded that the parent has a responsibility to preserve that for the next generation.

**STERN** Mr. Stern addressed a comment and referred to page 21 of the Ordinance, number 3 towards the top, which does require all developments in this

zone to provide safe and convenient pedestrian access to each use from adjoining properties and nearby residential areas of the township. For example, when the Donlee property was redeveloped, pedestrian access around the property was necessary.

**EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart stated that she was referring to recreation. The Township is big on recreation. There are a lot of positives that are going in, but in viewing that large of a block of land there should be offsetting factors. As those developments come in, there can be amounts placed in escrow to develop a portion of a bike trail.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that they would be required to conform. He stated that another part of the Ordinance include recreation. We require either land set aside or fees to be used to develop recreation areas. The Township cannot take a piece of someone's personal property and say, "Here's where the bike trail is going to go."

**EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart stated that properties which had used this type of zoning, those properties were privately held, and the pathway was created to take that outlying area and zone it or make accommodations for bike trails. The trails were created. Ms. Eisenhart indicated that this is preservation of the past so that our children have a future.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that there would be no way to legally do any of it.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked why the Township should be allowed to require sidewalks and not require a bike trail.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that he thought that a bike trail could be required.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that sidewalks are in a public right-of-way, and the bike trails are not. The Township would have to either have the property owner volunteer to give the right-of-way for these trails or the Township would have to condemn them.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he thought it was a very good idea and something to look at. When the park is done over a walk way and a bike trail are planned if enough money is raised.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that several years ago when there was another large track of land in the planning stage of development, the Board worked very hard to get a bike trail through that area. The hope was at that time was that the bike trail could then link into Rocky Ridge Park and we had a whole concept in mind and really went for it. As Mr. Stern indicated, the developer decided that wasn't going to happen and so today we don't have the trail. It is something that is very appealing; however, the Board has limitations in the planning stages. She added that there are a

lot of things that the Supervisors feel would be extremely beneficial to the community, but we just don't have the authority to require them.

**EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart, added that if zoning changes are being enacted, that is the time to put the requirement in. It can be done and there is also a link up with DCNR that would pay for a portion of a bike trail with grant monies. She added that it would take a tremendous amount of work, but it wasn't the impossible dream.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that Ms. Eisenhart stated that with a great deal of certainty.

**EISENHART** Ms. Eisenhart responded that she was certain it could be done with a number of steps. She indicated she would submit more information if there was an interest.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that this would add to the whole project. Mr. Pasch stated that he visualized the project in that way. A whole community lives within the community, which is important.

Mr. Pasch added a second point. He encouraged people to change the paradigm of how they look at what industrial is. Industrial today is not the old smokestacks. Visit the Meadowlands where the Post Offices is; that's industrial but I would rather go through that area than go through some of the commercial areas we have. It's a much nicer looking, and a much more appealing type of place. That's what we're trying to do here to attract developers that would go in there like that and build this type of development. It's much more appealing than some of your commercial areas.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he was concerned about that section from Memory Lane going east to Edgewood Road and south of Industrial Highway. Mr. Pasch indicated that in his opinion, York Mall with what Wal-Mart has just put in there and the size of their building and everything along York Market Place have too many economic factors involved there in terms of those businesses changing to something else. Mr. Pasch indicated that would be pretty remote. York Market Place, York Mall, Home Depot will stay the way they are. As far as McCory's property is concerned, that's a different question. York Container will stay the way it is, those things aren't going to change

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that there was one thing really needed and that was to address the traffic situation. He mentioned two areas that need to be reviewed: Memory Lane around Market Street, and Market Street down to Industrial Highway and probably North Hills Road. He asked what next step would there be whether or not the zoning is changed to review those areas.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the area of Rockburn Street had been brought up, and it was important to address that as well. In an attempt to address the traffic problem, Mr. Pasch indicated the traffic that would be coming in and out of here must have an alternative route. Motorists don't like to travel Memory Lane especially on Thursday and Friday because it is jammed and so that is why they cut across and go down Rockburn because it is an easy way out. Mr. Pasch indicated agreement with the residents that there was a need to address the traffic situation and attempt to establish routes which make it easier to get in and out without going through residential streets.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that there had been discussion about the traffic, and the Township engineer was looking into some alternative idea. It may have been informally discussed, but there had been discussion about traffic calming and other things that were at least looked at and probably need to be revisited.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there had been discussion about making the streets one way, also about speed bumps, narrowing a couple of the roads to slow the speed down. The Township Engineer and the Public Works Director needed to compare notes to make sure that none of the ideas would jeopardize the liquid fuels funding of the township.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he wished to reinforce the comment made related to the Home Depot's contributions and work on the intersection and on Market Street. A figure of \$400,000 was stated for off-site contributions by Home Depot to improve the traffic flow. The type of developer that would be attracted to the Caterpillar tract who would put that kind of money into the property would be a good citizen the same as Home Depot. We may get some real good help here as we have in the past. Mr. Amic focused on the development in the back of the Galleria and added that the developers paid \$450,000 for road improvements, not the taxpayers and not the Township.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that even on the connector road that is being considered extending Industrial Highway east and going back in around Sam's and across the railroad tracks to connect to the traffic signal at Concord and Mt. Zion. Verbal commitments had been made by some of the large businesses in that area that they would help to financially support that project if it went through. It would be a tremendous advantage to them because there would be another access to their location, and it would take traffic off of East Market Street.

**PRITCHARD** Mr. Jack Pritchard of Springetts Village asked about the stop signs at Memory Lane and Pleasant Valley Road and whether or not the signs are to be changed.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded that was the plan. The process that would occur would be that for a given amount of time the intersection where Pleasant Valley Road crosses over Memory Lane Extended would be a four-way stop. After a period of time when people recognize the four-way stop the intention is, and had been recommended by the traffic engineers, to then shift the stop to let Pleasant Valley Road be a through street and stop the traffic on Memory Lane Extended.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick concluded the meeting by thanking all the residents for attending the meeting. She commented that all of the input had been recorded and would be something that the Board would review again. She added that at this point nothing was written in stone. She stated that she would like to take the concept out of anyone's mind that the Board or this Township viewed the Caterpillar property as a problem. That was not the case, but rather as a challenge and looking forward to that which is necessary to do with the changes industry and businesses, the Board's primary concern was for the residents who live in this community. The Board's responsibility is to respect that and to support it. No decisions were made at this meeting. The ordinance with the map is on the agenda for our general meeting on December 9, 1999. At that time it could be held in abeyance if the Board still isn't 100 percent certain as to the content of the Ordinance and the map as well. Chairman Mitrick invited those in attendance to attend the general meeting on December 9<sup>th</sup>. If action were not taken at the December 9, 1999 meeting then there would be a good chance it would be sometime in January, 2000.

**3. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**SEPTEMBER 23, 1999  
DRAFT**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a Public Hearing on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Nick Guerreri  
Don Bishop

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Michael Hickman, Fire Chief  
Ronald Simmons, Building Inspector  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the Public Hearing to Order at 6:35 p.m. Chairman Mitrick stated the purpose for the Public Hearing was to gather public input on the recommended amendments to Ordinance 97-11 and 97-10.

**STERN** Mr. Stern introduced Mr. Tim Kinsley of Kinsley Construction Co. and Mr. George Bliss, representing the Springettsbury Business Association. Messrs. Kinsley and Bliss were present to speak for the recommended amendments. Mr. Stern stated that no one was present to speak in support of the existing Ordinance. Mr. Stern had worked through the York Builders Association, National Fire Sprinklers Association and Marker Fire Sprinkler Association. He had also contacted the sprinkler companies in York.

Mr. Stern provided handouts for the Board containing background information relating to the current Ordinance. He advised that the staff recommended that the BOCA Codes be followed as written as opposed to the local amendments for sprinklers.

Mr. Stern stated that the installation of sprinklers allows less expensive construction methods. He further stated that as one of the reasons the BOCA Building Codes are written as beneficial both for the Township's review and for the builders in that the Codes do allow for modifications. Mr. Stern added that savings in insurance costs seem to make the expenditure for automatic sprinkler protection a sound investment.

However, recently the Township went through an ISO insurance rating system for building codes, and most of the smaller businesses do not benefit from insurance premiums from sprinkler systems.

Further Mr. Stern commented that an equally important consideration was that modifications in the building codes are allowed when sprinklers are installed. Modifications permit an increase in undivided area, less fire resistance for the building construction and lower construction costs. With the local Ordinance this is not permitted, but there are trade offs with the BOCA Code as written.

Mr. Stern stated that in addition, the Ordinance should apply equally to all types of occupancies. The staff disagrees and noted that the Building Code allows for some differences based on occupancies, i.e. a business use in a non-combustible structure would have different fire loads and different safety concerns than a factory of 100,000 sq. ft.

In summary Mr. Stern advised that staff recommends when BOCA Code buildings are designed and constructed to provide early warning of fire to occupants, allow for their safe and efficient egress from structure, provide prompt notification to the fire department and to contain the fire to the room of origin. He concluded his comments by stating that if buildings are built to the BOCA Code, then the BOCA Code takes into account that they are safe structures whether or not they are sprinklered. If a building is not built to BOCA Codes and is not safe, the BOCA Code doesn't give us the authority to go back and make them sprinkler the building; therefore, the local amendment doesn't really help in those cases.

**KINSLEY** Mr. Tim Kinsley spoke for the BOCA Code. He stated that recently he had experience with the issue under discussion. The Meinecke Muffler building recently approved was discovered to require sprinklers.

Mr. Kinsley added that the Ordinance should be applied equally to all types of occupancies. An Ordinance that is equally and fairly applied and based on realistic criteria is typically more acceptable to the public.

Mr. Kinsley stated that the BOCA Code is realistic theoretical criteria issued from an organization, which focuses on this matter day in and day out. They are continually researching codes, changing the codes to apply to how buildings are being built today. It is updated every two to three years. The BOCA Code continues to reflect the most recent realistic conditions in construction and code enforcement.

Mr. Kinsley advised that specific tests are conducted to determine whether or not a building needs sprinklered. Attention is directed to the size of the

building, what is being stored in the building, what the travel distance is to get out of the building, the materials used, i.e., are they combustible, non-combustible, are there other forms of fire protection dealing with fire walls and dividing areas. Trade offs are utilized, and the BOCA Code refers the builder to different sections which give additional criteria to consider that may be superseded by a current ordinance, which takes what they are doing out of effect in the rest of the codes.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that if the Code required sprinklers, that determination should not be based on something, which is or could be variable, such as what might be stored there. Storage today for whoever is building the building may be entirely different from what a property might be used for at some time in the future. The Code should be based on the general construction.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the issue of storage would be considered a small part of a long formula used to determine if sprinklers would be needed or not. If the primary use of the building or area were storage, and it met the other requirements for needing sprinklers, then the NFBA book would determine what kind of sprinklers. The sprinkler heads would be specifically tailored for the specific type of storage. For example, if tires were being stored, a different kind of sprinkler system would be needed than if paper were being stored. Additionally, if the owner changed from storing one to another, the sprinklers would be changed.

**KINSLEY** Mr. Kinsley stated there are classifications of storage such as hazardous material storage. Buildings where there is a small percentage of hazardous material but primarily aerosols are addressed in the BOCA Code. Only a portion of the total area is allowed for that type of storage. Another warehouse might only be required to have a four-hour fire rated wall around it. Such cases would be addressed per tenant.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether a new tenant would be required to put sprinklers in if there are no sprinklers to start with.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that a new tenant would be required to put sprinklers in.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost asked how it would become known when the occupancy takes place.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that a new Certificate of Use and Occupancy would be filed.

- YOST** Solicitor Yost asked whether an Ordinance exists that says a tenant must advise when they change from storing one item versus another.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that was true as long as that which changes the occupancy is within BOCA.
- KINSLEY** Mr. Kinsley stated that the current Ordinance wouldn't address that either.
- KINSLEY** Mr. Kinsley stated that there is a form that businesses have to fill out identifying that they are in the Township.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that Sam's Club would be an example where there are tire racks. The tire rack area has sprinklers in the shelving units themselves, which is a requirement by NFPA.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that York City adopted the BOCA Code. He added that there are many of properties that are multi-units. He asked whether there are two-unit properties in Springettsbury Township?
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the Springettsbury condominiums are sprinklered.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he was referring to a single house with two units, two different families live in one house.
- STERN** Mr. Stern reminded the Board of the Nello Tire renovation, which included a 12,000-sq. ft. building. By making it separate buildings but next to each other, they avoided putting in sprinklers.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost commented that that would not apply to residential townhouse units. Even though there are rated firewalls between the units, the units would still have to be sprinklered.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that was correct under the current Ordinance, but under the BOCA Code, it would not be correct.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether multi-family dwellings, as defined by the BOCA Code as an R2, would be required to have sprinkler systems.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that an R2 covered more than two dwelling units. That would include boarding houses, shelters, and sleeping accommodations.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the typical new condos being built would not be sprinkled.

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that, under the BOCA Code, they would not be sprinklered.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented about the insurance cost savings offsetting the cost of the sprinkler system. He further stated that there had been no cost advantage to sprinklering with offsetting insurance savings in a building situation in which he had been involved.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that savings would only be realized, as it would apply to a very large, hazardous use building.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented about the muffler shop scenario and asked where that would fall, as an example.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded it would be a B-use business. Under the current ordinance if it's over 5,000 square feet, it would require sprinklers. Under the BOCA Code it would not specifically be required to have sprinklers. However, a height and area chart is investigated when plans are reviewed.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that when the plans show height modifications and the information is basic, unalterable information, such as construction, and including storage matters. All these things are factored in without being subjective, and it is an objective matter.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there is a specific formula, and if it is done correctly and the result is less than 100%, something must be added to bring it up to 100%.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that this position is not subjective; it's very objective and very black and white.
- SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons stated that Michael's was one where sprinklers were installed and then a second floor mezzanine was added for storage. Due to the height from the floor to the roof bed, it didn't meet the BOCA criteria so they had to spray all the structural members and the roof decking with fire proofing materials. There are checks and balances within the Code.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned Mr. Stern about a comment in his memo of the 18<sup>th</sup> in that the international codes were a separate matter and had nothing to do with what was being discussed. The issue focused on the BOCA Code as it exists today.
- BLISS** Mr. Bliss represented the Springettsbury Business Association. The Association recommended that the township adopt the BOCA Code. In

the past the Township Ordinance had been a hardship to the business people.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck referred to the content of a building, such as a movie theater or a public assembly area as an example where upholstered furnishings and items would give off toxic fumes. Mr. Schenck asked whether the BOCA Code addressed those kinds of things.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the BOCA Code included a chapter on interior furnishings, which covered everything from carpet, furnishings in movie theaters, certification during inspection for fabric on chairs, curtains, wallpaper, paneling, etc.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the Township addresses all those items.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that all necessary items are included in an inspection. He added that the Heritage Hills Hotel would be a good example of that where a list of such items had been addressed.

**KINSLEY** Mr. Kinsley added that whenever Kinsley does renovations within institutions like York Hospital, the contractor is required to produce all the certificates and the flame rating of carpet and the finishes. These items are included in the contract.

**SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons commented that having a sprinkler system installed would allow a reduction in the classification to a Class I. Without a sprinkler system it would require a Class II or Class III.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether that Classification system presently exists.

**SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons added that it would be more stringent, but we have to require it because the square footage had been reduced.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that some other fire safety issues could be lost because of the sprinkler mandate in some of the structures.

**STERN** Mr. Stern replied that an example of that would be in an office building. There are corridors leading to exits. In a sprinklered building a fire rating for the corridor is not required. In a non-sprinklered building a one-hour or two-hour rating depending upon the size is required.

**SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons added that travel distance is reduced, i.e., the distance to get out of the building. This is reduced by BOCA as well as the state. The

travel distance is reduced down to 75 ft. as opposed to 150 ft. in a sprinklered building.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern about the information she received in the packet and where the request originated. She stated it seemed to come “out of the blue” and had not been discussed at any public meeting recently.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there were two reasons: Mr. Simmons and Mr. Stern recommend that the BOCA Code should be followed. At the time Chief Seigrist was adamantly opposed to it and as a result there was no action taken. When Chief Flohr became Acting Fire Chief it was discussed, and there were several projects considered. In discussion Chief Flohr, Ron Simmons and Mr. Stern had agreed that a change should be considered. Out of respect to the new Fire Chief Hickman, we wanted to include him and give him an opportunity to address the issue. There are two additional items related to Building Codes and Fire Codes, which provided the opportunity to address it.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she sat on the Board through the entire fire safety process, and to her knowledge with minor variables on the local amendments, the three previous Fire Chiefs supported the revisions. Chairman Mitrick stated that it cannot be said that never our insurance rate is discounted, substantiated by information of cases where insurance companies do provide discounts if buildings are sprinklered.

Chairman Mitrick continued that at the time of previous focus through the process several years ago, 26 states were on record that had required residential sprinklers, which had been considered for Springettsbury. At that time the Board focused on the appropriate requirements for Springettsbury Township. The BOCA Code recommends the “minimum standard” for safety and protection. Chairman Mitrick recalled that it was on that basis that previous Boards recommended further restriction/enhancements for some of the parts of the BOCA Code. If it is true that the BOCA Code is the “minimum” requirement, it was on that premise that previous decision makers felt that it was okay to make the requirements more strict. Chairman Mitrick also had reviewed the PEL study, which recommended sprinkler systems in residential dwellings.

Chairman Mitrick stated that it was unfortunate that Mr. Stern was unable to bring someone else in to show the other side of the story, but that was not available for the Board to hear. Chairman Mitrick understood and respected the comments made about the cost of installation; however, Chief Stall previously stated that the primary cost is not just construction dollars, but other values affected when a building has a fire, such as time

to get back on the job, emotional consequence on the owners or employees. Most of the comments she had heard during this meeting focused on construction costs. There are other factors to consider, which had been considered in a timely study done in the past.

**KINSLEY** Mr. Kinsley stated he did not disagree. With respect to the contents of the building, the Township would be legislating the decision of a property owner regarding how to construct his building. Mr. Kinsley stated that was not what democracy is all about.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that her statement relates to the safety and security of those requirements.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that, if it were his decision, he would have every doghouse, shed and fish aquarium in the Township sprinklered. However, what is reasonable needs to be addressed. The BOCA Code is a very integrated standard and is very stringent. It takes into consideration construction, occupancy, and the contents. Fire Engineers write the BOCA Code. Chief Hickman stated he is a Fire Fighter by trade and knowledge. He stated that the BOCA Code is very adequate as written in fire protection. When it comes to the displacement of employees, time lost, you will still have that if you have a fire regardless of whether a sprinkler system in place or not. The initial damage done from the fire before the sprinkler activates is enough to cause that. When the sprinkler does activate you have water damage that often causes more damage than what the fire actually would have. We are fortunate to have career fire fighters able to respond and be on location within 4 to 5 minutes. Sprinkler systems, when they go off, have to be turned off before the damage stops. That is often several minutes, could be 20 to 30 minutes. Thousands of gallons of water go inside the structures. The BOCA Code does not take into account the thousands of pounds of water put into the building that makes construction unsafe. Chief Hickman supported sprinkler systems but cautioned that there is a limit as to what is reasonable and BOCA has met that limit.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she recalled a case at Monroe Muffler. They were not happy that they had to put in sprinklers; however, they had a fire, and the owner of Monroe Muffler stated that he was exceedingly pleased that he had the sprinkler system because it contained the fire. Minimum damage had been done and they were back in operation in two hours.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that consideration should be given to the fact that the Township does not prohibit any business from putting in sprinklers if they think it is a prudent thing to do.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it's not just to legislate economic decisions, but also to fulfill an obligation to look for the safety involved not only for a particular building, but buildings surrounding it and what is stored in the buildings.

Mr. Pasch continued that a yeoman's amount of work had been done in determining what should or shouldn't be sprinklered by the BOCA Code. Based on the BOCA record it seems to be a logical way to go but it gets down to a matter of personal opinion of whoever is sitting on the Board as to what size should be sprinklered and what size should not, without technical and engineering information to substantiate what went into it.

Mr. Pasch stated his personal opinion regarding the variability of the tenants and different items of storage. However, if the township has the wherewithal to force a tenant to put in the sprinklers if it in fact it would be required with a new tenant, then the safety of the public and the people involved has been covered.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he understood the frustration with the current amendments because if you look at the BOCA standards one is looking at truly the big picture; taking everything into account to determine the need, the amount or the types of sprinklers. Township regulations are purely based on one criteria and one criteria alone. Mr. Schenck agreed that Township standards probably do not encompass enough of the issues that need to be addressed. However, he recalled testimony on the safety issues surrounding the people and the firefighters. He continued that the Township may be flawed in that it singled out strictly square footage as a requirement. Based on the old testimony, getting on the fire scene, being able to enter the building quickly, getting to the fire when you're sprinklered were major points. Mr. Schenck was very concerned about the public health and safety issues that surround this matter.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed with Mr. Schenck's point. He was not convinced that the BOCA Code was necessarily weaker on public safety.

**SIMMONS** Mr. Simmons added to Mr. Bishop's comment that, in fact, the BOCA Code is more stringent than the state's requirements as far as the sprinklers, fire rating issue, inspections. The Township Code is more stringent than the state's requirements.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked what type of building would a fire fighter rather run into, one with sprinklers or one without.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked how many situations are really involved where the BOCA Code is going to necessarily mean that there are going to be lots

more structures without sprinklers. He continued that where there are buildings without sprinklers there are other situations/tradeoffs that have improved the overall safety of the building rather than just sprinklers being that one sort of panacea that that's going to solve all problems.

**HICKMAN** Mr. Hickman added that another thing to look at and understand is that a sprinkler system is a confinement tool; it's not necessarily an extinguishment tool. We're looking at it as an end-all and that's not the case. The BOCA Code has many checks and balances, and if the ordinance would be removed and the BOCA Code enacted as it is written all safety factors and hazards would be included.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Chief Hickman whether he would agree that the BOCA Code is the minimum standard.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that his opinion of the "minimum standard" as being somewhat different. He stated that he views "minimum" as what had been set as to what is required to meet a safe level. Dealing with sprinkler systems, the minimum that BOCA has set is extremely fair to fire fighters, to the contractors who build the buildings, to the residents who have to pay for it. It's not just about sprinklers; it's about construction in general.

**KINSLEY** Mr. Kinsley stated that the matter covered an imposed limit and includes smaller buildings. The BOCA Code addresses the number of exits, the travel distance, all items toward getting out of the building quickly if there's a fire. If people can't get out of a small building without a sprinkler system, it's because someone is not following other codes other than sprinklers, like keeping doors locked.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that this is a Public Hearing and no decisions are made at this time. She added that the Amendments to the Ordinances are on the agenda for action this evening. Chairman Mitrick thanked those participating for their attendance.

## **2. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 7:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a Public Hearing on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Bill Schenck

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the Public Hearing to order at 7:00 p.m. Chairman Mitrick explained the intent of this Public Hearing, which was to discuss Ordinance 99-03 Amending the Springettsbury Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance to require evidence of Chapter 94 inclusion prior to submission of a Land Development and Subdivision Plans (for the year of or the year after).

**2. ORDINANCE 99-03:**

**STERN** Mr. Stern recommended holding off on any action and expressed his hope that submission of those projects included in Chapter 94 for 1999 would have been submitted by this time and would have been through the process. Work could then begin on year 2000 projects. To date none have been completed. Three new projects were submitted this week. Because the process has been lagging behind, Mr. Stern assumed that the other projects would be submitted in August, 1999. The 1999 projects must be completed prior to beginning the Year 2000 projects.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked when Mr. Stern would anticipate action regarding this Ordinance.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that this would likely take place during the first meeting in September. August 17, 1999 is the unofficial deadline for projects to be submitted in order to be able to complete the process and begin construction before year-end.

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost how much time is available.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost referred the question to Mr. Stern as they had previously discussed the matter of timing.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the time period is 90 days for a New Ordinance. There is no time frame stated for an existing Ordinance.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the Board could vote and have the Ordinance become effective in September.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that might be a possibility and referred the question to Solicitor Yost.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that action could be taken with an effective date.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern whether he was comfortable with that action.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that would be satisfactory.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there would be any reason to review the compilation of information.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated it was just a matter of timing for work to begin. The Planning Commission will review work for all of this year and next year at the same time. Mr. Stern added that work couldn't be done for Year 2000 until the pump station is completed.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Bishop whether he had any concern over acting tonight and making the Ordinance effective at a given date.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked for clarification that the action would only be changing Section 3 to change the effective date.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that would be the case.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed with the suggested action.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Pasch whether he agreed with the approach.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated agreement.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that Planning Commission had given their approval.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked for any additional comments.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the effective date would be in September.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated agreement.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri pointed out that Mr. Stern had suggested September 23 in his correspondence to the Board.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that would be an appropriate date.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick re-stated the effective date as September 23, 1999.

**Consensus was to leave this matter on the agenda for the Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors scheduled to begin at 7:30 p.m.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated, for the record, that there was no public comment.

**3. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 7:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors held a on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Don Yost, Solicitor  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Mike Myers, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dave Mersberg, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Jim Crooks, Superintendent – Wastewater Treatment  
David Eshbach, Police Chief  
Michael Hickman, Fire Chief  
Andy Hinkle, MIS  
Mark Hodgkinson, Superintendent – Wastewater Treatment  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Economic Development Director  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Gurreri led the Pledge of Allegiance. Chairman Mitrick extended a happy, healthy and safe Holiday Season on behalf of the Board of Supervisors.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick advised that the Board had scheduled an additional General Meeting on the morning of December 23 at 8:00 a.m. to take final action on the Annual Budget for the year 2000.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**SURTASKY** Mr. Tony Surtasky of 2245 Mt. Zion Road spoke to the Board about signs for Rocky Ridge Park. He read excerpts from the evening paper which discussed the necessity for a variance from the Zoning Board. He asked the Board whether the Supervisors could get a message to the Zoning

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

Board that they are in favor of the sign. Some better signs were put up this year, and they're lit up. Also Mr. Surtasky asked that the Board would get back with the park people sometime in a reasonable amount of time and ask if they're doing anything. The township has some responsibility to pursue this. The citizens should not have to come and ask whether anything is being done. He added that any help the Supervisors could provide would be appreciated.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic if anything could be done to expedite this at this point.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the he, as the Zoning Officer of the Township, had corresponded with the County and interpreted their request as a zoning matter, which must be taken up with the Zoning Board. They will have to come to the Board with a request. Mr. Amic indicated that Mr. Surtasky should be aware that, in his comment he wished that the township or the Board should notify the Zoning Board about the way we feel about it. The Board needs to be very careful about that because it is a quasi-judicial body and what the Board might say to the Zoning Board is limited.

**SURTASKY** Mr. Surtasky commented that the gentleman did not say it would be done in six weeks or six months. He said it could be a lengthy time, maybe nine months to get the state's approval. It could be next year.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that the Board is very much aware of it, and they certainly did not mind him coming and reminding them.

**SURTASKY** Mr. Surtasky indicated that if it's being worked on, that's the best that can be said.

**LILLEY** Cindy Lilley of 2210 Rocky Ridge Court came to the Board to request a No Outlet sign to be placed on their cul-de-sac. People get confused upon entering Rocky Ridge and there is a lot of turn around activity in the cul-de-sac. There is another cul-de-sac behind them which has a No Outlet sign. She requested that a sign be placed in their cul-de-sac as well.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to look into the matter.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he would do so and contact Ms. Lilley.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated she was sure it was as frustrating to those in automobiles when they get onto the court and find there is no outlet.

**MUNDIS** Rebecca Mundis of 1265 Haines Road (part of Camp Betty Washington) discussed her concern with people who are speeding up and down the road

in front of her home. She stated it was a dangerous situation. Her home is the second house on top of the hill, and they have an inlet along the road where two vehicles are parked. She reported that she had written a letter to Penn Dot to see if they could set up a convex mirror or set up some speed traps across the street. Penn Dot did turn them down with a statement that the convex mirrors are illegal. They had done studies on the road which indicated there had been no speeding or accidents and felt there was no risk. She had talked with Rep. Platt's office and they had advised her to call the Zoning Officer of Springettsbury, who stated he couldn't do anything about it. It seems everyone is aware about the road including the speeding. She had tried to get a Springettsbury Police Officer to sit there to observe the traffic.

**SCHMEAD** Jeff Schmead, Rebecca Mundis' father, stated that it is a difficult place to pull out of, especially if you have the speeding. He prefers to park in the salvage yard. There is a big problem with their place. If the convex mirror would be permitted, permission of the land owner across the street had been granted. She needed permission from the township.

**MUNDIS** Rebecca Mundis continued that her mailbox had been hit three times since January. There is a fresh 50 ft. skid mark from three weeks ago in front of her house, and in addition a 30 ft. one that aimed into their garage. There is history there.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick referred the matter to Police Chief Eshbach.

**ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach responded that with regard to her request for a mirror, Penn Dot will not approve it as they view it as a bigger liability. Chief Eshbach indicated the Police Department would take a look at the speeding problem. The area in which Ms. Mundis lives is only partially in Springettsbury Township and adjoins York Township. Chief Eshbach offered to discuss the problem with their police department and their Chief.

**MUNDIS** Ms. Mundis requested that when someone would come to her property, she would appreciate an opportunity to show them how difficult it is to pull out in the street with her automobile.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober provided an update regarding the Harrowgate project. Springfield had nearly completed the Raleigh Drive area. Amliner had been on site a number of times to do the re-lining project; unfortunately, they selected some inopportune times where they got stuck in the mud, but

slowly they are getting up and running. The PLC system is still progressing well. GES Contractors are still on site creating reports. Mr. Schober is looking forward to opening bids on Tuesday for the Millcreek Project. Mr. Schober provided information regarding legislation being considered by the state to make the wastewater lab become accredited to do all of the laboratory testing for the purpose of recording all the information. The problem is that, if this legislation is passed, it could adversely affect the Springettsbury lab and others that rely on their own staff to do the testing. It could create a hardship in that all of the testing would need to be sent out to a lab that is accredited with the state.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked for some kind of a summary indicating what this might do, and what Springettsbury Township would be required to do.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani reported that he had nothing further to add to his report. One of the issues being discussed regarding the Land Development Plan for St. Onge and the other for People’s State Bank. The bulk of his report contained the information regarding the Land Development plans under review.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented on the information provided regarding the Heritage Hills Hotel and the process the township is undergoing for Plymouth Road. She asked whether there would be any logic to putting the township project on hold to see what would happen.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that the drawings are 99.9% completed. He recommended that the township proceed with getting Penn Dot approval as he does not foresee significant more costs. Heritage Hills may decide to hold off for a year. In the drawings Mr. Luciani observed, the bulk of the parking lot is located to the west side of their site. It did not make it very easy to get to the east side of the site where the township wants them to come out at the light. It will take some fine tuning with them. He recommended that the township should complete the highway occupancy permit and when spring comes start paving and implement that even if they are not ready. The township alignment is set up so that Heritage Hills becomes signalized at Plymouth and it will tie right into the improvements.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert reported a few items to highlight from their progress report of December 1. The last Occupancy Agreement required for the Diversion Pumping Station interceptor system had been received and was on the Agenda for signature. Bids had been received on the final component of

the project regarding the parallel interceptor. Bids range from \$1,189,200 to slightly under \$2,000,000. Seven quality bids had been received. There had been a bracket of a lower number of bids because the contractors recognized one of the options being incorporated in the documents for materials. Recommendation for award was on the Agenda. The general contractor for the Diversion Pumping Station will begin excavation this week on schedule. Regarding Bio-Solids, the draft tri-fold incorporated most of the facts and a few photographs and is being reviewed. The preliminary document will need graphic upgrades so it is a more presentable document. There will be a reduction of texts with a more graphic appeal to it. The standby generator upgrade was bid and there were four or five bidders ranging between \$23,000 to \$38,000. The estimate we have is \$26,000.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what the schedule for completion would be.

**MERSBERG** Mr. Mersberg advised it would be 60 days but the contingent may not be exercised to complete it before the end of the year. The complete system would not be operational, but would be able to transfer equipment that's not currently connected to the generator by use of the breaker before the end of the year.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that he had a contingent item to accelerate his schedule. There was a bid item for that, and usually for the contractor it is to his advantage to get things accomplished quickly. R.K. & K. would be working with the contractor to make sure that happens.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that on the tri-fold, she had spoken with Mr. Amic who indicated in his report you are waiting for a response. Chairman Mitrick asked that the tri-fold could be discussed in early January rather than during the December 9 meeting due to the lengthy agenda.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 12/09/99**
- B. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Progress Billing #1 – Standby Generator - \$2,043**
- C. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Progress Billing #1 – Utility Water System - \$2,640**
- D. Springfield Contractors – East/West Interceptor – Progress Billing #9 - \$10,942.15**
- E. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Diversion Pumping Station – Progress Billing #11 - \$7,640.25**
- F. Shannon A. Smith – Municipal Building Electrical – Progress Billing #1 - \$7,322.40**

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

- G. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Bio-solids Education Program – Progress Billing #1 - \$1,120**
- H. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Progress Billing #2 – Standby Generator - \$1,208.46**
- I. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Progress Billing #7 – Mill Creek Interceptor - \$942.85**
- J. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Progress Billing #11 – Harrowgate/Kingston - \$688.55**
- K. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Progress Billing #6 – PLC Upgrade - \$256.50**
- L. Murphy & Dittenhafer – Progress Billing #14 – Municipal Building - \$4,021**
- M. Springfield Contractors, Inc. – Progress Billing #2 – Harrowgate/Kingston - \$83,102.15**
- N. MPJ Construction, Inc. – Progress Billing #1 – Farmhouse - \$35,120.06**
- O. Reed Smith Shaw & McClay – Grant Consulting - \$4,734.42**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided commentary regarding the Accounts Payable items. He particularly called attention to the fact that Item O had been added for Reed Smith Shaw & McClay.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether that was for Phase II.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that was correct.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether Item O was a normal invoicing.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated they are a month behind.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that there would be a new format on the Administration Building construction. The farmhouse will be indicated differently than it is on the forms right now.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that in the construction meeting the subject came up about billing from the number of contractors and subcontractors. A decision was made to have each one of the ends billed separately. The new Administration Building will be separate; the farmhouse separately and the present township building separately. One contractor is working on three buildings. If he continues to build that way the costs for each building won't be known. We asked the contractors to bill separately.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF ACCOUNTS PAYABLE ITEMS A THROUGH O. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS PROPOSALS AND QUOTES:**

- A. Composting Bulking Agent – Jolly Gardener Products, Inc. - \$5.99/cu.yd.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that sealed bids were received on the bulking agent for the Wastewater Treatment facility. The low bidder was Jolly Gardener Products, Inc. at \$5.99/cu.yds. Wastewater staff and Mr. Amic recommended approval.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE COMPOSTING BULKING AGENT BID OF JOLLY GARDENER PRODUCTS, INC. FOR \$5.99 PER CUBIC YARD. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- B. Parallel Interceptor – Manhole 54-59 – Springfield Construction, Inc. - \$1,182,813.19**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided background commentary and stated that on November 17 bids were opened for the Parallel Interceptor which complements the pump station access to the City of York. The low bidder was Springfield Construction in Glen Rock, Pennsylvania for \$1,182,813.19. The design engineers, staff and Mr. Amic recommend the bid be awarded.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AWARD THE BID FOR THE PARALLEL INTERCEPTOR TO SPRINGFIELD CONSTRUCTION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,182,813.19. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- C. Transfer of 1977 International School Bus to the York County Fire Training School at No Cost**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic discussed the request by Paul Schaeffer, Director of the Fire Training School, that the 1977 International School Bus be donated to the school. Mr. Amic requested permission to transfer the title to the school.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE TRANSFER OF THE 1977 INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL BUS TO YORK COUNTY FIRE TRAINING SCHOOL AT NO COST. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- D. Change Order #1 – Existing Municipal Farmhouse Renovations – MPJ Construction, Inc. - \$2,708.21**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided commentary regarding the Change Order, which related to renovation of the existing farmhouse. This Change Order is to add the total of two new six-panel doors to be located at the first floor, to install new hardware at five door locations as required by the Department of Labor and Industry. Total amount of this Change Order is \$2,708.21.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the Change Order included all the Labor and Industry issues that might surface.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it is an L & I issue, which Mr. Stern and Mr. Simmons received back from L & I indicating that these items must be done.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded to the question of, "Is there more coming?" He advised that there were more.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there are a few more that relate to electrical work.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked how those items were missed in the beginning.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the work was put out to bid before L & I approved the plans.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that would be something that a qualified architect should have been able to anticipate.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that it is a public building.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he had mentioned that the doors and windows were not being addressed.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern if he was aware of the three Change Orders on the agenda or if there are more coming.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there is at least one more.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there were any more comments.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck said none, other than he was disappointed.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that there had been a big hassle about the farmhouse as to whether to even keep the building, and a lot of it was based on what it was going to cost. Now we are adding considerable cost almost immediately upon starting. Mr. Pasch indicated he was very upset.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that the insulation problem is not being addressed; the windows are being caulked when they should be replaced. We started at \$65,000. We'll be at \$100,000 and it won't stop at that.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that it was disappointing; however, in these particular cases we find ourselves in a position of being in violation of Labor and Industry requirements.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added there would be violation only if we occupy the building. Mr. Bishop stated he is more than disappointed and was unwilling to put more money into that until a complete analysis was done of the current status and where it is going to have some kind of guarantee that we know how much it's going to cost.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that when we're done with it we'll have four offices which we do not have a use for at this time. We're building a new Municipal Building in which we have more office space than we need, so there's really not a need for the house as far as for that use. Mr. Gurreri indicated he was very disappointed that we're close to \$100,000, and it won't stop at that because we didn't address everything yet.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic what the total of the three Change Orders on the Agenda tonight.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded it was about \$8,000, and there's another Change Order coming, which he had been made aware of today.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic for an approximate dollar figure for that Change Order.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he was not sure of that amount.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated it should be reviewed because the building needs to be insulated. The utility bills, especially the gas bill was really high, and nothing had been done to stop that. We need to insulate and put windows in if we're going to do it right.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what the original quote was on the original renovation.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded it was \$61,100.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that \$61,100 plus \$9,000 means we're closer to \$70,000 than to \$100,000. Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost whether the Change Orders could be tabled.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the items could be tabled.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he would much rather see the Board take some sort of positive action. If there is a Change Order, we either approve or deny the Change Order.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called for a motion.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that before that would be done, he suggested that if the Change Order is denied, you're in essence saying there would be no occupancy because you won't be able to occupy the building.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that they would be continuing to spend your money on that project unless you negotiate a halt to it.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated it was on-going, and they are well over half way complete.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Amic spoke with Mr. Dittenhafer about this.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he had not; that the Change Orders came up in the staff meetings. Between Mr. Stern and Mr. Simmons they are both fairly distressed. Some of the items were so obvious, such as broken windows. Mr. Amic stated that his instruction was to repair the windows. There would not be a public building with broken windows. The next Change Order will be on the subject of the windows.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Solicitor Yost about the fact that if the Change Orders are denied, there would be nothing stopping the contractor or the architect in the township of having a discussion as to what remedy might be in coming back with another solution on the 23<sup>rd</sup> when we're getting together.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated the Supervisors would be free to talk with them anytime.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that windows are going to be painted over because the Change Order is denied. They will have to undo what was done to deal with the Change Order.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost recommended tabling the Change Orders subject to a meeting with the architect and having a thorough discussion.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated the meeting would have to be shortly. He's doing what he bid. When L & I comes in and says you've got to do it, you've got to do it.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that their thinking was to comply with the law to occupy the building, and if we don't we won't occupy the building.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the architect came here and said the house is in pretty good shape. It is not in good shape, and this is not all that needs to be done in that house.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that we have a contract with a contractor; he bid according to what he had to do; he's doing it. He can either continue or he can bill you for everything he's got in it plus whatever, because he has a contract. We have to recognize that.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that the township can negotiate with him now to see what kind of flexibility we have so that we can make an intelligent decision about how we're going to move forward.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the contractor is not responsible for it.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked how quickly could we have a meeting.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that would be something the Township Manager could take care of.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he didn't have a problem with that, but that his advice would be that we've put over half the money in this building and we're going to be faced with the decision as to stopping construction. If we stop we can't use the building. The kind of things that are here are absolutely fundamental to having the public walk into a building.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that no one is arguing that. No one wants to have a building that can't be occupied and that isn't up to standard, but there may be some of us who would rather not throw good money after bad. If we have an option to at least explore that we should. We need to find out how much good money we're really talking about in the end before we start throwing more money in.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he'd be glad to meet with the contractors and architects.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked, with the discussion in mind, would he recommend tabling it or acting.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated either deny it or table it.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic took it that the motion should read D. H. and I.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO DENY CHANGE ORDERS D, H, AND I.**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he did not mind seconding the motion, but specific reference should be made to the Change Orders.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO DENY CHANGE ORDER #1 (Item D) FOR MPJ CONSTRUCTION, CHANGE ORDER #1 (Item I) ELECTRICAL SYSTEM – SHANNON A. SMITH AND CHANGE ORDER #2 (Item H) FOR MPJ. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that, in his opinion, denying the Change Orders was not the way to proceed. He felt it should be tabled, because the work had already proceeded and was close to being completed. He suggested that a meeting be held with Mr. Amic and the staff and the architect and contractor to determine the project status before any Change Order would be denied. He added that Mr. Stern had pointed out that if the Change Orders are denied, they cannot do the work called for, they will do work which would have to be undone and redo it again. It is a matter of tabling it until a meeting could be held.

**MR. GURRERI AND MR. BISHOP VOTED FOR THE MOTION. MR. PASCH, MR. SCHENCK AND CHAIRMAN MITRICK VOTED AGAINST THE MOTION. MOTION WAS LOST.**

**MR. PASCH MOVED TO TABLE CHANGE ORDER #1 WITH MPJ, CHANGE ORDER #2 WITH MPJ, AND CHANGE ORDER #1 WITH SHANNON A. SMITH, AND INSTRUCT THE STAFF THAT THEY MEET WITH THE ARCHITECT AND CONTRACTOR TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF INVOLVMENT SO THAT THE BOARD CAN MAKE A DECISION AS TO HOW TO PROCEED. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MR. PASCH, MR. SCHENCK, MR. BISHOP AND CHAIRMAN MITRICK VOTED FOR THE MOTION. MR. GURRERI VOTED NO.**

**E. Act 339 Subsidy Funding – Buchart-Horn, Inc. – Cost Included in Retainer**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding a request to have Buchart-Horn complete the Act 339 Subsidy Funding application. The report is due on January 31 and some time is needed to prepare that report. The report is included in B-H's retainer.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE BUCHART-HORN TO PREPARE THE ACT 339 SUBSIDY APPLICATION. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**F. Proposal of Reed Smith Shaw & McClay LLP – Federal Funding for Calendar 2000**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided a brief commentary regarding the proposal to represent the township during Phase III of Federal Funding for the Sanitary Access System, Pump Station and Interceptor.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented about the previous proposals, which have resulted in \$2 million to the township for this project, which had cost less than \$100,000. Indications from the township manager revealed that the proposal could be also very successful. He recommended continuation with Reed Smith Shaw and McClay.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THE PROPOSAL OF REED SMITH SHAW & MCCLAY FOR FEDERAL FUNDING FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2000 BE APPROVED. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**G. Wastewater Treatment Standby Generator – I. B. Abel - \$23,393**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic discussed the background information provided by R. K. & K. relating to the standby generator. The award to I. B. Abel was recommended.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested that the I. B. Abel representative make comments about the time factor for the standby generator.

**MERSBERG** David Mersberg of R. K. & K. provided background information that the time factor involved the entire contract of 60 days from Notice to Proceed. One week ago a contingent bid item was implemented that advised the contractor he needed to have the functional part of that system in place before December 30, 1999 in anticipation of Y2K. The major part of that project involved a circuit breaker that had been put in the switchgear and feeder making the emergency power available for the generator and distributing it with equipment that is not currently on the system in order that the people at the plant can run any piece of equipment that is necessary when it is necessary.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that they would not be able to run all of the equipment, but they would be able to run the pieces that are necessary to keep it functioning.

**MERSBERG** Mr. Mersberg indicated that was correct.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that would provide the security that would be needed.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked for a comment about the contingent items.

**MERSBERG** Mr. Mersberg explained that there was a contingent bid item in the case where the breaker being installed in the switchgear is a re-manufactured breaker because of the age of the switchgear and it must be tested. In the event that the contractor were not able to obtain that breaker, the contingent item would involve Siemens as the manufacturer of the switchgear coming in and making the structural modifications to the switchgear and then incorporating a new breaker from Siemens.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked how this would be handled if the Board awarded the contract at \$23,393 and the contingent item would be necessary.

**MERSBERG** Mr. Mersberg responded that the bid was being awarded knowing that the contingent item is not needed. The apparent low bidder had located the breaker and was waiting for a phone call to order the breaker.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE WASTEWATER TREATMENT STAND-BY GENERATOR BID OF I. B. ABEL IN THE AMOUNT OF \$23,393. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

- A. Planning Module – Morgan Industrial Park – Manchester Township – A367939-332-3 – 40,000 GPD**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided background information regarding Item A.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF PLANNING MODULE FOR MORGAN INDUSTRIAL PARK IN MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP FOR 40,000 GPD. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- B. Subdivision 99-08 – Wawa – Granting of Extension to 1/13/00**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented that Subdivision 99-08 for Wawa involved Irvin Naylor's property granting an extension of time to 1/13/00.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO ACCEPT THE SUBDIVISION 99-08 WAWA / NAYLOR SUBDIVISION GRANTING OF EXTENSION TO JANUARY 13, 2000. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- C. Land Development 99-12 – Wawa – Granting Extension to 1/13/00**

**STERN** Mr. Stern advised that Wawa had granted the township an extension of time for Land Development 99-12 to January 13, 2000.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT THE EXTENSION OF TIME BE ACCEPTED FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-12 FROM WAWA LAND DEVELOPMENT TO JANUARY 13, 2000. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- D. Subdivision 98-06 – Two Ton/Burger King – Granting Extension of Time to 7/31/00**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided commentary regarding Two Ton/Burger King granting an extension of time to 7/31/00.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO ACCEPT THE GRANTING OF EXTENSION OF TIME FROM TWO TON/BURGER KING/GALLERIA PLAN 98-06 TO JULY 31, 2000. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- E. Land Development 97-19 – Two Ton/Burger King – Granting Extension of Time to 7/31/00.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided commentary regarding Two Ton/Burger King granting an extension of time to 7/31/00.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO ACCEPT THE GRANT OF EXTENSION FROM BURGER KING/TWO TON LAND DEVELOPMENT 97-19 TO JULY 31, 2000. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- F. Subdivision 99-09 – Hunters Crossing – Granting Extension of Time to 2/24/00**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided commentary regarding Subdivision 99-09 – Hunters Crossing granting an extension of time to 2/24/00.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO ACCEPT THE GRANT OF EXTENSION OF TIME FOR HUNTERS CROSSING SUBDIVISION TO FEBRUARY 24, 2000. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. PASCH ABSTAINED AS A RELATED PARTY.**

- G. Land Development 99-17 – Diehl Motor Co. – Granting Extension of Time to 1/27/00.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that Land Development 99-17 related to Diehl Motor Co. granting an extension of time to 1/27/00.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO GRANT EXTENSION OF TIME TO DIEHL MOTOR CO. FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-17 TO JANUARY 27, 2000. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**H. Land Development 99-15 – St. Onge – Action 12/9/99**

- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that Land Development 99-15 encompassed the St. Onge property of 37,554 sq. ft. for a new building next to the church on Williams Road behind the Springettsbury Park. The following representatives were present to speak for the project: Paul Francis, Consultant for the project, Arthur St. Onge, President, Larry Keller, Comptroller and Paul Evanko, Vice President of St. Onge Co. and Jon Seitz, Traffic Engineer of TRG. The plans call for a two-story office building. Subdivision had been approved October 28, 1999. Sewer Planning Module had been approved on August 26, 1999. Capacity appeared in the 1999 Chapter 94 report. Planning Commission had acted upon the plan with seven notes. Staff recommended approval of the plan with the several items for discussion.
- FRANCIS** Paul Francis spoke for the project and reported that since June-July they had been working on the building project. An Architect had been hired and the company was working toward hosting an International Symposium in June, 2000. Additional sewer capacity had been provided, and they requested approval in order to utilize the sewer during 1999; otherwise the EDU's would lapse and construction could not be done. Mr. Francis then went through the plans. He discussed their request for a slight modification to the landscape and buffer yard requirements. The ordinance required street trees and shrubs and buffer requirements. Rather than plant a large concentration of trees along the 50 ft. buffer, they asked for consideration to allow them to plant the trees within the parking area. It will add additional screen to the parking facility. The pin oaks provide adequate screening and would provide an additional 10 trees. The shrubs meet the requirements and a 50 ft. buffer will be provided.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the south side of the building and whether there would be anything close to the building.
- ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge indicated that the plan behind the new office building called for a medial strip with wild flowers with an existing mulberry tree. A retention pond built by drilling a well will have a fountain and use that as a noise buffer from Rt. 30. The intention would be to keep back of building in a more natural state with wood flowers.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how much land would be involved.
- ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge responded it was about four acres with flowers and the pond.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked how visible the pond would be from the building.

**ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge responded that they hoped it would be very visible.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what the estimated depth of the pond would be.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis responded it would be 24 inches.

**ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge brought forward a question as to whether a fence was needed at the pond. He added that they are attempting to create an environment in the back of the property that would be attractive. The addition of a fence will detract from the appearance of the pond. Given where the pond is and that buffers are added from the park area by some residences and other buildings. The only other danger would be at the church where they only operate on Sunday. They are always supervised. He asked for consideration to not have to provide a fence.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis stated that the signalization could be provided. A traffic study and a signalization analysis had been done. Traffic engineer recommended to re-time the existing traffic light in order to provide for a longer east-west movement on Mt. Zion Rd. The Public Works director advised at noon-time and four o'clock that it was not operating at a C-service level. Some cars are remaining through at least one cycle. He understood that this particular light was in-sync with the rest of the lights along Mt. Zion Rd./Rt. 30 and Market Street. The idea is to move traffic through the major arteries. In order to do that the cycle times are coordinated. As a result there is a very long cycle time for the light, i.e., 100 seconds. There is only so much time to budget for the side streets. We extended the east/west by about 5 seconds, improving the light in terms of an overall service level. It was reported at the Planning Commission level that they observed that the cycle time was not long enough for some of the southbound movement from Mt. Zion. That had been corrected.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the situation would exist certain times of the day. He asked whether that was mainly going west, or east as well.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis responded it was going west-bound. It's the left-turn movement from the west-bound direction.

**SEITZ** Mr. Seitz commented that the school traffic provides a big influx of traffic concentrated heading west-bound toward Rt. 30 and Market Street. Because of that activity at the school where a large number of students get out at the same time, it creates problems for those peak periods around noontime and late afternoon.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that they had met with Charlie Lauer and Andrew Stern on site. Following the signal having been struck by lightning, motorists noticed there was a great improvement because the light was not tied in sequence to everything further south. They asked whether that light could be removed from the network. The response was negative. They are looking for a way to break it out of the network for certain peak times and allow it to go back in; one of the problems is that the current controller will not support that kind of activity because its capacity and age.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis added that a left-turn light was studied as well. The conclusion was that was not the solution.

**SEITZ** Mr. Seitz interjected that when an exclusive phase was added it was limited with 100 seconds. Alternative solutions are being studied.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that a controller change was suggested during specific times of the day (12-12:30 p.m. and 3:30 – 4:00 p.m.) when the north-south traffic would not necessarily be peaked.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis stated that the solution is to go with a better controller. A modified controller is the solution. What that will allow you to do is to give you the best of both worlds; you can re-time it to get out of the 100 second cycle during peak times and operate as well as it did when it was hit by lightning. It was working well for the east-west bound traffic. That was their suggestion. Adding a controller is not a cheap solution. The simple solution is to add a light. On behalf of St. Onge Mr. Francis offered \$3,000 towards remedying the situation. It's about 1/3 of the estimated cost. Mr. Francis added that there are two other facilities which could share in the cost.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether St. Onge would be willing to go to bat and get the others to contribute.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis indicated he did not know whether they would do so.

**ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge interjected that they might do that but he could not guarantee it. He added that he would take the responsibility of speaking with the other property owners.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated if they won't do it then the township has to come up with the solution.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated he was concerned about the fence for the pond and young people getting in there. He asked what the chance would be of that happening.

**ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge responded that the possibility existed. It would be a question of to what extent could they get in there and under what conditions. A 24-inch deep pond is not a swimming pond; it's a wading pond. He concluded that there was risk, but that it was minimal.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Stern to summarize the regulations concerning fences and retention ponds.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that this concerned a retention pond; there would be water in it at all times. The pond is not a detention pond which has water in it only during a storm. The stormwater ordinance requires fences whenever you have a retention pond; in addition the building codes are more flexible because it was not a part of the Land Development process, but the building codes also use 18 inches as a magic number for pools of water whether it be a swimming pool or fish/garden pool. The fence would have to be at least four feet tall and no more than two inch spacing. It doesn't have to be just around the pond. It could be around the whole property.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Land Development Ordinance provided any flexibility for waivering that specifically.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there were provisions in the Stormwater Ordinance for the township whether it be the Supervisors or the staff to modify provisions to the Ordinance in general.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked about the status of the pond during a storm event and whether it would maintain the 24 inches.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that it would get slightly higher.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis responded that it might get to 3-1/2 feet deep.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the design would allow the pond to stay an attractive water pond as opposed to a stagnant, muddy, silty pond.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that the pond needed to maintain at least 18 inches. Vegetation would not grow in a 24 inch pond.

**EVANKO** Mr. Evanko indicated that 30 inches is ideal for fish growth. They don't die in the winter.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani commented about the slopes approaching the pond are fairly flat. It would be unlikely that someone would fall into it.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the fencing. She stated that at the present time the property is basically in an isolated area; however, in somewhat close proximity would be park property. The property immediately across the road is residential. We don't know the status of that residential property, but if in years to come the township were able to purchase that property and incorporate it into the big park picture, it may be reasonable at that time for the township to put a small ball field or a playground or something on that property. A safeguard for the township would be for St. Onge to consider a note on the plan indicating that with curbs and sidewalks if they are not needed immediately a note on the plan indicating that if, in the future the township feels that a fence is necessary that within a certain amount of time you would install the fencing. Right now it would detract from the property and basically serve no purpose; however, it may serve a safety purpose in the future. She asked whether St. Onge would be willing to put that note on the plan. She asked Mr. Stern what was placed on the other statement.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded it was six months.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether, along with that, the township would need some sort of statement.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that an Agreement is already in place between the church and St. Onge and the township. He recommended that the Agreement be modified to have the church consent to the no fence, and the township agree to the no fence and St. Onge agree to indemnify and hold the township harmless against any liability for any bodily injury as a result of the pond not having a fence.

**ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge agreed with the statement.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost continued that it would all be in one agreement, recorded, and contained as a permanent record. As the Board agreed to the language, the six months to install would be in the agreement as well.

**ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge agreed.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated St. Onge would have insurance to protect them.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick discussed the traffic situation. She asked Mr. Francis what he recommended as the best option.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis responded that it would be to install a new, up-to-date controller to enable the light to be taken out of the sync with the other Mt. Zion Road lights but only for a period of time of about an hour out of the day, half hour around lunch time and a half hour around four o'clock.

That would enable the east-west movement to proceed. It would bring the service level up to a level C.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether there had been any correspondence that specified what that is if the township would accept that as an alternative.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis responded that there was nothing at the present time, but a letter could be drafted to put it in writing.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that if the township required it would be part of the financial security.

**SEITZ** Mr. Seitz added that this solution had been utilized in Shrewsbury at the square. Rt. 851 at Exit 1 is in a synchronized corridor. In the morning the traffic on the Susquehanna Trail has trouble getting onto 851 – not enough green time. During the rush hour in the morning they take it out of system to let it operate more efficiently and then the rest of the day it runs in cycle.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether any Penn Dot contact would be made.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there would be a signal change, but no problems are anticipated.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that St. Onge had provided a generous offer to do the whole controller.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck added, under the condition that the fence would not be done.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that a notation would be placed on the plan.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch was satisfied with the comments.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that in the last meeting during discussion on the curb and sidewalk requirement, it was required on the south side of the access road. When Mr. Francis laid all that out, where Williams Road joins back to Bradley Academy it's perfectly flat. It worked okay then because the road was pitched towards a grassy lot. When he put the curb and sidewalk in he basically dammed up the water and it can't get off the road. He has to collect it into the storm water system. Because the land was flat he had to put ups and downs on the road to make the water run into the road and have it collect it. He's got inlet space tightly. He has one half percent grade which he feels will be acceptable. It is a privately owned and maintained road they are accepting all liability for it – all maintenance of it.

**ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge stated that they have agreed to do the sidewalks, curbs and to modify the roads at a significant cost. What he wanted the Board to think about is the fact that there are no curbs there except on the north and south direction. In order to meet the ordinance requirements, St. Onge had agreed to put the sidewalks and curbs in the whole way across what is now their property and also across the church, so that on the south side of the road would be looking very nice. On the other side, the north side, there would be grass coming up to the road. One of the reasons why they had difficulty working through what to do with the road is that we are doing this in a very half-baked way, half a road and half a sidewalk. Mr. St. Onge requested, not based on what the code said, but based on what he thought was an esthetic issue. The only thing he could see that made sense to do this is if everybody else did it. Then it would look reasonable and balanced. We've worked together with the people from the township to work through to a solution, but as I look at it as a person who lives in the community, I thought to put in that sidewalk does not make sense. It is used very infrequently. It seems that we're doing something that meets the code, but doesn't make a lot of sense for the community.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Stern whether he had the infamous curb and sidewalk note on Bradley.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that had been done prior to the policy.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that Mr. St. Onge had missed it because the Board had just spent a lot of time on the subject. He didn't hear anyone state that the sidewalk not be put in.

**ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge indicated that they would put it in because it was required, but he appealed to the Board from a standpoint of making sense. He stated they would be willing to put the sidewalks in in the future if that were something that everyone agreed to.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated it would look very right to some of the Board members.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that only one opportunity happened to get curbs and sidewalks. There's nothing to say that even though this is developed today it couldn't be modified, and that provided the opportunity to get curbs and sidewalks on that side. Mr. Schenck stated he agreed with Mr. St. Onge's point to some degree; however, but viewing the project it would look complete. It frames the project and adds esthetics to the project having it on his side.

**ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge indicated they would be more than willing to bond that so that if it were necessary to move ahead the township would have the assurance that they would put the sidewalks in.

- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that a “sidewalk district” could be established and require every property owner to install sidewalks.
- EVANKO** Mr. Evanko stated that what had been said at the Subdivision approval meeting was that you could have ordered people to put sidewalks in. You did need a policy; you didn’t need to refer further to the ordinance or modify the ordinance if you could direct it.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that he had indicated the township could require it. We would have to implement it by adopting an ordinance requiring whoever to install the curbs and sidewalks. We can’t do it without an implementing ability.
- EVANKO** Mr. Evanko indicated they were not unwilling to install the sidewalks, but would like to ask that everyone do it.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that if the Board decided to grant the request right now that it would set this project back significantly. Mr. Bishop did not see how the plans could be approved if the sidewalks were removed.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it could be done with a codicil on there that they would have to do it on six months demand.
- STERN** Mr. Stern said that the question was, if the Board agreed to take the curbs and sidewalks off, would you then undesign your street changes.
- FRANCIS** Mr. Francis indicated that could be done fairly simply, i.e., just add a note that the curb and sidewalks would be added when directed.
- STERN** Mr. Stern asked what would be done about the street in that case.
- FRANCIS** Mr. Francis indicated it could be a geometric change.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether anyone on the Board was willing to change the position taken previously on the curbs and sidewalks.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that wherever sidewalks are put in merely to put them in with no traffic on them, he was not really enamored with it. Things might happen that we would want the sidewalks because there would be use of the sidewalks, then fine he would be in favor.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that this use of the sidewalks had been discussed in relation to building the park. We thought there might be use at that time. That was a reason why it was considered .

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested that a clause be placed on the plan indicating that St. Onge has a six month notice to put sidewalks in.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that if the sidewalks are there they'll be used.
- ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge stated that the opportunity to walk to the park is present today. If people did walk to the park with any degree of frequency it would already occur. The church does not feel sidewalks are necessary.
- EVANKO** Mr. Evanko indicated that at the Subdivision meeting the clause was attached that previously indicated the policy.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether he was asking to put a hold on the sidewalks and the curbs or just the sidewalks.
- EVANKO** Mr. Evanko responded both the curbs and the sidewalks.
- STERN** Mr. Stern interjected along with the street improvements.
- EVANKO** Mr. Evanko agreed.
- FRANCIS** Mr. Francis added the storm drains.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani commented that Mr. Francis had discovered a problem with trying to drain the street.
- FRANCIS** Mr. Francis responded regarding the problem. There's a low spot in the roadway which the stormdrain inlet could pick up if we're putting a storm drain to the stormwater basin. We purposely put it here because it's at a low point. If we put this inlet in here it will collect that stormwater irrespective of whether we do the curb and sidewalks. There's a natural low depression. The other problem sighted was a slight problem if we did the returns of this entrance into the church it would improve it. It would rectify the low spot and drain away from the roadway. It would be pretty simple to modify. The rest of it is virtually level.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she had visited the site. As much as the Supervisors feel that we need to uphold the ordinances, she understood what Mr. St. Onge said. Looking at it from the end of the private road, her wish would be that Bradley immediately install the curbs and sidewalks. Chairman Mitrick stated she could respect their request on the postponement on the curbs and sidewalks if the roadway could be built so that they could be installed in the future.
- FRANCIS** Mr. Francis stated that the roadway today, irrespective of the curbs and sidewalk, etc. if the storm drain were added to collect the low spot. If the

entrance were improved putting the curb into the fillets, it could be continued later.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that at that time you would also have to add those inlets.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis indicated that was correct.

**STERN** Mr. Stern asked about the policy, which he understood was designed to correct problems with state road. Simply putting curbs and sidewalks isn't a problem, they are not bonded. Looking at the situation in terms of stormwater and street improvements, Mr. Stern would have to hold a bond forever. We're getting away from just curbs and sidewalks.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis responded that the surety is the note being placed on the drawings, even though not a financial surety but insurance that given notification that St. Onge within six months time would perform according to the plan. At that time they could place the bond. At that time if they don't satisfy the plan, then you can fix it to your satisfaction.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated it was an engineering issue. If you were to decide to waive curbs and sidewalks for the present time, that can be placed in the Agreement also.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated if you do the sidewalks right now, or six months from now, not only do you have to do that, you have to put these inlets in. That would be a big financial hit you and the church would have to commit.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked how we really know if we would do that what we're getting today and allow time for our engineer to review it. If the Planning Commission approved one set of plans and they are changed completely, that would subverting the whole process.

**EVANKO** Mr. Evanko indicated it was a private road and it can always be referenced in whatever agreement that we are contemplating, it would be comparable in its functionality.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost asked whether, if the Board were to waive curbs and sidewalks for the present time, there would also be some stormwater drainage facilities that would not be installed at the present time.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that was correct but that they would need to be done to put curbs and sidewalks in.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

- ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge responded that would be to channel the water. Not putting the curbs and sidewalks in would not be an issue.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether this would have to be bonded.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that this had not been tried before. We haven't gone to anyone and said you promise to do it, now you have to do it. For just curbs and sidewalks that's not too major. Now we're throwing in street and stormwater improvements.
- EVANKO** Mr. Evanko indicated that the stormwater agreement as it's written today binds us.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that was correct.
- STERN** Mr. Stern added that without the financial security if a party involved in that says we're not doing it, then the township would have to file suit against the property owner.
- ST. ONGE** Mr. St. Onge added that they had been in the community for four years and now are making another big investment in the community. There is no indication that we're going to leave.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated there would be enough equity in the property.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked Mr. Luciani whether he would suggest installing the stormwater measures without the curbs.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that could be the solution. One way to make sure that curbs and sidewalks are easy to install at a later date is to do the drainage improvements shown on the plan.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that there was the possibility that the stormwater improvements could be implemented now in consideration of waiving the curbs and sidewalks.
- FRANCIS** Mr. Francis added that the inlets are not going to capture anything now but it would be fairly simple to implement later.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the lesser amount that you would have to do to install the curbs and sidewalks would be less onerous to you in the future than if you had to do some additional work for the storm drain. His point was well taken.
- FRANCIS** Mr. Francis stated that they have the module approval for DEP. One thing that DEP prefaced was that we should get the sewage enforcement officer

out to inspect the church's system. The church is on an on-lot system, so Mr. Hengst inspected it and said that it was a functioning system. Mr. Francis requested that the Board would consider keeping this on-lot system in place in lieu of St. Onge connecting.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that any project needs to connect.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether a visual inspection by the SEO a vigorous plan.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded what had been done with the 537 Plan. There is no scientific way. It must be within 1,000 feet of the public sewer the Ordinance requires connection.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that had any impact on the situation today.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that the church will connect.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked whether they were connecting on their own lateral.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that it was on their own lateral.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that the church with two tanks should be sufficient for them to stay on an on-lot system.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that the only reason why the church came under scrutiny is because the church owned the entire 20 acre tract. If you subdivide your parcel and make it smaller, that leaves less room for you to replace the system, so suppose they decided to cut off that area and they didn't leave a replacement area for their septic system they're really boxed in. Our ordinance requires that within 1,000 feet you must connect.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated their system is only four years only.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that if the plan indicates that they are connecting, why did was this letter triggered by DEP. The application for the Planning Module didn't show that the church is going to connect to the sewer.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that was correct.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the church is, in fact, going to connect.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis stated that the plan shows that the church would connect.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that their plan doesn't bind the church to connect.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated it does. Now they're asking to take it off and not connect and they do have a way to connect.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what the last request covered.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that the last request appeared to be to remove the church from the requirement to connect to the sewer at this time.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked how that would be done.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated a waiver would be granted.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck observed a missing piece was having the church's input.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF LAND DEVELOPMENT  
99-15 – ST. ONGE WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND CONDITIONS:**

- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN;**
- **MODIFICATION FROM LANDSCAPE AND BUFFER YARD REQUIREMENTS;**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY IN AN AMOUNT TO BE APPROVED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER INCLUDING 100% OF THE COST FOR THE SIGNAL IMPROVEMENTS WHICH WOULD BE TO THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER'S SPECIFICATION AT THE INTERSECTION OF MT. ZION AND PLEASANT VALLEY ROAD;**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE INCLUSION OF A NOTE INDICATING THAT THE FENCE AROUND THE STORMWATER POND WILL BE INSTALLED WITH SIX MONTHS NOTICE FROM THE TOWNSHIP;**
- **MODIFICATION TO ALLOW THE LONGITUDINAL SLOPE OF ½% AS OPPOSED TO 1% FOR THE PRIVATE PORTION OF WILLIAMS ROAD AND THAT CONDITION WOULD APPEAR ON THE PLAN INDICATING THAT A PRIVATE ROAD THAT THE LONGITUDINAL SLOPE OF 1% DOES NOT MEET ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR A PUBLIC ROAD AND SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP WILL NOT BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY WATER PROBLEMS IN THE ROAD AS A RESULT OF THE ½% SLOPE AND A NOTE BE ADDED INDEMNIFYING THE TOWNSHIP FOR ANY AGAINST LIABILITY FOR ANYTHING OCCURRING WITH THE POND AS CONDITION OF THAT WAIVER. CONDITIONS WILL BE INCLUDED IN A DEVELOPER'S AGREEMENT**

**THAT WILL INCLUDE THE THREE PARTIES.**

**MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. SCHENCK, GURRERI AND BISHOP VOTED IN FAVOR; MR. PASCH AND CHAIRMAN MITRICK VOTED AGAINST.**

**I. Subdivision 99-11 – Kingston Square Shopping Center**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided background information regarding Subdivision 99-11 for the Kingston Square Shopping Center. Mr. Stern explained that this item is a reverse Subdivision to attached two existing tax parcels into one contiguous parcel. The staff recommended approval of the plan.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION 99-11 WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS:**

- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SHOW ALL STREETS WITHIN 400 FEET OF THE PROPERTY ON THE PLAN**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A SEWER AND WATER FEASIBILITY STUDY**
- **MODIFICATION FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SHOW CONTOURS IN THE ENTIRE SITE**
- **MODIFICATION FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SHOW SIGNIFICANT NATURAL FEATURES FOR THE ENTIRE SITE**
- **MODIFICATION FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SHOW MAN-MADE FEATURES FOR THE ENTIRE SITE**
- **MODIFICATION FROM DEDICATION AND RELEASE STATEMENTS THAT APPLIES TO A PARTNERSHIP.**

**MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**I. Land Development 99-11 – Peoples State Bank (PSB)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided commentary with regard to changing the parking lot area.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented that if this were a new plan for the whole area, would we have anything to say how that eroded in.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the landscaping. She stated that their information indicates they will “try to” maximize, and asked what that meant.

**PERRY** Ron Perry responded that he had a landscaping architect review the area from the property lines from the east side the whole way around the property line on the south side. The Ordinance required 10 street trees times 5 based on the width of the buffer yard. The total requirement in the Ordinance for 50 trees. Presently there are 22, so there would be a 28 tree deficit. The number of shrub requirements are a total number of 100. There are actually 104 shrubs there now. We are adding an additional 24 shrubs and four additional trees. This totals over and above the plant units but they are not distributed in the same fashion with the number of trees and shrubs. There are regulations regarding visibility for security concerns for the bank.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked re/coming in from Eastern Boulevard, as you approach the Rutter’s Building, there are two flower beds one on each side of the driveway. Asked whether they would be willing to replace the tree on the other side of the driveway.

**PERRY** Mr. Perry indicated that they would be willing to do that.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick also commented that the Planning Commission had asked whether we had notified York County Transportation regarding these plans to let them know this was being done.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that when the plans go to York County Planning Commission, the planner chooses which ones he believes warrant his review.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that in their notes the Planning Commission had indicated that Steven Gland should be informed. Eastern Boulevard is becoming busier and busier and public transportation provided there would be all the better.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF LAND DEVELOPMENT  
99-11 – PEOPLES STATE BANK WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND  
CONDITIONS:**

- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **MODIFICATION TO ALLOW SHOWING CONTOURS FOR ONLY THE AREA OF NEW DEVELOPMENT RATHER THAN THE ENTIRE TRACT;**

- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A SEWER AND WATER FEASIBILITY STUDY;**
- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SHOW ALL STREETS WITHIN 400 FEET OF THE PROPERTY;**
- **MODIFICATION FROM THE BUFFER YARD REQUIREMENT TO TRY TO MAXIMIZE THE NUMBER OF EXISTING AND NEW PLANTINGS;**
- **MODIFICATION FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SHOW ALL MAN-MADE FEATURES ON THE PLAN;**
- **MODIFICATION OF DEDICATION AND RELEASE OF PARTNERSHIP;**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY IN AN AMOUNT TO BE APPROVED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER AND TO INCLUDE FINANCIAL SECURITY FOR INTERSECTION TIMING CHANGES;**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE PAYMENT AND FEE IN LIEU OF STORMWATER IMPROVEMENTS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$395.25.**

**MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that the developer had indicated that they would send a copy of the plan to Steven Bland's office, York County Transportation Authority, and secondly that the developer had agreed to balance off the entrance to the property with the additional tree on the adjacent side.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**J. Chapter 94 Staff Revisions**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided commentary regarding Chapter 94 indicating that for the year 1999 50,000 gallons of sewage were borrowed from Manchester Township. Five of the projects listed for 1999 were not scheduled to be started during 1999. Rather than waste the gallons, which amounted to 11,499 GPD. the staff requested that they be placed in a miscellaneous status.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the township would contact potential users who might be able to use the EDU's,

- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated they contact the known ones who want the EDU's,
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what those users needed to do to obtain the EDU's.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated they need to pay their \$1600 and pick up their plumbing permit and building permit and begin construction within six months of picking up the permits.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE STAFF'S REVISION TO CHAPTER 94 REFERENCING THE MEMORANDUM OF NOVEMBER 30, 1999. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**7. COMMUNICATION FROM SUPERVISORS:**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he wanted to thank Mark Hodgkinson for getting information on the truck waste comparison, but if the information he had provided were examined, Springettsbury is approaching the point where they become the top rated place. We probably need to be more cautious the next time we go to look for an increase.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri had received a letter from Wayne Harper regarding the 250<sup>th</sup> Chronicle. There are limited editions available for purchase for \$95.00. Mr. Gurreri indicated that the Board might consider the purchase for the library.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the township supported two libraries and added that would be a good place for it but would approve a purchase.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri mentioned the 2000 banquet for the Volunteers and Employee Appreciation about the dates of October 20 or 27<sup>th</sup>. Days Inn Conference Center was being considered. Saturdays are already booked, so the function would be held on a Friday evening.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated her interest in pursuing this. She would not want at this point to lock in with any one place. Unless costs, etc. had already been investigated at this one location, she would suggest looking for the best price for what we want. Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Gurreri would take the lead for this function provided the Board was in favor.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated he would, but added that a place needed to be secured.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that a few possible dates should be secured. She asked whether Heritage Hills had been considered.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri responded that it might be expensive.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that it sounded like there was a committee that was willing to do the work and move forward. A date and a place should be chosen.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked Ms. Speicher how many people would be involved.

**SPEICHER** Ms. Speicher responded there could be 350.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated at the last function there were 245 people.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated agreement with Mr. Bishop if Mr. Gurreri was willing to head it with the volunteer group.

**Consensus of the Board was that Mr. Gurreri take the lead, work with his team, get it on the schedule and come back with a report.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked that Mr. Gurreri gather information regarding the costs involved and come back to the Board as soon as possible so that it could be formally approved.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported she had received a letter from the Election Voter Registration office indicating the election results for November 2, 1999. The information had been copied for everyone.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported she had received a questionnaire from the Second Class Township regarding input for the location of next year's convention. They would like the Board to respond.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the Executive Board of the York County Association would like to make a decision on the location of the convention. Attendance is up, and the participation of the vendors is up. Mr. Schenck's recommendation would be the York Fairgrounds.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Schenck to respond for Springettsbury Township.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that at the last meeting discussion was held regarding the situation on the south side of Walmart and the pedestrian crossing. Speed bumps had been installed and she wished to thank Walmart and the staff for getting those installed. The area is much safer.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick discussed the intersection of Mill Street and Eastern Boulevard. She asked Police Chief Eshbach whether it would be possible to attach to those existing stop signs a sign indicating that cross traffic does not stop.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach responded that he had never seen that in Pennsylvania.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she had been in Illinois over the holiday and noticed the signs. If it were possible it would resolve the problem at Mill Street and Eastern Boulevard.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick received a letter from Tim Pasch. Tim indicated that he is concerned that the Board was not being fully consistent with enforcement of the Ordinances – one related to flags. He had been advised to take his flag down and argued that because another one on Eastern Boulevard at Coldwell Bankert. If one can do it, that he should be able to do it, or no one should be able to do it. He was also concerned about residential development plans going in in Hellam Borough, and if there are signs in our township along East Market Street and again he feels that if one can do it, so should someone else. Chairman Mitrick responded to Mr. Pasch and indicated that Mr. Amic would be in contact with him regarding his letter.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that Charlie Lauer was successful in securing a department of Community Economic Development grant for approximately \$40,000. On behalf of the Board Mr. Lauer thanked him for his effort.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that she had received a copy of the East York Historic District sign for which the Historic Preservation Committee had requested approval. They would like to proceed on this provided the sign meets the Board’s approval.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that, if the Board approved this purchase tonight, he would take care of ordering the signs.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the township had obtained permission from the property owners where the signs would be placed.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated the first thing he would attempt was to convince PennDot to allow the signs to be placed between the sidewalk and the curb. If that did not work, several property owners along Market Street had agreed to allow the signs to be erected next to the sidewalk on their property.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the sign was a two-sided sign.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded it was a one-sided sign, and one would be placed east-bound and one west-bound. He added that the sign was only 2 feet by 3 feet.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether, in consideration of the sign, there was a reason to have a motion to approve the sign.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that a motion had been taken to see the sign prior to approval.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what the cost would be.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it was \$450.00 each plus \$22.00 for each post.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR THE TWO EAST YORK HISTORIC DISTRICT SIGNS AS OUTLINED IN THE MEMORANDUM DATED 11/18/99. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented about correspondence from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. A meeting was scheduled to be held December 14 regarding the significance of the Pleasureville Historic District. The Board and/or staff was invited to attend.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated he would attend with Historic York.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that Mr. Stern had provided information regarding the results of the Zoning Hearing Board meeting. She asked the Board to review the information, which could be discussed at the next meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost to be prepared to discuss the subject with the Board at the next meeting.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that he had nothing to add to his previously submitted report. He would be interested in a five-minute Executive Session to discuss an offer for the CSX right-of-way.

**Chairman Mitrick stated that an Executive Session would be held immediately following the Regular Meeting regarding legal matters.**

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**A. Write-off of Uncollectable Receivables**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Internal Auditors had provided a report as of 12/2/99, which had been discussed in a Budget meeting. Mr. Amic had discussed this matter with Solicitor Yost. Mr. Amic asked the Board to accept the recommendation of the Internal Auditor in his memorandum of 12/2/99.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that it was absolutely regrettable that the Board was required to do this.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO ACCEPT THE TOWNSHIP MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION DETAILED IN HIS DECEMBER 2 MEMORANDUM TO WRITE OFF UNCOLLECTABLE RECEIVABLES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$73,556.35. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the situation had been corrected.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that there were no current problems.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there was a system in place that would prevent this from happening.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic had counted some 45 cases which had been referred to Solicitor Yost to lien, which is the proper procedure.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how long the township would wait before taking action.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded one year.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated at least six months was required; a year would be okay; we have 3 years within which to file the liens.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the liens are only good if the people have a piece of property to lien against.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that if they rent, the township liens against the property owner.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that the Ordinance provided that the township could bill the tenant and hold the tenant responsible. He alluded to arguments in the past that the property owner should be held responsible.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the billing should be in the property owner's name.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what it would take to change the Ordinance.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that an Amendment would change the Ordinance.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that an Amendment should be drafted.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that what had happened in the past on the ones being written off was because they were just renters. If an Amendment were passed, the township could lien against the property owner.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that a closer look should be taken at the situation and come back with a recommendation.

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Labor Agreement – Fire Fighters Local 2377 and Springettsbury Township for the Years 2000-2001-2002-2003**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic presented the Labor Agreement indicating it had been discussed by the Board in meetings as well as in Budget sessions in how it related to the budget. Approval was requested.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF LABOR AGREEMENT FIRE FIGHTERS LOCAL 2377 AND SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP FOR THE YEARS 2000, 2001, 2002, AND 2003. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented relating to the fire department, Mr. Amic had discussed a statement regarding the work schedule made during Budget sessions regarding duties. She asked Mr. Amic to provide a status report.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he would do so.

**B. Ordinance 99-11 – Establishing a Management Program for On-Lot Systems**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that this Ordinance 99-11 had been discussed in the Public Hearing earlier during the evening.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT ORDINANCE 99-11 ESTABLISHING A MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR ON-LOT SEWAGE SYSTEM BE**

**APPROVED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that Mr. Amic had requested a motion to authorize him to proceed.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE TOWNSHIP MANAGER TO SUBMIT HIS PLAN FOR MANAGEMENT OF ON-LOT SYSTEMS TO THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Ordinance 99-09 – Adding Article 16A – “Flexible Development Zone” to the Township Zoning and Subdivision and Land Development Ordinances**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he had been interviewed with regard to Item C. He had not discussed the outcome, but a report had appeared on the 10 o'clock news.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he had not yet seen anything that would indicate on the Supervisors part what would be required as far as infra-structure for traffic in the area in order to be able to accommodate the traffic generated because of the development. He stated that a traffic problem would be created up and down Memory Lane, but also on Market Street and possibly beyond all the way down to Haines Road to the next exit at Rt. 83. He did not think that as a supervisor he could vote for this with inadequate information.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that when Home Depot opened there would be a lot more traffic than at this time. Regardless of the Flexible Zone, something must be done about the traffic.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch further stated that Mr. Stern had done a good job on the zone and it is a very good project and something that needed to be done, which can be very beneficial for the community. He was not opposed to the project. What he was opposed to was that not enough had been done to determine what was needed to handle the traffic.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked how long a traffic study would take.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the study at Mt. Rose took about a year. The study that had been discussed in the Budget sessions encompassed studies suggested by the township supervisors from Rt. 30 south to Exit 7. It would be more of a regional study.

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that, by putting in the road from Mt. Zion to Memory Lane, it did alleviate the problem of traffic on Memory Lane.
- STERN** Mr. Stern agreed that a study should be done. As to how much it would alleviate the traffic he indicated about 20% but stated that he could not be sure of that.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that would by pass Market Street and alleviate traffic in front of Walmart.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked about the status.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the last he had heard that Mike Lopano from the state indicated that it is on the TIP (Traffic Improvement Program) for next year's budget. That would mean if all goes well it would be built next year.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick made mention of one item regarding the traffic problem. When the public hearing was held residents came forward who stated they feel they live in a neighborhood that had been a bad situation. Regardless of what is done with the zoning, the bad situations need to be addressed. If the zoning makes the traffic situation through a residential neighborhood worse, it will have to be dealt with, because every stop sign and speed control has to be done through PennDot. In her opinion the board was being extremely conservative and there are residential neighborhoods out there who want us to attend to it now. She asked the Board to place the residential neighborhoods both north and south of Market Street on an early Agenda to see what could be done. Secondly, it was hard for her to vote on the zoning district knowing that Mr. Stern had submitted several options on the map. She requested that the Board refer to that part of the Ordinance and see if there was a need to discuss the options because that certainly would affect her vote on the whole project. She asked Mr. Stern to briefly explain his options.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that "A" was what they had been looking at which was indicated in the blue area. At the other end was the green area indicating just Caterpillar. Option "B" was what had been discussed at the last work session eliminating properties on Industrial Highway and west of North Hills Road but leaving in the Caterpillar Distribution Center and Donlee along with a few vacant lots and Saturn. Option "C" was similar but removing Donlee and Saturn and include properties west of Memory Lane but only properties which are parking on Memory Lane so that North Hills Road would not be directly affected. Option "D" included only properties east of Memory Lane and only north of Industrial Highway not including the vacant tract of land across the street from the former Lowe's, Eastern Market or the vacant McCrory's.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he would go back to the beginning of Chairman Mitrick's comments. Mr. Bishop agreed wholeheartedly on the neighborhood action and would like to put some teeth to that.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DIRECT THE TOWNSHIP MANAGER TO PREPARE A PLAN TO ADDRESS THOSE TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN THE TWO NEIGHBORHOODS NORTH AND SOUTH OF MARKET STREET BETWEEN ROUTE 83 AND MEMORY LANE AND INDUSTRIAL HIGHWAY TO K-MART AND THAT HE WOULD HAVE THAT PLAN AVAILABLE FOR THE BOARD PRIOR TO THE SECOND MEETING IN JANUARY. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that Mr. Luciani had attended a conference on traffic calming and as Mr. Amic wrote his report she asked that he would consult with Mr. Luciani and Chief Eshbach for the options.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added what the Supervisors should do procedurally to move forward is to address questions regarding the previously agreed upon map.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that no matter what section of the map they have, they still do not have any information as to what's coming forward.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the Supervisors would never have all the information the way they would like it. He felt that immediate action in order to move forward with what information was available was necessary. To sit back and wait is to pass up unusual opportunities for development and put our heads in the sand.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that, if the Board were to table this until more information would be available, he would not view that as taking away any opportunity. It is an excellent project; an excellent piece of property and as a Board it should be done correctly. He was not in favor of changing the plan in any way until he had more information.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop disagreed that any time the Board embarked to do something and changed minds and decided not to do it in the way we were going to that there is the potential for an opportunity to be lost. If he were convinced that there was additional information to be garnered that would be of value in making the decision he would agree 100%.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked why it could not be done coincidentally, i.e., do the traffic study and approve the plan.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he had been told too many times by Solicitor Yost that once the plan is approved and the zoning is approved there is nothing he had a legal right to do in terms of the traffic that has to be done. What we're doing here is creating a good zone, which can be very beneficial for the township. What he visualized was if it were approved at this point in time he visualized is having a horrendous traffic situation turned into almost a standstill and creating more problems for the residents that are in that area. There are opportunities in the future if we develop this properly but if not, we'll have problems. Not once during all the discussions had it been mentioned that Memory Lane should be increased from two to four lanes. The plan should be all-inclusive to be able to provide to a developer all the items needed. If it costs the township some money then it should be spent. It's a good plan, which would benefit the township.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri agreed that we should be willing to spend Township funds and indicated that some plans are already in place. By-passes and extensions had been discussed. The traffic impact is unknown. He asked Mr. Stern what his idea was for traffic.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated there were a lot of cars on the roadways when Caterpillar was operating. He agreed with everything being said. His concern with traffic studies was that they don't really provide much more information. When a traffic study is done for re-zoning, they look at potential uses and come up with some estimate of what the traffic would be based on the new zoning. The situation with the new zoning is that the uses that would be permitted in the new zone are basically the same uses that are already in place in the area, so for them to determine they would either need to use a worst-case scenario but use retail for the whole thing or use industrial for the whole area or use a mix of 50/50. It would not give a proper comparison. It could provide an analysis of what needs to be improved. Memory Lane needs help; Industrial Highway needs help. Exit 7 from 83 needs help.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated it would be better than nothing at all.

**STERN** Mr. Stern would not agree that the meaning of traffic counts are valid. What means something is that we all know where the traffic problems are, and we know what needs to be done.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that, as far as he was concerned, if they did not do a traffic study or a complete engineering study on the whole corridor and what's involved, an unreasonable situation would be created for all of the residents of the township. Planning is important to the entire matter, and a comprehensive plan should be done because we want to provide the best that possibly can be done for the township with the information available.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that Caterpillar had been discussed and it had been mentioned as to how long those types of plants sit before they are sold. They could sit for 10 to 15 years. We don't want to see that happen. This is a good plan to re-develop land.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he appreciated the ability to discuss the map. He had great concerns about the map. He agreed that Mr. Pasch's points are essential but he also read Solicitor Yost's information regarding even if we went through all the studies and gathered information, the ability to implement anything that we would legislate would be very limited. We may have all the information and yet still could not do anything to cause any serious contributions to come up with the solutions that the study would prove. The experience with developers in the past has been successful in working out traffic issues. There had been a great history of working with developers that understand how they impact the community, and as much as it is somewhat scary, the history to him tended to make him put his faith in that process as opposed to something that we would try to mandate through Ordinance. Impact these and they may as well not exist, and the other option is that it won't give us the teeth that we need.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he was not advocating impact fees. They won't do the job either. Let's take a look at what we've done with all of the developers in the past and what we've gotten from them. He asked whether they considered the township to have a good traffic situation.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that overall the traffic was not good.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that additions had been made a little here, a little there, and no plan was in place that indicated this is what we want to do. He asked the Board to take the opportunity and make the most of it and do it right.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he thought both could be done.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated he agreed that both could be done.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that he did not think it was totally the responsibility of developers to provide for the road system in Springettsbury Township. Nothing precludes the Board from doing that at the same time that we have a different zone created within the township.

**PASCH** Let's set forth a plan that says this is what the township is going to do and this is what we'll expect the developer to do.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that in the Budget session they basically made that commitment, i.e., that the Board is looking unrelated to this solely, but looking at the big picture.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he liked Option "C" on the map as it accomplished the major concern. This is a zone which could be expanded easily to retract it is next to impossible.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MAKE WHAT IS OPTION "C" AS THE MAP THAT IS PART OF THE PROPOSED FLEXIBLE ZONING DISTRICT. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND.**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked how long it takes to add to the zone.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated less than 60 days.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented on the motion that she believed that what had been outlined on Option "C" is very close to what was originally discussed. Somehow in the process the concept had been expanded and, in her opinion, the expansion had been way out of hand. She believed Option "C" addressed her concern on Market Street. The earlier motion to handle the traffic problems in those residential neighborhoods answered those concerns. She was in support of Option "C."

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the only area of difficulty was within the Caterpillar property. Mr. Pasch was more in favor of Option "E."

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked for further discussion regarding Option "E."

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that all of the rest of the property at this point was pretty much vacant in "C." He indicated that there was not much in there and with what we're looking at we can have an inordinate amount of development that takes place in there almost immediately and not have the time to put together the infrastructure necessary to handle it. Option "E" was open and operating at one time. We had the traffic and we dealt with it. As far as Mr. Pasch was concerned Option "E," just the Caterpillar property would be fine. He would prefer to see more Industrial coming in as it provided better jobs and a better outlook for the township than Commercial. If we re-zone to help get industry or something else in there, because of the facilities that are there, it would be more likely to be Industrial.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked Mr. Pasch if he had any problem just voting for Caterpillar. Mr. Gurreri recalled a previous discussion about spot zoning.

- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that with the broad number of uses that you could have under the new ordinance and the sheer size of the tract, there would be no spot zoning involved.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated he didn't see any problem with Option "C."
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned Option "D." and whether the Board looked at Option "D" there are some properties there, especially on Industrial Highway that are sitting vacant. She asked Mr. Stern whether, if it were not included in this zone, it would be extremely difficult for those properties to be developed.
- STERN** Mr. Stern reminded the Board of a map that he had previously provided which indicated priorities of properties, Caterpillar was the #1 priority. One piece of Caterpillar goes across the street into another piece. The parcel in between had been impossible to develop under the current zoning. Several others were pointed out as being impossible to develop.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what the parcels were currently zoned.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that they were commercial, commercial highway, and industrial.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated they were very intense uses right now.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated those properties under the current zoning would not be developed quickly.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called for the vote.

**MOTION CARRIED. MR. PASCH VOTED AGAINST THE MOTION.**

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented on the Ordinance. As the Board had gone through the numerous work sessions on the construction of this ordinance, she had kept very close notes on the concerns she had in the ordinance itself. She stated that her concerns, for example, if a site is in violation of any part of the ordinance, who is responsible for the specialist evaluation. She indicated she was satisfied that if the township does find a violation, then the property owner is responsible for the cost of that specialist and also to remedy the problem. Also she was happy to see that noise levels were being addressed. She continued that there is always a concern in the township regarding outside storage and what might be generated from that. This ordinance gives the township much better control, better input over what exists as outside storage and the related factors than presently.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE 99-09 WITH THE NOTE THAT SECTION 3 IS AMENDED TO INCLUDE ONLY THOSE PARCELS IDENTIFIED IN YELLOW ON THE MAP IDENTIFIED AS OPTION "C" INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he was opposed to the size of Option "C."

**MOTION CARRIED. MR. PASCH VOTED AGAINST THE MOTION.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick, on behalf of the Board, thanked Mr. Amic, Mr. Stern and other staff members and consultants who had been involved in putting the ordinance together.

**CHAIRMAN MITRICK MOVED THAT, BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE DISCUSSION HELD RELATING TO THE ACTION ON THE FLEXIBLE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND CONSISTENT WITH THE POSITION TAKEN DURING THE BUDGET SESSIONS REGARDING ATTENTION TO MAJOR TRAFFIC CONCERNS IN SPRINGGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP, THAT THE BOARD DIRECT THE STAFF TO TEND TO THAT ISSUE IMMEDIATELY AND BEGIN BRINGING FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SOME RECOMMENDATIONS. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Ordinance 99-10 – Establishing No Parking Zones – Whiteford Road**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding Ordinance 99-10 and stated that it had been duly advertised to establish No Parking Zones at the cul-de-sac on Whiteford Road. Staff recommended approval of this ordinance.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE ORDINANCE 99-10 ESTABLISHING NO PARKING ZONES – WHITEFORD ROAD. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**E. Right-of-Way Agreement – James Rossi/Springgettsbury Township**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided commentary regarding Item E., a Right-of-Way Agreement by James and Catherine Rossi in relation to Mt. Zion Overview replacement sewer at a cost of \$764.00. Design engineer and staff recommended approval.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE RIGHT-OF-WAY AGREEMENT – JAMES ROSSI/SPRINGGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**F. Agreement – York County SPCA and Springgettsbury Township**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided information regarding Item F. The Agreement had been prepared by Mr. Amic and reviewed by Solicitor Yost. Approval was recommended.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT – YORK COUNTY SPCA AND SPRINGGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**G. Resolution 99-57 – Census 2000 Complete Count**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Resolution 99-57 is the Census 2000 Complete County recommended by the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors. Approval was recommended.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what Item G. meant.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the county would be responsible.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that the county has people throughout the community whose goals is to insure that the entire county is counted. He had gone to a census meeting about this item. Originally they were encouraging the municipalities to have their own census. However, the county has the means to provide the census.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-57 – CENSUS 2000 COMPLETE COUNT. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**H. Agreement – Norfolk Southern/Springettsbury Township – Activity 1029042**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that two agreements are under consideration. Item H, the first Agreement, related to a 12 week water main. As Solicitor Yost indicated in his comments, these are nothing more than License Agreements. He agreed with Solicitor Yost's comments, and his concerns listed in his letter had been addressed. The insurance policies are in place. The contractor had been notified about the rail inspections. Staff recommended approval.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT WITH NORFOLK SOUTHERN TO INSTALL TWO LONGITUDINAL PIPES. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- I. Agreement – Norfolk Southern/Springettsbury Township – Activity 1029567**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT WITH NORFOLK SOUTHERN TO FOR 64” DIP. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- J. Storm Water Management Agreement – St. Onge Partners, LLP, East York Faith Missionary Church and Springettsbury Township – Lot No. 1A**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Solicitor Yost asked that Item J. be placed on the Agenda.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost recommended that the Board adopt the Agreement as modified by your approval of the St. Onge Land Development Plan.

**MR. PASCH MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE AGREEMENT AS MODIFIED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE ST. ONGE LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

- A. Board of Supervisors Development Zone Work Session – November 11, 1999.**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 11, 1999 DEVELOPMENT ZONE WORK SESSION. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. SCHENCK ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

- B. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – November 11, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 11, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. SCHENCK ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported no Old Business for action.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested an update from Mr. Amic for the next meeting on the Professional Fundraising effort.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether any kind of temporary sign could be erected in the area of the new pump station to indicate what the project is.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated it might be part of the specifications.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that R.K.& K. would probably do that if they could put their name on it.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he would investigate it.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that, due to the lateness of the hour, a new issue relating to the information received from Miller & Co. If the Board would allow Chairman Mitrick she would send a letter indicating that they would consider it at one of the early meetings in January with a response.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated he would be in favor of moving forward if no discussion were necessary.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck was in agreement.

**Consensus was to move forward with the Miller & Co. letter.**

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 11:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**NOVEMBER 11, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**NOT IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Bill Schenck

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Mike Myers, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Michael Hickman, Fire Chief  
Andy Hinkle, Manager of Information Services  
Mark Hodgkinson, WWT Superintendent  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m. She welcomed the general public and the Boy Scouts to the General Meeting of the Board of Supervisors. She announced that there had been an Executive Session on November 3 regarding personnel matters, and that another session had been held on November 10<sup>th</sup> regarding personnel. She announced that there would be an Executive Session following this meeting regarding personnel. She requested information from the Boy Scouts in attendance.

The five Boy Scouts in attendance were from Troop 20 working on their Citizenship and Community Merit Badge. One of their requirements is to attend a public meeting. The scouts in attendance were: Keith White, Michael Yates, Chris White, Joseph Hammond, and Jason Berwick.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**SURTASKY** Mr. Anthony Surtasky of 2240 Mount Zion Road brought forth several items. He would like to have information with regard to a sign for direction to Rocky Ridge Park and what progress had been made.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he had heard nothing about the park signs.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the County park personnel were notified that it was a matter that must be discussed with the Zoning Hearing Board.

**SURTASKY** Mr. Surtasky indicated that he had lived at 2240 Mt. Zion Road for 42 years and had observed the amount of traffic on the road. Years ago a sign was intended near the cemetery. His neighbor puts traffic cones in his driveway all summer long to keep people from turning around. He himself has had to wait for people to turn around in his driveway. He wanted something done. Especially at Christmas time there should be a police officer to direct traffic.

Mr. Surtasky added that regarding Memory Lane Extended he thought they were going to shut off the old Memory Lane. He asked whether that was the original intent.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it was one of the scenarios at that time.

**SURTASKY** Mr. Surtasky indicated he did not think the road was doing what it was supposed to do. Cars turn east on Old Whiteford Road, make the turn and go up the old road. Do not enter signs should be placed there. Exits would be okay, and there should be a no left turn sign.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that Mr. Surtasky was correct. The Supervisors do know that some of the issues surrounding that roadway are not completed.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that he is one of the people who still use that roadway. The reason is because that's the through street. We're working on making the change so that the stop is on Old Memory Lane. When that happens you'll see that a lot of the traffic will start using the road the way it was intended.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that the Supervisors would like to see the signs in place, but they need to go through the Zoning Ordinance.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the entrance to the park is really in need of work, not only going south, but also going north.

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that she would like to provide Mr. Surtasky a broader picture on the situation. She asked Mr. Amic to address the general traffic study being done on Mt. Zion Road in relation to North Sherman Street.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that he and Mr. Stern met with Mike Lapano of PennDOT and viewed the intersection of Sherman and Mt. Zion, the T intersection and also the Trout Run Road/Deiningger Road intersection. The Township suggested that they look at this intersection due to the topography at the top of the hill. It is a dangerous condition. They agreed to look at it. At that time he said that this project would be on their plan for design in the year 2000 and built in 2001. We felt he was optimistic about including this work at that time.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the whole corridor is a concern, and as Mr. Amic mentioned, it is hopeful it will be included satisfactorily in the study.
- SURTASKY** Mr. Surtasky was pleased that someone was at least looking at it.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that he probably would not get the sign he hoped for by Christmas.
- SURTASKY** Mr. Surtasky responded that at least there should be a sign there that is connected electrically.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Police Chief Eshbach and Fire Chief Hickman for a report of their responsibilities with the arrival of President Clinton at Harley Davidson.
- ESHBACH** Police Chief Eshbach reported that he had been contacted Thursday morning, November 4 at 9:20 a.m. by the U. S. Secret Service, who advised him that the President was coming to town. There was a lot of coordination that took place, and he had been the person who coordinated the law enforcement and Federal officials in the area. The Secret Service arrived in York on Friday afternoon and spoke with the Chief and advised what they needed. A team sat down and coordinated the work to be done. The key to the entire project was intermunicipal cooperation between municipalities, the City, the Pennsylvania State Police, the Fire Department, Emergency Medical Services, and people from the York County Prison. Chief Eshbach thanked everyone involved for their help. They had received a lot of compliments from the Secret Service and officials, who said normally these efforts were not as well thought out. The ultimate goal was to make that situation the best it could be. Taking the President into an area like that where there were so many nooks and crannies and so many corners was very difficult to secure the area. The

Police Officers who were there did a magnificent job and made it safe for him to come and visit. The President told Chief Eshbach he really liked Springettsbury Township, and he was really glad to be here. He felt secure in the surroundings, which was due to the hard work and effort put into the project. Chief Eshbach commended his staff, Sergeants Harvey, Trott, Laird and Detective Drawbaugh, who deserved a lot of credit. They worked long and hard and got the job done. This job normally takes a minimum of three weeks, which they did in four days. The quality of people in Springettsbury Township and in the Police Department are the finest with which Chief Eshbach had ever worked. He was very proud to have them in his command.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that shortly after Chief Eshbach's week began, he was invited to a meeting with the Secret Service, where details were spelled out as to what was necessary. His responsibility included to take care of all fire protection on the grounds. He called in 18 of the 22 employees and had a staff of about six volunteers to cover the grounds and stand by in the stations. He coordinated with Paul Shaeffer to have a Hazardous Materials Team on standby. Medic 97 at York Hospital was coordinated to have two paramedics staffed. Ambulances were on the site. He commended Chief Eshbach with his members for the excellent job that they did. All of the work was with professionalism during a very, very stressful event. To have the magnitude of this event thrust in your lap with no notice, the staff is to be commended wholeheartedly. He added that it was an honor to be in Springettsbury Township to be in the presence of the President. Springettsbury Township did an excellent job in representing the State of Pennsylvania.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick, on behalf of the full Board of Supervisors, applauded Chiefs Eshbach and Hickman, for doing a superb job. She added that they were excellent representatives of the community. Chairman Mitrick gave the Boy Scouts the opportunity to shake the hands of the Chiefs.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober reported that the Raleigh Drive project was moving along satisfactorily. Amliner has submitted their shop drawings for review. He reported it would take them a week or two to manufacture the liners. The PLC system had been started up as scheduled. Everything seemed to be working smoothly.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Schober whether the bugs would be ironed out fairly shortly.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober indicated he did not anticipate any problem as there was nothing out of the ordinary.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani reported that he had met with the Planning Commission members and reviewed Land Development plans. During the next Supervisors Meeting there will be the People’s State Bank, and St. Onge with plans to be reviewed. Mr. Luciani indicated their meeting was lengthy but they tried to evaluate and scrutinize some of the modifications more specifically. Some waivers are still needed, but Mr. Luciani felt that the Planning Commission scrutinized the plans, which came before them.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether Diehl Toyota acknowledged a better attitude.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated Diehl had a long history in the township with concerns many years ago. He was happy to hear that there were people who wanted to work with him within the framework of the Ordinance.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned an item in Mr. Luciani’s report concerning the Municipal Building. He asked about First Capital Engineering needing to be involved with construction and some of the grading work.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that First Capital is on an as-needed basis.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked about the Meadowlands stormwater and the direction Mr. Luciani asked for from the township regarding the priority. Mr. Bishop asked the Supervisors what they want there and how it would be addressed. We need to give Mr. Luciani direction.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated Mr. Luciani had asked a good question at the last meeting regarding opinions on the condition, status, history. Chairman Mitrick would like a firm opinion from Solicitor Yost as to what the township’s responsibility is with the situation.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that the township does not have a liability situation.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated it was a problem that needed to be fixed one way or another.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani added that it’s not a simple solution. When it had been discussed initially with Charlie Lauer, Paul Amic and himself, they thought they could modify the outlet structure. That’s only 7% of the total water that’s causing the problem. It’s a combination involving some real estate taking of the lands that are in a floodplain, enlarging the pipe

beneath the railroad track which had been there for more than 50 years and building a regional pond for a combination of all three. Any one of these alone won't solve the problem. He offered to put together a proposal to evaluate this, and it could be reviewed. As far as the partners and the financial responsibility that's something that needed to be decided. It's not something that can be solved without a significant amount of engineering, topography and permitting.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether Mr. Luciani thought that might be retention and controlled release.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that could be a solution. There is a huge basin upstream, but 7% of that contributed to the problem. It involved a lot of businesses, parks, roadways, and the prison.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she felt there was a consensus of the Board that there is a need to address it. She asked Mr. Amic to meet with Mr. Luciani and come back with a potential reasonable approach.

**The Board of Supervisors indicated agreement with the pursuit of a solution.**

**B. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert brought forward a status report regarding the pumping station. The contractor was presenting drawing submittals. The contractor should be turning dirt during the week of November 15<sup>th</sup>. Regarding the parallel interceptor there were a few addendum items; however, the bids are expected in the original time frame. The pre-bid conference revealed a few minor items. Relative to the bio-solids the draft tri-fold brochure is expected to be in the hands of the Township Manager and Supervisors prior to the Thanksgiving holiday. Comments had been incorporated from the Township Staff with photographs. One more photo is to be added.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that he read in a report that as soon as the brochure was finished it was to be released. Mr. Pasch had not had an opportunity for review.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it would come to the Board first before it would be released.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that their plan is to make sure everyone's comments had been incorporated from a technical side and thoroughly reviewed by Mr. Amic and the Supervisors.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 11/11/99.**
- B. C. S. Davidson, Inc. – East/West Interceptor – Progress Billing #8 - \$527.23**
- C. Reed Smith Shaw & McClay – Progress Billing #7 - \$2,307.50**
- D. Murphy & Dittenhafer Architects – Progress Billing #13 - \$4,016.31**
- E. Springfield Contractors – Harrowgate/Kingston – Progress Billing #1 - \$8,721.90**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the fire department's telephone account for the month of \$338.49 was high.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that the bill had been that high for the past few months.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what created a bill that size.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that it was long distance phone calls. Particularly within the last month interviewing for positions and calling resources for sprinkler ordinances.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch was assured that the calls were made in the pursuit of particular projects.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether this was a telephone plan that he had chosen or one which had been chosen for him.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that he had not chosen it and that it needed to be investigated. He particularly noted one 10-minute phone call to Springfield, Illinois at \$20.00.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that Mr. Bishop brought up a good point. The plan should be investigated.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO PAY ACCOUNTS PAYABLES ITEMS A THROUGH E AS SUBMITTED ON THE AGENDA OF NOVEMBER 11, 1999. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

- A. Municipal Maintenance, Inc. – Nitrification Tank Mixer Repair - \$14,496**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided information regarding item A. The Board had authorized the staff to bid specifications for three of the wastewater treatment tank mixers. Bids had been received and low bidder on the project was Municipal Maintenance, Inc. in the amount of \$14,496.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the possibility of an additional cost.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the cost would not be known until the project is begun. The maximum case scenario would be \$29,496. Permission was requested to award the bid for \$14,496.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the add-ons were considered in selecting the bid. If all three are required whether this still covered the bid.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated this was not an alternate.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AWARD THE BID FOR THE NITRIFICATION TANK MIXER REPAIR TO MUNICIPAL MAINTENANCE, INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$14,496. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Mill Creek Interceptor Repair Project – Authorization to Re-Bid**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Buchart Horn has re-defined the specifications and he, himself, had done an extensive analysis of the prior specifications and changes. This is a serious infiltration problem. He had reviewed the language. The bid was \$80,000 and prohibitive for this kind of work. There is an additional paragraph, which Mr. Amic intended to speak to Mr. Schober about. Mr. Amic thanked R.K. & K. for their comments related to this project. He requested the opportunity to bid the project once more.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch cautioned that, that in an attempt to reduce the price, the township would not be exposed to something else that could be as or more expensive.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he did not think so. The wording of the language in the potential specs places the responsibility on the contractor.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO AUTHORIZE TO RE-BID THE MILL CREEK INTERCEPTOR REPAIR PROJECT. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Wastewater Treatment Standby Generator – Authorization to Complete Specifications and Bid**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that item C. related to a request to permit staff to complete the specifications and bid the wastewater treatment standby generator. The issue went back to July when former employee James Noll forwarded information and the ensuing discussions relating to risk

management in this area. At that time the Board had authorized looking at this and authorized R.K. & K. to review it and provide preliminary specifications and mainly an approach to the problem. Permission was requested to complete the specs and to bid the project.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO BID SPECIFICATIONS AND BID THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT STANDBY GENERATORS. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Planning Module – Strine Printing – Manchester Township – A3 67939-330-3 for 2,650 GPD**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the Planning Module for Strine Printing had been included in the Chapter 94 report and was recommended by the staff.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE PLANNING MODULE FOR STRING PRINTING – MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP A3-67939-330-3 for 2,650 GPD. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED.**

**B. Planning Module – Hunters Crossing – Springettsbury Township – A3 – 67957-300-3 21,000 GPD**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the Planning Module for Hunters Crossing is on the Chapter 94 report and was recommended by the staff.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern whether a firm indication that the Army Corps of Engineers would be involved in this, and whether there would be any reason that this should not proceed forward.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the article in the newspaper was not completely correct. He added that there are many different opinions about the correct facts. Even with a Planning Module there is uncertainty about whether DEP would approve it or hold it. As far as Springettsbury Township is concerned in approving this, it is something that has to be done at some point in the process. There is no bearing on the other issues as far as the township is concerned. DEP can fight it out with the other people if they choose.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF PLANNING MODULE FOR HUNTERS CROSSING – SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP - - A3 – 67957-300-3 21,000 GPD. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. PASCH ABSTAINED AS A FAMILY MEMBER WAS INVOLVED.**

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the next Emergency Services Commission meeting is on Wednesday, November 17<sup>th</sup>. He asked Solicitor Yost what information had been gathered from PEMA about the low-interest loan.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that a telephone call had been placed to PEMA, which had not been returned. A letter had been written to PEMA's Chief Counsel outlining the situation and requesting a prompt response. Solicitor Yost had shared his opinion and a copy of the agreement as well, in order for him to know what he was addressing.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that he had attended the York County Association of Second Class Townships on November 4<sup>th</sup>. Supervisor Bill Schenck is President. The meeting had been very professionally done, and he had gathered some good information.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that one of the speakers at that meeting had indicated most of the Second Class Townships Board of Supervisors begin their Board meetings with the Pledge of Allegiance. Chairman Mitrick stated that Springettsbury had not done this with the exception of when the Boy Scouts had attended the meetings.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that it pleased him to see it done, and he would be equally pleased to see Springettsbury Township do it.

**Consensus of the Board was to incorporate the Pledge of Allegiance into the Agenda of ensuing meetings.**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri brought forward the item of going to see the President. Secretary of Commerce, Bill Daley was there. The President, in person is much younger looking and slim and has a lot of charisma. Mr. Gurreri indicated it had been delightful to meet him.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Amic and her colleagues as well because as with the Chiefs the Board also received short notice on the invitation for the event, and everyone accommodated it in their schedules. It was time consuming, but extremely beneficial and it was an honor to be there.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that all Springettsbury Township Officials and Board Members attended. All five Supervisors greeted the President at his helicopter.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that they had received the VIP treatment. Chairman Mitrick presented a book of the Township to the President who indicated his appreciation for history. Mr. Gurreri speculated it would probably be in his library.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that a letter had been received from Mr. Robert F. Hoch from Robert F. Hoch and Associates. He complimented the staff, particularly Mr. Stern regarding the concept of the Flexible Development Zone that is being studied. Additionally, a copy of a memo had been received from our Director of Human Services, which indicated that the employees of Springettsbury Township had been very generous in their contributions to the 1999 United Way Campaign. The Board thanked the employees as well.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned whether the Board would be interested in being included in that solicitation within the Township next year.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned whether it was possible to have a payroll deduction.

**SPEICHER** Betty Speicher responded that it was possible.

**Consensus of the Board was to be included in the United Way solicitation.**

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost reported, as a supplement to his written report, Mr. Amic and he attended the fact-finding conference with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission on Monday. He intended to provide a verbal report during Executive Session; however, he decided to provide a comprehensive written report following his investigation of a few items. That report would be submitted in a few weeks. Additionally, he had a few items for Executive Session on a litigation matter.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost whether he would be able to attend the Noon meeting on November 23 with the Planning Commission to further discuss the information on the Flexible Development Zone.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he would plan to be in attendance.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that Reed Smith Shaw and McClay faxed him today a letter from Chris Rissetto which discussed the successes of the campaign for funding, as well as alluding to the efforts of our legislators. Mr. Rissetto and Mr. Amic had discussed additional Federal funding opportunities. As you know the economic development initiative account within U. S. HUD Redevelopment Block program reached a level of some \$275 million in project earmarks. Mr. Amic continued that without the dedicated help of Chris Rissetto, the township would not have the \$5.2

million project, \$2 million in Federal grants. The suggestion here is that Springettsbury Township is on the front burner. Mr. Amic requested that the Board take a proposal on Phase III at this time. Mr. Amic would provide it to the Supervisors in December to allow time to decide whether to go further.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how much time there would be after that.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded he would have to do this at the December meeting as he would have to begin in the January session to start his process through the Congress. Mr. Amic added that he wanted to see what would be charged.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the proposal was great and had done extremely well working with the firm. Two million dollars is a lot of money for what it had cost. He added that, if a decision had to be made at the December meeting, he would like to see something in writing prior to that.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he would be meeting with Mr. Risetto and would provide items for review prior to the December meeting. Mr. Amic brought the item to the attention of the Supervisors because of what the elected officials had accomplished and to give them credit for what they're doing for York County.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated the support of the Board to proceed.

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Ordinance 99-11 – Establishing a Management Program for On-Lot Systems**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented briefly about Ordinance 99-11 to establish the sewage management program. In researching the regulations to accompany this, it had been determined that a Public Hearing must be held prior to passage. Mr. Amic had written to DEP and requested an extension until December 31, 1999. He would like to bring the matter to a close through the efforts of Mike Schober and the Wastewater Treatment staff. Following review of the extensive planning necessary this would be brought forward.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the Ordinance had been reviewed.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that he had written the Ordinance. It had been advertised for adoption (11/11/99). Therefore, we would not have to re-advertise it. He requested a motion adjourning action on the Ordinance until the meeting in December.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that changes could be made to this Ordinance prior to a Public Hearing.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that the Board had discussed putting sewer lines in and how expensive it would be for the property owner. Mr. Gurreri would be in favor of repairing the on-lot systems, which would be more economical.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the cost was a major concern; however, DEP had made it clear that the township needs to provide the solution.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that he is in favor of doing the repairs and certainly where there are septic systems leaking. Every three years they have to be checked. Mr. Gurreri asked who would do the checking, and how is this enforced.

**HODGKINSON** Mr. Hodgkinson indicated their department would do the checking. He added that there are about 450 on-lot systems. However, they have not been checked for some time.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch agreed with Mr. Gurreri's comment regarding enforcement, and as long as it can be determined by the soil tests and an administrative schedule to check those items it would be satisfactory. In the Ordinance itself it states that enforcement "in lieu of having a replacement" the use of laundry facilities may be limited to one load per day. Mr. Pasch questioned who would enforce that.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the item of one load of laundry per day came from the Regulations.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated the entire matter would be very difficult to solve and would be an on-going program within the Township.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri emphasized that it was very important to address the lots that are leaking.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated there are lots where that can't be done and other measures have to be taken.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO ADJOURN ACTION ON THIS UNTIL THE  
DECEMBER 9<sup>th</sup> MEETING INCLUDING HOLDING A PUBLIC HEARING.  
MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the Public Hearing regarding Ordinance 99-11 would be scheduled for December 9<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m.

**B. Resolution 99-10 – Posting No Parking Signs – Whiteford Road**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided commentary regarding Resolution 99-10 and stated that it actually is Ordinance 99-10.

**STERN** Mr. Stern apologized that this Ordinance had not been advertised for this evening. It was advertised for December 9<sup>th</sup>. No action was taken.

**C. Labor Agreement – Fire Fighters Local 2377 and Springettsbury Township for the Years 2000-2001-2002-2003**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the Labor agreement had been negotiated for some time. The Negotiating Committee (Paul Amic, Betty Speicher and Randy Wachter) reached a tentative agreement for the Board's approval. It had been approved by the union. The contract is precedent setting in that it is a 4-year contract.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he had some questions for discussion and suggested his items be discussed in Executive Session.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated the matter could be held in abeyance.

**D. Resolution 99-49 – Retirement Resolution**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Resolution 99-49 covered the retirement of Sgt. Barry Bailets.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that it would not be necessary to read the full Resolution 99-49, Recognition of Barry R. Bailets. He had given tremendous service to Springettsbury Township. She added that it was unfortunate that the Board would not have the public opportunity to present the Resolution to Mr. Bailets, but due to circumstances he was unable to attend the meeting. She asked that, when the Resolution is presented to Barry Bailets, that Mr. Amic extend congratulations to him on behalf of the Board.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would be happy to do so.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 99-49 RETIREMENT RESOLUTION FOR BARRY R. BAILETS. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**E. Resolution 99-50 – Service Charges and Fees Industrial Pretreatment and Trucked Waste Programs**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Resolution 99-50 covered the request from the Wastewater staff to change the fee structures to truck wastes. Mr. Amic and Mr. Hodgkinson had done analysis regarding this change. The request was to increase the charges based on the needs.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the net difference in what is being proposed in revenue and the related costs is about \$70,000. There was some indication that the handling of this is a difficult thing and that it has some major affect on the rest of the facility.

**HODGKINSON** Mr. Hodgkinson responded that the TSS (Total Suspended Solids) is the major problem in bio-solid sludge management. The more of the heavier TSS that is received from other smaller municipalities creates a problem of disposal, which is the greatest challenge at this point from the Wastewater Department. By increasing the TSS more strictly and charging more this might alleviate the disposal and treatment costs of the sludge trucked in from elsewhere.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether that was all included in the calculations toward determining the costs.

**HODGKINSON** Mr. Hodgkinson responded that was correct.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the proposed rates are about \$70,000 to \$75,000.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that in the number a factor was considered for those that may not accept the price increase and may take their waste elsewhere. The numbers indicate more net and less costs.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked why the township takes the waste in the first place.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it has resulted in the past in \$450,000 worth of revenue.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether a lot of the costs are fixed costs, which would not be eliminated if this were not coming through.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated there would be the same amount of employees.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the issue was one, which was difficult to understand as to whether it was really profitable or not because it did cause technical problems in the process, which were hard to measure, along with the impact.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost asked whether DEP provided any favorable return as a result of the Township handling the waste.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that there was none.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that there are not many municipalities which accept the waste.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that this relates to Mr. Pasch's point regarding the elasticity of the price, but there aren't a lot of other alternatives.

**HODGKINSON** Mr. Hodgkinson added that with the higher TSS there is ground water coming in from the different landfills. It looks like drinking water when it comes out of the truck. That takes little money to treat. That's a gift.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he had some questions as to whether the costs clearly reflect what is being done. He would like additional answers regarding that, but because of the fact that this \$72,755 is an increase in revenue, it certainly is an acknowledgment that some of the business would be lost.

**HODGKINSON** Mr. Hodgkinson stated that the last time the Resolution was changed, which was in 1997 there was a price increase and no business was lost. A very conservative 9% was calculated in.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how Springettsbury compared with any other sewage facility doing this work in terms of price.

**HODGKINSON** Mr. Hodgkinson stated that Springettsbury is the cheapest. What is unique about Springettsbury is that it is the only nearby wastewater treatment facility with the exception of Dover Township, and they accept a very limited amount. From there municipalities have to travel to Derry Township or Harrisburg. This adds to their costs in terms of fuel.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he had no problem with applying the increase; however, he would like to review the whole process as he was not convinced that it is a wise thing to do.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed that the Resolution should be passed. We should be looking at the prices again right away.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that it should be done in total, but based on the information that a lot of this is fixed costs, which could not be eliminated, we're probably better off, but he'd like to see a more in-depth report.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he would like to hear any justification as to why we would want to be the least price provider of this service. He understood that this is an incremental change, but Springettsbury should not be the lowest price provider.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-50. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**F. Labor Counsel Proposal – Stock and Leader**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the Board had requested he investigate Stock and Leader related to services as labor counsel for the township. The current rate is \$135.00 per hour for the regular labor counsel.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Amic felt the Township had received good service in the past.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there had been excellent legal advice. If there were a downside, it took some time to get the legal advice. There seemed to be a difficulty with the time due to their office proximity.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether any services were provided by that firm at less than the \$135.00.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there might have been some instances.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether we would know if a para-legal had been used.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that para-legals had been used.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the proposal for consideration discusses using associates. He would assume that the associate would be an attorney.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated there was nothing comparable regarding associates. He added that there had not been a lot of labor grievances where they were used.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether Mr. Amic thought the services that he would get from having a local firm would be just as good.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he was not sure that this firm is as good in labor; however, that could not be the judge. They have other resources that are used in arbitration cases.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he knows the firm, knows the individual and the reputation. He would like to see a recommendation from Mr. Amic indicating he would be comfortable with the change, or that he would like to stay where he is. Mr. Amic is the one who will have to deal with the firm.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he didn't want to stay where he was because of the difficulty in obtaining information.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that in checking around there might be some options to consider.

**There was no action taken on this item.**

**G. Resolution 99-51 – Authorizing a Cost of Living Increase for a Retired Police Officer**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding Resolution 99-51 authorizing a cost of living increase for Gerald Williams, who retired September 3, 1994.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT RESOLUTION 99-51 AUTHORIZING COST OF LIVING INCREASE FOR GERALD L. WILLIAMS BE APPROVED AS WRITTEN. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**H. Resolution 99-52 – Interfaith Observance of National Bible Week**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he had been asked to provide Resolution 99-52 in Interfaith Observation of National Bible Week.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that he had never seen a Resolution where the Chair personally takes the responsibility for something and added that other actions taken had been taken by the Board.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated it should come from the full Board.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop instructed the words, "I, Lori Mitrick, Chairman of" be removed and be replaced with "The Board of Supervisors of" in the Resolution.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 99-52 INTERFAITH OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK AS AMENDED. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**I. Agreement – City of York/Springettsbury Township**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated the agreement had been voted for in the City, and they are willing to accept an additional 800,000 gallons.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**NOVEMBER 11, 1999  
APPROVED**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost provided the agreements signed by the City. The only change from the initial agreement signed June, 1998 is that the 3.5 MGD had been changed to 4.3 MGD.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that there is no additional cost to Springettsbury Township.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch reiterated that it does not cost Springettsbury or any other municipalities except the one prime municipality that's involved.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF YORK AND SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that she hoped as the Board goes through the budget process some information would be received on the cost of Mr. Amic's office for the creation of this agreement.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that the charges should be charged back to the other municipalities.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that half of the costs were recaptured in 1999 in budgeting the remaining half for 2000.

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. Board of Supervisors Work Session – October 27, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION 10/2799 AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – October 28, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING OCTOBER 28, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS;**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic advised there was no action required under Old Business.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there was a need to advertise again for the vacancies on the Zoning Hearing Board and the Planning Commission.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how many vacancies there are at this time.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded there are two on the Zoning and one on the Planning.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated the Board had interviewed two prior to the meeting and asked whether they were the only candidates.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated there had been a woman interviewed previously.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that action should be taken on whatever interviews had taken place to see whether they agreed or not.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he had not seen any out of the three that he felt deserved to be disqualified. He asked for the woman's name previously interviewed.
- BOWDERS** Mrs. Bowders responded that her name was Judith Fisher.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick spoke with Mr. Maciejewski and asked him what skills he thought the Planning Commission needed. He indicated he needed someone who would devote a lot of time to studying the plans, would have the time to come to lengthy meetings as he looks to the future and address difficult issues for the Township. Based on what he told Chairman Mitrick, of the candidates interviewed she felt that Mr. Randy Meyerhoff has the skills that would be advantageous to the Planning Commission. Both gentlemen were advised that there was a vacancy on the Planning Commission. Mr. Meyerhoff showed a lot of interest in that position.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO APPOINT RANDY MEYERHOFF TO THE  
PLANNING COMMISSION. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND.**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic called for a Point of Order. There should be a Resolution prepared for this appointment.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated it should be determined as to what the term would be.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that this would be an appointment to an unexpired term and added he really would not want to wait another month.
- BOWDERS** Mrs. Bowders reported that the next Resolution number would be 99-53.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-53  
APPOINTING RANDY MEYERHOFF TO THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF DON  
ALLISON TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND**

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested that a letter be sent to him as quickly as possible to inform him of his appointment.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic asked Mrs. Bowders to remind him to do that first thing in the morning.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that during the Work Session earlier in the evening, Mr. Gibbs indicated that his term expires at the end of this year. He would like the Board to reconsider his appointment.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the re-appointments are normally considered at the reorganization meeting.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated the re-appointments should be done during the December agenda rather than waiting for the reorganization if an interest is known.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost commented that Larry Gibbs had taken Tanzola's place.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic requested Mrs. Bowders to be sure these are done.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick mentioned that there are three expiring at the same time.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that there are not actually two vacancies on the Zoning Hearing Board. We really only have one vacancy and one planned vacancy. It would be incorrect to appoint someone to a position before it is vacated.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that the Ordinance does allow that an alternate could be appointed. There had been instances where there were only three eligible voting members and one might have a conflict of interest.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked for the name of the second interviewee.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded that the name was Ronald Scheeler. She added that she had spoken with John Schmidt and asked him what he felt they needed on that Board to balance the skills. They desperately need someone who can read blueprints. That is a consideration.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that Zoning Hearing Board members should not be reading blueprints. The job of the Zoning Hearing Board was to read the law and interpret the law.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that when someone requests a variance they bring in exhibits to show the Zoning Hearing Board the situation in what they are requesting.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that they do, but that he could not recall any blueprints. At the point that a plan is before the Zoning Hearing Board they're concepts that they want to prove. They're not blueprints.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that if they need a dimension variance they are going to specify the exact amount of the variance they need and they are going to verify that point.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-54  
APPOINTING RONALD SCHEELER TO THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF JEFF  
NICODEMUS ON THE ZONING HEARING BOARD. MR. GURRERI WAS  
SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether an alternate should be appointed to the Zoning Hearing Board with the idea that person could move into a regular position when it becomes available.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there was a problem with that procedure.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the alternate could not be a voting member most of the time.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that having an alternate present when needed is difficult.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that right now a problem exists where there is difficulty getting people out to the meetings.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that as of January 1<sup>st</sup> another position will be available.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that he advocates alternates. During his time in the City, there were three alternates and each one rotated at every meeting.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-55  
APPOINTING JUDY FISHER AS AN ALTERNATE TO THE ZONING  
HEARING BOARD. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY  
CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to inform her by letter and advise that she had been appointed as an Alternate.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**NOVEMBER 11, 1999  
APPROVED**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the Manager be instructed to prepare a Resolution for a re-organization meeting appointing Judy Fisher to a full term to the Zoning Hearing Board.

**Wal-Mart**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick brought forward an item regarding Wal-Mart at the stop sign. A motorist could run over people exiting because there is no distance between the fence and the front fender of a car going by.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated it had been changed from the original design twice. The third plan was the best scenario.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated the situation is worse than what they had with the old building at the front door. Someone could walk out of the Garden Center quickly and be right in front of your automobile. She stated that she considered it to be terribly dangerous.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether anything had been communicated to Wal-Mart.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that they were advised to repave so there would not be any ledge and then place a yellow cross action across the entire area; there are three signs indicating a cross walk and to watch pedestrians. None of that was required.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether stop signs could be required.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he could ask them. The Store Manager was made aware of this and agrees that it is not what he envisioned.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Mall Manager had been contacted.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he had spoken with the Mall Manager, and they have done everything we've asked them to do. The biggest problem is that the people walk right out across the street and don't even stop and look.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that they probably don't realize that they're in a roadway.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he would hate to see someone be injured there because of the lack of a stop sign or anything else that could be done.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that a cross walk requires the motorist to yield to the pedestrian.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested that Chief Eshbach talk to Wal-Mart about the unsafe conditions and what might happen. Perhaps the Chief could lend some authority that we're interested in the public safety of Wal-Mart's customers.

**Presidential Visit**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she was sure that in the process of thanking Chief Hickman and Chief Eshbach there had been other members on the staff, such as Public Works who had also contributed a lot of time to the Presidential event. The Board of Supervisors desired to extend their appreciation to everyone involved.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he intended to prepare letters to those people who didn't get paid for their extra work, such as the Fire Chief, Police Chief, and Mr. Lauer. He intended to thank them for their extra effort and putting a copy in their personnel file. They did a good job.

**Employee Appreciation**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that this issue had been brought before the Board many times, and it is regrettable that we as a Board have our hands somewhat locked in a formal type of appreciation event for the employees. She indicated she had discussed this with Mr. Amic and asked him to try to be as creative as possible and come forward to the Board with some options.

**Presidential Visit**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the costs for this event could be gathered.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was a possibility.

**SPEICHER** Mrs. Speicher stated that she had records of the overtime.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that it would not just be the overtime but the time they took from their normal duties.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that there were people who worked straight through.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**NOVEMBER 11, 1999  
APPROVED**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**OCTOBER 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1901 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Design Engineer, R.K.&K.  
Mike Myers, Design Engineer, R.K.&K.  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Jim Crooks, Superintendent, Wastewater Treatment  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Michael Hickman, Fire Chief  
Andy Hinkle, Manager, Information Systems  
Mark Hodgkinson, Superintendent, Wastewater Treatment  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. She stated that this meeting would be a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors and that the Agenda was available for the public's use.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**A. Fire Sprinklers**

Chairman Mitrick stated that two gentlemen had come forward regarding their views on the proposed amendments to the existing Sprinkler Fire Ordinance. Two meetings ago a developer and a business owner, Tim Kinsley, spoke on one side of the issue. Before the Board voted on the issue, they wished to hear from the other side of the proposed amendment.

Chairman Mitrick thanked and welcomed Mr. Mack Fleming, Regional Manager of the National Fire Sprinkler Association.

**FLEMING** Mr. Fleming stated that he had been with the NFSA for two years and was a former fire official with District of Columbia for 31 years. Mr. Fleming applauded the Board for its efforts in 1994 to enact an Ordinance more protective of citizens than the minimum code required. BO CA feels strongly that the local jurisdiction should make codes strong and protective of citizens.

Mr. Fleming reported that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania passed out of the local government committee the state-wide Building Code Bill. The Bill looked very positive for Pennsylvania that it will pass within two weeks. This Bill very specifically mentions that as a minimum code and provides the means and mechanism for the jurisdictions within Pennsylvania to enact local codes to be more protective. The model codes are all intended to be simply a minimum.

Mr. Fleming continued with information regarding the addition of fire sprinklers adding value and safety to a building. Buildings with included fire sprinklers can be built with associated cost savings that go a long way towards making the buildings more economical for the owner. With a strong protective ordinance requiring sprinklers, there is a savings with providing services to buildings. Insurance service offices will rate each jurisdiction according to their means of accomplishing fire safety and providing necessary water to serve needs. The ISO uses a “required fire flow figure”, a calculation specific to each individual building. The net result is that it is able to figure out how much water a jurisdiction or community must make available in total for the entire community but specifically for each building. When the required fire flow formula is applied to the buildings, a building, which contains fire sprinklers, requires much less water. There is a movement within the State of Pennsylvania to have all of the jurisdictions look at the required fire flows based on this Insurance Services Office “fire flow figure” because it is used to determine the costs of providing the water.

Mr. Fleming advised that he had spoken with Fire Chief Hickman and offered the services of his engineering and code department if there are specific needs to be addressed. Legislation in 1994 included protection for one and two-family dwellings. Unfortunately, 80% of the fire deaths in the U. S. occur in residential dwellings. Enacting a residential requirement goes a long way towards helping the biggest part of the national fire problem.

Mr. Fleming stated that, if there are any specific problems dealing with an individual part of the code, his office could help with any adjustments. He referred to tire storage. If the Springettsbury Township Code simply referenced the NFPA’s Standard 231D, that addresses the Tire Storage

problem. It would not impact on the rest of the legislation that had been enacted previously. Every fire department in the nation has problems matching their resources to the fire problem. The fire sprinkler fills the gap between what the Fire Chief and the Fire Department needs to accomplish the fire protection mission and what he actually has. Fully sprinkling a building is like having a fire fighter in every room. Fire sprinklers can make a tremendous impact on the fire problem that no community can afford simply by giving the Fire Department more budget. Three model codes in the U. S. have gotten together to adopt one specific model code for the U. S., the International Building Code. Note that the three model codes participated in the writing of the new model code would be coming out next year. In 12 of the 18 use groups (the way the building is used), the International Code is more protective than the BOCA Code. BOCA contributed to the writing of the International Code. The codes offered are minimum codes. Local jurisdictions need to survey their own unique fire situation and enact ordinances that would help in specific township situations. If the township were, in fact, to lose those ordinances previously passed, it would be taking a step backwards in the protection of consequences of fire.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Fleming for his comments.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how Mr. Fleming could place a minimum and maximum code. He asked Mr. Fleming where he would place the 1994 Code enacted by the Township.

**FLEMING** Mr. Fleming responded that, from what he had seen, it was right in the middle. Most fire chiefs would like to see every structure be fully sprinkled, and many jurisdictions have done that. Scottsdale, Arizona requires every building to have sprinklers. This code had been in existence for 10 years, and statistics show that there had been no fire deaths in Scottsdale. Property losses – average fire went from \$15,000 fire loss to about \$1,200. A maximum code would cover a building with sprinklers; a minimum code would be just what BOCA had established.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that depending on the fire service and the availability of water that could affect how the code would be written.

**FLEMING** Mr. Fleming responded that in every case where water is a problem, fire sprinklers is a better solution. If a building were sprinkled you would be using much less water because of the nature of the sprinkler than if the fire department were to come in and be counted on to extinguish the fire. You are comparing 150 – 175 gallons per minute later in the incident. Discover, report and respond. The first five minutes is the most important during the period of discovering, reporting and responding. He mentioned a term called flashover, which is a phenomenon that occurs if you don't

stop a fire, when everything in the room is heated to its ignition temperature and virtually the room explodes in fire. Fire companies cannot guarantee they could be on the scene within that five minutes. Sprinklers not only contain the fire today, but also put the fire out. There is no fire department in the country that has the resources to match the impact of a fully sprinkled building.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that 80% of the people die in residential fires. He asked whether the deaths are attributed to smoke.

**FLEMING** Mr. Fleming responded that was correct.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether a sprinkling system produced smoke.

**FLEMING** Mr. Fleming indicated that smoke is not eliminated, but it is kept to a manageable level. There has never been a life lost in a fully sprinkled building.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that all of the sprinkler manufactures today manufacture to the level of new technology. He asked whether that was a requirement.

**FLEMING** Mr. Fleming responded that there is a standard of competition, UL (Underwriter's Laboratory) and an FM (Factory Mutual). Fire sprinkler systems are very carefully tested and inspected and maintained because of the obvious need for them to operate at 100% capacity.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether it would be just as logical for someone sitting on this side of the table to allow the market forces to do their will and allow the businesses to sprinkle their buildings. The Township is not prohibiting anyone from sprinkling their building, Mr. Bishop questioned the act of mandating the matter if it's an economically feasible thing to do. Why not let building owners make their own decision.

**FLEMING** Mr. Fleming responded that this was a public education problem as well. Sprinklers traditionally are viewed as an added cost.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Stern whether he had indicated at a previous meeting that the BOCA code had a formula, which indicated what Mr. Fleming had mentioned. Mr. Pasch added that if certain things are built within a building, a larger square footage building could be built without the requirement of sprinkler.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that was correct.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that BOCA had built that into their code.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**OCTOBER 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there are formulas that take into consideration a number of different factors, which is part of the planning process. That formula determines how big the building will be, how tall, etc. The other part of that indicates that if it's sprinkled then the corridors don't need to be rated..
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Fleming for providing the information and introduced Robert Bahn, Past President of the Electrical Association of York County.
- BAHN** Mr. Bahn commented that he had been involved during the time of the 1994 code enactment. Mr. Bahn had intended to cover many of the comments previously addressed by Mr. Fleming. He commented on a few other issues. Mr. Bahn mentioned that single dwelling units in Boca Raton, Florida require sprinklers. He stated that he's an individual who had been deeply involved in the issue of fire safety, presently retired 12 years. Mr. Bahn mentioned that if a building caught fire and a sprinkler was in operation for 20 minutes, it had done its job. It would have made a mess but the house would still stand. If the sprinkler would not have been there, the building would have burned down.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated appreciation for his coming forward, particularly as he had picked up the issue from the press, and came in to address the Board.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that the Amendment to the Ordinance appeared on the Agenda for action later in the meeting.
- CRIST** Mr. Jay Crist, Springettsbury Business Association and Rutters, commented about a personal experience he had with fire. One of their buildings had caught fire, a building of 9,200 sq. ft. The building did not have sprinklers. It was an electrical fire. The Fire Department responded quickly, but when it was all said and done, with the water coming from the fire department as well as the smoke, the building had to be gutted and rebuilt. If sprinklers had been there, there would still have been smoke and water. A building was built after the new Ordinance came in for 1,500 sq. ft. A sprinkler system needed to be installed with four exits. It was not more economical to install sprinklers. \$13,000 more had to be spent than a duplicate building built in another township where we did not have to install a sprinkler. Additionally, now Rutters has to pay \$80.00 a month to the water company because of the big four-inch line connected to the sprinkler system, which is an on-going cost. Mr. Crist stated they had to take out additional insurance that in case the sprinkler system goes off, they would be protected. In the food industry if a sprinkler goes off you lose everything. Mr. Crist stated that he is not against sprinklers and agreed that in high-density buildings they should be installed. A building 5,000

or more should be sprinkled, which he felt was more reasonable. Mr. Crist added that if a person in business is prudent enough they would have the proper insurance, but reiterated that it had not been cheaper for them to have a sprinkler system.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked Mr. Crist if he didn't get a break on his insurance with the installation of a sprinkler.

**CRIST** Mr. Crist responded that was correct, but then additional insurance is needed if they go off automatically, which is more than the savings.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Crist for his comments. She thanked the gentlemen who had spoken and indicated it was important for the Board to have the opportunity to hear discussion on both sides of the issue. She thanked Mr. Kinsley, the Fire Chief and Mr. Stern who addressed the matter during a previous meeting.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober provided an update to his written report. Regarding the 537 Plan work had progressed with the staff on some of the mapping issues for the on-lot disposal and sewer extension portions of the sewage management program. The Harrowgate/Raleigh Drive project is progressing with the Harrowgate portion completed, and the Raleigh Drive portion about half done. Completion is expected in two to three weeks. The lining contractor will be on site measuring pipes. The PLC project is moving along. Contractor will try to start the system up next week, which is ahead of schedule. Staff training had started. Regarding the Millcreek repair specs, the by-pass pumping portion was provided to the staff for review.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether any problems had been encountered at the Harrowgate project.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that with one manhole they found on the outside a mass of concrete that had to be chipped through. Costing for a change order had not been submitted to date. No further surprises were encountered.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch inquired about the PLC and whether this has to be in operation prior to the end of the year.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that this would be in operation long before the end of the year.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani previously had provided a written report on a host of topics. He added updates regarding the flooding problem on Market Street. His assessment is that the pipe just can't carry the volume of water to it. He provided several options to pursue. He spoke with several developers in the same drainage area had asked for storm water waivers, which he indicated to them would aggravate the situation. Further discussion is necessary.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Solicitor Yost whether Mr. Luciani's comment in his report indicating that the design in 1987 was acceptable to the Township would permit any liability for errors.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the township would not be responsible.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani added that the Municipal Building work was underway. He responded to an inquiry made by Chairman Mitrick regarding stakes that are offset from where the basins are being constructed. Those are set outside the area where construction is on-going.

Mr. Luciani reported on a problem with Plymouth Road grade work for the beer distributor. Because Plymouth Road had been widened, the beer distributor's driveway had become very steep and eliminated some of his parking. Coordination will be made with the distributor to be sure he is aware of the physical changes being made.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked how long the project would take.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that it probably would not be completed during this construction season.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani added comments regarding the Land Development planning process. Because of the number of land developments taking place, he suggested that it might require advance meetings with the Board. The Planning Commission reviews the Land Development plans in two stages, and the developers feel like they've been through the full process. Unfortunately, if the Supervisors ask for a change or there's something on there that is not consistent with what they've heard from the two previous meetings they are upset. Mr. Luciani would favor a more smooth process. Sketch plans may be coming forward to gather a general feeling of the Board, which may help the process.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that she had spoken with Mr. Maciejewski, head of the Planning Commission. He had indicated that they receive

their packet on a Friday night prior to their Tuesday meeting. There is a crunch time for the Planning Commissioners as well to thoroughly review the plans.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that what really is the problem is the Pennsylvania Municipal Planning Code, which restricts the acting bodies on how they must act. There are 60 days in which to approve or not approve. Mr. Amic's conclusion is that someone has to say no earlier.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani commented that the atmosphere of the Board of Supervisors is very business friendly. No one wants to make the difficult decisions, but sometimes there are good reasons to say no. He asked the Supervisors whether they would want to review the plans when they come through the first time.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that it had become clear to him that there is a great deal going on in the background that he knows nothing about until the packet shows up the Friday before the Thursday meeting. He had not seen Minutes of a Zoning Hearing Board; nor Minutes of a Planning Commission Meeting; no plans, no reports from staff until 5 days prior to making a decision. At that point the developer is well into that 60 days. The process seemed to be flawed, and at a minimum there should be better information coming to the Board of Supervisors.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that that information had come to the Supervisors in the past.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he had not seen anything like that for months.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the process had changed, but that the Board of Supervisors had not changed the process.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that when the Board finally does get information it is very good information.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch mentioned that there hadn't been a lot of activity. There should be a flow of information.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop continued that if information is going to come it should come in a timely fashion. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes four weeks after the meeting doesn't help either.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani suggested that even if developers are submitting smaller plans, perhaps an 11 X 17 plan would be suitable to get an idea of where the structure is, how big it will be, how many parking spaces will be there and it would help to familiarize the Supervisors.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed that it would be something to consider. Consideration also should be given to a reporting mechanism so that information is provided from staff that says these are the plans we're looking at; this is what's being considered, here are the issues.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that having information would provide a greater opportunity to go out and look at the site
- AMIC** Mr. Amic apologized to the Board for the lack of information provided. He was unaware that the procedure had changed. He assumed that the Board was receiving all of the Minutes of the supporting bodies. He stated he would review the matter.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that the staff had done a good job of coming forward and giving a good summary of waivers requested, etc. She agreed with Mr. Bishop that the Minutes provide a broader perspective.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that the report, when it is received, is excellent. He would like to have a report advising what is coming. If there are a specific number of plans all with the 60 days ticking, it wouldn't be a bad idea for the Board of Supervisors to have a report that advised a list of plans that are on the docket with the dates started.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch agreed and stated further that a lot of activity could be expected once the sewer matter was resolved.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented further about her conversation with the head of the Planning Commission. Mr. Maciejewski indicated that there is an increasing level of frustration with the number of waivers that are coming through, and he would like the Board to address those and take a position on what the Board expects because they are being inundated with waivers on the plans.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that almost every plan that proposes 4,000-5,000 sq. ft. of impervious area, all want a storm water waiver. They will pay the fee and take the easy way out.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that in Mr. Luciani's report he indicated it was his opinion that the Springettsbury Ordinances, when compared to adjoining municipalities, are very basic and not overly restrictive.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that Springettsbury Township would stack up against any other township in terms of appearance, economic feasibility, and people

desiring to locate in the township. Mr. Pasch would not rush in to change the Ordinance because he felt it is a good Ordinance.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that another point was that because the Ordinance is fairly straight forward and not complex, not granting waivers should not be difficult.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck added that, regarding waivers, it appeared that designs come forward assuming certain waivers. When it comes before the Board of Supervisors, Mr. Schenck did not feel that it was the appropriate time to start the whole process over again. He added that any plan that requests a waiver can be denied by denying the waiver.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that, if the plan has the required waiver and the Board does not grant the waiver, the plan is denied.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there would be any legal difficulty with denying it if precedence had been established in the past.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded no.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Luciani about the signalization of Pleasant Valley and Mt. Zion. Only three cars can get through on the green before the light turns back to red.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that St. Onge, in part of their Land Development Plan, would look at that signal, which had been hit by lightning. That signal is connected to the signal at Whiteford Road. When the lightning struck, it broke the interconnect. The reliance between the two signals was broken, and that connection had allowed more green time on Pleasant Valley. The panel is being redone, and it will be reconnected to Whiteford Road.

**C) Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert reported that the Diversion Pumping Station Part B package, which DEP was required to approve prior to Notice to Proceed with the contractors, was received. Mr. Halbert stated that there had been some concern earlier during the week in the on-going activities of contacting them about the status, their Chief on the Municipal Funding side wanted to incorporate the Interceptor Project into it prior to approval, which would delay the project substantially as the Interceptor had not yet been bid. The Chief had been convinced that was not the right thing to do. The Contractors have received their Notice to Proceed.

The Parallel Interceptor had been advertised as a pre-bid conference at the plant November 3. The project would then be bid November 17.

With regard to the Mt. Zion Overview Sewer Rehab Project , Mr. Halbert advised that DEP asked for some wetland delineation. Documentation completed and sent to DEP. That project is ready for advertisement.

Mr. Halbert reported on the Bio-Solids Education Program. The tri-fold text is complete in draft form. Several photos had been requested from Township staff to focus on some specific issues that are important to the Public Education Program; once those photos are received the brochure will be sent out.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that it's been a long road for approval. He thanked R.K.&K. for aiding him. Mr. Amic felt that this should keep the Township in good stead for the next project. Mr. Amic commented that the staff of R.K.&K. had been a tremendous help.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 10/28/99.**
- B. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Mill Creek Interceptor Repair – Progress Billing #6 - \$247.**
- C. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Harrowgate/Kingston – Progress Billing #10 - \$565.51**
- D. GES Technology, Inc. – PLC Upgrade – Progress Billing #1 - \$71,250**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO PAY THE REGULAR PAYABLES DETAILED IN THE PAYABLE LIST 10/28/99 ITEMS A THROUGH D. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

- A. Mt. Zion/Overview Sewer Replacement (permission to complete)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that specifications had been completed on the Mt. Zion Overview Sewer Replacement.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked how old the project was.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that in November of 1998 the design was approved.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert interjected that originally the staff envisioned repair of the existing sewer in place. That sewer is under an embankment of the condos. R.K.& K. had recommended that it would not be a good idea to go into the embankment to repair the sewer. A parallel sewer was

recommended on the other side of the stream to get away from the embankment, completely different from the original concept. An actual survey had been required.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked when the original line had been installed.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks responded it was about 15 years old.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO ADVERTISE FOR BID THE MT. ZION OVERVIEW SEWER REPLACEMENT PROJECT. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. 1995 GMC 4X4 (Recommend rejection of bid from Ted O. McWilliams in the amount of \$201).**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that this item covered advertisement for 1995 GMC truck. Mr. Amic asked that this item be rejected.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO REJECT THE BID OF TED O. McWILLIAMS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$201 FOR THE 1995 GMC 4X4. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Independent Consulting Associates – Proposal Not to Exceed \$10,000 (recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic had previously provided a proposal for the management consulting systems for the new phone system for the Administrative Building. The proposal was from Independent Consulting Associates. Mr. Amic had provided his comments on the matter and the approach that might be taken. Comments were received that this should be an Open Bid item, which is what state contracts are. They are openly bid and the low bidder is awarded the state contract. Mr. Amic recommended a consultant for this project and stated further that no one on staff has the ability or time to handle it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned whether, if an alternative recommendation were chosen, only recommended systems that are already on the state bid list would be selected.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that was correct.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether a consultant would be utilized to recommend a system that would provide all the features desired.

**HINKLE** Mr. Hinkle responded that the system that the state has available would provide the features currently being viewed as a possible solution.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned why it would be necessary to hire a consultant who would advise the township to buy specific equipment.
- HINKLE** Mr. Hinkle indicated that the consultant is needed to help determine how many phone lines would be needed, what type of phone system itself as far as stations on each desk, lines, billing. The consultant would write up the information for the state contract.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that purchase should be made of the absolute very best system with all the features.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that having a consultant is a good idea and that the idea of having a consultant to purchase a police car made sense to him. However, he questioned the necessity of a consultant who would become involved in the purchase of technology. It almost by definition has to be old, established technology if it involved a state contract.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that his comments were more of a quasi-legal/financial comment and not technological. He stated that Mr. Bishop's comments were well taken.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop replied that the township might not get the best possible solution.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he had wrestled with that, but not on the basis that the maximum was \$10,000 or \$13,000, but rather with the whole bidding procedure. There is a \$3,000 difference if you want to go to market.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that the difference was \$3,000 in the cost of the consultant.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that the consultant would then explore the market
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the township would not be committed to purchase the state contract. He added that it wouldn't preclude the state contract. The consultant would be paid \$3,000 and advertise where you wouldn't advertise for the state contract.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated he had reviewed the information received from the consultant, and he had been interested in seeing the recommendations. In every case they came up with a different solution, which he felt was an important consideration.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he and Mr. Hinkle had lengthy discussions about the matter concerning some limited abilities in this area and also based on experience.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated he agreed with having the consultant. He would prefer to have the flexibility at the end to choose the system that would be best for the Township rather than base it on cost.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic replied that he did not base this consideration on cost. For \$3,000 much more analysis would be received.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what the lead time would be.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that action now would provide plenty of time. There is a second phase to this regarding implementation help. Mr. Amic reassured Mr. Pasch that choosing a system now was not an issue that is behind in timing.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what implementation meant.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that part of that package included some installation help explanation, and training of people.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL FROM INDEPENDENT CONSULTING ASSOCIATES FOR THE NEW PHONE SYSTEM DESIGN AND BIDDING OPTING FOR THEIR STANDARD APPROACH NOT TO EXCEED PRICE OF \$13,000. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Composting Bulking Agent – Permission to Complete Specifications and Bid (recommend approval)**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented briefly about the current contract for the bulking agent, which are wood chips. The contract expires on December 31<sup>st</sup>. The contract had been awarded to Kirkwood Trucking in December of 1996 at \$6.17 per cubic yard. This contract had been extended two years (within the contract terms) on January 1, 1998. Mr. Amic requested permission to bid.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked where the wood chips come from.
- HODGKINSON** Mr. Hodgkinson responded that most of the trees are coming from the Washington, D. C./Virginia area when they are clearing land for development. The whole tree is put through a chipper. Kirkwood brings the chips to Springettsbury.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented they (Kirkwood) do not have a problem with supply. He asked whether this would be another three-year bid.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it would be three years.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR PERMISSION TO COMPLETE SPECIFICATION AND BID COMPOSTING BULKING AGENT. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**E. Utility Water System Upgrade – Authorization for Rummel, Klepper & Kahl to Design and Advertise for Bids (recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding item E. relating to the utility water system which R.K. & K. analyzed. This was an Act 537 priority. Staff reviewed the analysis and concurred with the conclusions. Mr. Amic asked for authorization for R.K. & K. to design the system and advertise the bid for construction. Construction costs are estimated at \$86,000.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE R. K. & K. TO DESIGN AND ADVERTISE FOR BIDS THE UTILITY WATER SYSTEM UPGRADE FOR THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Planning Module – Taylor Estates Phase II – Windsor Township – A3-67966-284-3 – 28,350 GPD (recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic mentioned that Item A. had been included in the Chapter 94 report.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE PLANNING MODULE FOR TAYLOR ESTATES PHASE II, WINDSOR TOWNSHIP A3-67966-284-3 – 28,350 GPD. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Planning Module – Gerhardt USA – Dallastown Borough – A3-67804-029-3 – 3,000 GPD**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Item B. was located in Dallastown Borough for 3,000 gallons per day. This item was included in the Chapter 94 report and was recommended by staff.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO APPROVE THE PLANNING MODULE FOR GERHARDT USA – DALLASTOWN BOROUGH - A3-67804-029-3 – 3,000 GPD. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**C. Land Development 99-13 – Drovers Bank, York Marketplace  
(12/9/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided comments regarding LD 99-13 for Drovers Bank, which proposed to move to the east side of Memory Lane to a vacant lot at York Marketplace. The property involved a 3,387 sq. ft. free-standing bank accessible through York Marketplace driveways and accesses. Planning Commission reviewed the plan, and staff recommended several waivers

**STERN** Mr. Stern introduced Russ Bardolf, V.P. of Drovers Bank and Monica Love of Sight Design Concepts representing the project.

**BARDOLF** Mr. Bardolf provided a photograph of the prototype Drovers Bank building.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked for an explanation of the Eastern Market easement.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani advised that he had discussed the issue with New Plan Realty regarding the pavement, which accesses the residential driveway at Eastern Market. It appeared that it was leftover pavement material from previous pavement work, which showed up on the site plan. As a result it appeared as though Drovers would be taking pavement away from Eastern Market in their driveway. There does not appear to be any significance.

**LOVE** Monica Love described the area and provided explanation regarding the pavement, which had never been improved.

**BARDOLF** Mr. Bardolf received a telephone message from New Plan that the same survey done today would not show the pavement issue. It had been a title issue, which does not exist at this time.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost whether he had any concerns about the matter.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he had none.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked why there would be a modification not to submit a traffic study.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there are no new accesses proposed. An abbreviated version of a traffic study had previously been provided.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**OCTOBER 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

- BARDOLF** Mr. Bardolf commented that with the proposed accommodations the flow of traffic would provide safer and faster movement of autos by providing alternate ways to leave the property.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned whether the stormwater management had been addressed.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani assured her that all had been addressed.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that York County Planning had commented regarding the agreement for private access drive to York Marketplace. Andrew says that to the best of his knowledge it exists.
- STERN** Mr. Stern advised that York Marketplace would have to sign the plans as owner of the property.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that he had not seen any independent agreement. However, if they sign the plan and it's on the plan, it binds them to it.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether Solicitor Yost had reviewed the plan.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that he had not seen the plan.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern to explain the request for modification in landscaping.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the landscape modification meets the Ordinance requirements along Memory Lane with the exception that they are not putting in the required fence; however, they do have a berm.
- LOVE** Monica Love explained the landscaping with a 24" mounded berm with plantings covering which would be 3 to 5' tall from the base of the curb screening car headlights. The request for fewer trees came from the location of the ATM.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether they would be willing to add some shrubs and/or plantings as a trade off for the larger trees.
- BARDOLF** Mr. Bardolf indicated they would be willing to do whatever they could within the restrictions of the landlord.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost, having reviewed the plan, indicated this is not a sub-divided parcel.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated he would like to see sidewalks; however, he acknowledged that sidewalks are not required.

**BARDOLF** Mr. Bardolf pointed out that there are sidewalks from the Memory Lane sidewalk to access to the sidewalk around the building.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-13  
DROVERS BANK, YORK MARKETPLACE (12/9/99) WITH THE FOLLOWING  
WAIVERS:**

- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN,**
- **WAIVER FROM SHOWING ALL EXISTING FEATURES WITHIN 400 FEET OF THE PROPERTY,**
- **MODIFICATION FROM LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS, WITH THE ADDITION THAT DROVERS BANK INDICATED THEY WOULD BE MORE THAN WILLING TO ADD ADDITIONAL LOW LANDSCAPING IN THE AREA TO THE NORTH SIDE OF THE PROPERTY AND A LITTLE BIT TO THE EAST.**
- **MODIFICATION FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A COMPLETE TRAFFIC STUDY,**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY IN AN AMOUNT TO BE APPROVED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER.**

**MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Subdivision 99-10 - St. Onge, Williams Road (12/9/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided commentary with regard to the St. Onge and York Faith Missionary Church property on Williams Road. The property is being sub-divided into two parcels, half for the church, and about 9 acres would become St. Onge's property to be developed in the near future. Tract encompasses 16.6 acres, one to be 9 and the other 7.6. Planning Commission had reviewed the subdivision. Staff recommended approval.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what the justification was for not recommending waiver for sidewalks.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the ordinance states that it "shall not be waived in any zoning district where the development is within 600 feet of church, school, public park or playground and other community facility, of which all of those exist within the vicinity of this property."

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that she understood.

- STERN** Mr. Stern continued that the applicant had placed notes on the plan referencing waiver or modification requests to install sidewalks within six months.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned why Mr. Stern would not recommend it if the note 19 appeared on the plan.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the item had been discussed with Planning Commission and there was a question as to the difference between a waiver and a modification. Mr. Stern explained that if the policy were considered to be a waiver, then it would go beyond his authority to recommend a waiver when the ordinance specifically prohibits such a waiver. If it's the Board's belief that that policy is a modification and not a waiver then the opportunity still exists to install sidewalks at a later date. Mr. Stern added that he was not opposed to not having sidewalks there now.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost commented that the difference between a waiver and modification is a very important distinction.
- EVANKO** Paul Evanko spoke for the project. He indicated that they thought they had complied with current policy and added that the church, school and specific types of facilities are clearly mentioned in the Ordinance. The amount of foot traffic in the area is immeasurable. Having sidewalks would be a detriment to the development of a site from a stormwater management standpoint and from a general use of the college, keeping as much greenspace as possible. There is a large amount of money involved in their complying in what would otherwise be a requirement if it were enforced. However, he stated they would comply with Township requirements.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether from the stormwater management standpoint, if later on the Township would request that you to put the sidewalks in, there would be a stormwater problem.
- FRANCIS** Paul Francis responded that sometimes when you have a flow of a stormwater and don't put it directly in a pipe, there is a certain water quality benefit that is derived.
- EVANKO** Mr. Evanko added that none of them know for sure what stormwater requirements would occur. Sufficient capacity had been allowed for in the stormwater management plan that had been developed which would exceed the minimum development.

- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that there would not be a measurable difference whether or not there were sidewalks. The basin is designed to accommodate whether the sidewalks are there are not.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he was assured that there would be no problem with the stormwater issue, but asked Mr. Yost whether, because the modification is already on the plan, there would be difficulty in six months requesting it.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that it is part of the plan.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Township had ever gone back and asked that sidewalks be installed.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that had not occurred yet.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether there was a mechanism in place to make that determination if the situation warranted it.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that a letter would be sent.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated there is no measurable way in place.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked why sidewalks are part of subdivision.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance does not separate Subdivision and Land Development in the requirements. All of the requirements in the Ordinance are for both. When the Land Development Plan comes forward, the issue will come again.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani added that the Land Development would be for this lot. Once the lots are separated, the second lot is addressed.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that as it sits right now there is no mechanism in place to get the church to put sidewalks in without this plan. With the plan they could be notified to put sidewalks in.
- EVANKO** Mr. Evanko provided a letter from the pastor who stated what Mr. Evanko had reported and asked to have that made part of the record.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO APPROVE SUBDIVISION 99-10 ST. ONGE  
COMPANY WITH**

- **WAIVER FOR REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **WAIVER FROM SHOWING ALL CONTOURS ON PLANS**

- **WAIVER FROM SHOWING ALL STREETS WITHIN 400' OF THE PROPERTY**
  - **CONDITIONED UPON REMOVAL FROM THE PLAN OF REFERENCES IN NOTE 17 TO WAIVERS TO SECTION 407 CURBS AND GUTTERS AND REFERENCES TO SECTION 408 OF THE ORDINANCE, SIDEWALKS, AND ALSO**
  - **CONDITIONED UPON REMOVAL OF NOTE 19 FROM THE PLAN.**
- MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**E. Land Development 99-16 – Carnegie Road Office Park, Carnegie Road (12/9/99).**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented regarding Land Development 99-16 covering two new buildings in the Carnegie Office Park. There are four existing buildings, two proposed buildings each 3,000 sq. ft., additional parking, stormwater management met all requirements. The two proposed buildings were included on the original Land Development, but sewer capacity was not available. Sewer capacity had been obtained from the 50,000 gallons on Chapter 94. Planning Commission had reviewed the plan and recommended several waivers.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that all the public improvements and sewer are in and no landscaping is required. A stormwater basin had been done in the previous plan.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the dumpster.

**PASCH** Tim Pasch responded that the proposed dumpster is planned for an area behind the building and will be hidden in accordance with the Ordinance.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-16 CARNEGIE ROAD OFFICE PARK (12/9/99) WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:**

- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A TRAFFIC STUDY**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A SEWER & WATER FEASIBILITY STUDY**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A LANDSCAPING PLAN**
- **CONDITIONED ON APPROVAL FROM YORK COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT, IF APPLICABLE**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY IN AMOUNT TO BE APPROVED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER, IF APPLICABLE.**

**MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that Mr. Pasch indicated for the record that Mr. Tim Pasch would be putting his dumpster somewhere in the northwest corner of the property with screening in accordance with the Ordinance.

**MOTION CARRIED. KEN PASCH ABSTAINED FROM VOTING AS TIM PASCH IS A FAMILY MEMBER.**

**F. Sewer Transfer Request – Two EDU’s from Concord Road Associates to Meadowlands**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that a request had been received from Kinsley for some tap-in transfers. The proposal is to drop one EDU and transfer two EDU’s from the Concord Road to the Meadowlands. These types of transfers had been approved as both companies are owned by the same people.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Stern whether there are some plans coming forward.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there are no new plans. This relates to Lot 10A and Lot 1 as well as Industrial Highway Concord Road building, which were all spec buildings. At the time they were submitted they were limited in the spaces that could be shown on the plan because of the sewer capacity. They want to allocate the sewer capacity to those buildings so that they either increase the number of tenants or increase the sewer flow. Building E only has one EDU.

**FRANCIS** Paul Francis stated that Building E actually is 50,000 sq. ft.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that this would allow an opportunity for more flexibility to include flow to that building.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked about Building E.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis stated that it is the newest one being built.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned the change to showing Meadowlands Lot 1 and Meadowlands Lot 10A, but coming from the allocation is only Meadowlands. He asked whether it needed a specific allocation.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it would not need a specific allocation. It would remain under the heading Meadowlands. Industrial Highway and Concord Road building E are still part of the Concord Road Associates project.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis added that during the planning process they questioned how many EDU's they would need. They indicated that four EDU's would be needed for Century Woods, ten for Meadowlands, and six for Concord Road Associates. All the entities are owned by Kinsley Equities II. These EDU's were included in the Chapter 94 Report.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the mapping of the EDU's. She stated that even though it is basically the same ownership, is it fair to someone else, since they are not using the two assigned to the specific location, to transfer those to another site because the ownership is the same.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there are people waiting for EDU's, but at this point in the year (end of October), there would be no way that anyone can get sewer capacity that does not already have an approved plan. The pool of people waiting for EDU's who have approved plans is very small.

**KINSLEY** Tim Kinsley stated that when the Industrial Highway facility was purchased, the water records were reviewed and one EDU was required. However, an EDU is required per tenant. As leasing of the building began, an additional EDU was needed for each tenant. There are still not adequate EDU's for the amount of tenant spaces; therefore, the ones they have are necessary. If the EDU's are given up, spaces will sit vacant. There is a need for the sewer, but the user has to come.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the Board had been granting this type of transfer within ownership, but additionally if the EDU's are not utilized, and there are no people to take advantage of them, the EDU's are lost to the Township. Mr. Pasch stated it did not make any sense to him to not grant the transfer.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE TRANSFER OF TWO EDU'S FROM CONCORD ROAD ASSOCIATES TO MEADOWLANDS SEWER TRANSFER REQUEST. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**7. COMMUNICATION FROM SUPERVISORS:**

**York Little League Utility Lines**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he had received a telephone call from the York Little League thanking the staff for cooperation and presenting the plans for the new building and how it would affect their field. They have some outstanding concerns that are not resolved concerning electric and water lines for their concession stand.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani reported that, prior to start of construction, a call will be made to PA-1-Call. The utilities are marked and labeled as to whether they are to be relocated or demolished, etc. No one knows about those lines.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated these lines are probably minimal. They want reassurance that they would be reconnected, and there are some other issues to be addressed with them. The Township needs to communicate with the York Little League.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would be glad to call and attend their next meeting, or he could meet with them and learn of the issues. If the contractor destroys the lines, they would be replaced.

**Emergency Services Commission**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reported on the Emergency Services Commission, which met on October 19<sup>th</sup> for the Jt. Operating Agreement vote. On Thursday, October 21<sup>st</sup>, Ken Myers of Springetts Fire Co. came forward with a recommendation that he thought the three entities had an interest in pursuing some kind of consolidation. He suggested that they take time and each go off on their own and figure out what was important to them and see if they had any ideas. A month later they would come together to discuss what they discussed individually. Mr. Bishop stated he suggested that they do that and at the next regularly scheduled Emergency Services Commission meeting, the regular business meeting be held, adjourned, and followed by the three entities meeting together. Mr. Bishop stated that if there were someone willing to take the ball and run with it he was comfortable with that, but the Commission needed to be in the loop to be sure that the process keep moving.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked if they agreed to come to the next meeting.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that they did agree. He added that there is a great deal of concern about the idea of the loans and if they would decide to go with something like the Jt. Operating Agreement, whether they would be putting their loans in jeopardy. Regarding the three low-interest state loans for each organization, they have the written opinion of Solicitor Yost, which did not give them the full comfort level that they desired, so Mr. Bishop offered to discuss it with Solicitor Yost, Mr. Amic and the Board to see what is the best way is to get some kind of response from the state (PEMA) preferably in writing that would tell them that, if you go this way, it's not going to be a problem.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated he would write to PEMA.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he felt this was a legal matter.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Solicitor Yost whether he expected to get a response.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he would not expect a response; however, he stated that an attempt must be made.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop suggested that a parallel effort be made to communicate with the state representatives who might be able to provide an impetus for response.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested that Solicitor Yost follow up his legal opinion by writing a letter to PEMA, providing a copy of the opinion letter to Mr. Amic. Mr. Amic will write a cover letter with that to our representatives and ask for their help in receiving the answer.

**Historic Preservation Committee – Designation Signs**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that she and Mr. Stern attended the Historic Preservation Committee Meeting October 28<sup>th</sup>. Part of the agenda was discussion of the designation signs to be erected on East Market Street. The Board had previously suggested that they be consistent and put up a monument sign. Chairman Mitrick stated that the monument sign is appropriate for a specific building location/property; however, she did not believe the monument sign was appropriate for the district. The location that had been selected was not really visible from the opposite direction of traffic. She asked whether the Board would reconsider the type of sign, which would more appropriately designate each end of the district.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he felt the sign should be a very classic sign and he felt the monument sign had the distinction of being a first-class piece. He added that he had no input as to whether it should be a monument sign or not, as long as it was in good taste.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that it had been mentioned that the sign could not be read from the other side of the road. This is the same problem business people have in the community.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the majority of the committee didn't want historical markers because people can't read them.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that they started out with historical markers initially, and when the Board requested the monument sign consistent with the Ordinance for the area, they began considering the monument sign.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**OCTOBER 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that they wanted to do a sign similar to the sign at the entrance of the City of York, which is a wood-carved sign. They did not want to do the blue historical marker sign.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the Board's discussion was not so much that it wanted a monument sign, but thought everybody should follow the same rules that are imposed on other community signs.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the Committee was asking for reconsideration so that they can place a sign at each end of the district.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked what kind of sign.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded that it would be a sign similar to the one seen in other areas, but not in the middle of the roadway. They would still bring the sample sign back to the Board; they just don't want to waste their time researching and gathering prices regarding a monument sign if the Board would allow something else.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he would be more comfortable and could make a better decision if they would bring in a sample sign.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he would be in favor of keeping within the sign ordinance.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the Board does have the authority to do that given the fact that it would be a township sign.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick suggested that they bring to the Board samples of signs that they would recommend.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked why put them through that if the Board won't allow it. He wanted to stay with the sign ordinance.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that this is a property along Market Street; it's a district.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch understood what Mr. Gurreri was saying, but commented that it was not an individual property owner who would be putting it up for their own benefit. It's for the benefit of everyone who goes through. It's a different situation, and based on the type of sign they would come in with he would be inclined to agree.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated he would like to see what they want.

**Consensus of the Board was to have the Historic Preservation Committee provide their selection of the sign to be erected brought before the Board for approval.**

**Development Zone Work Session**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated as follow up to the Work Session held October 27<sup>th</sup>, she had contacted Mr. Maciejewski to clarify what had been discussed when the Board met with the Planning Commission regarding the proposal for the Flexible Development Zone. He indicated that Mr. Stern had provided them with correspondence and they felt they were somewhat informed, but that the door had been opened for them to meet with the Board regarding the intentions of the district. Chairman Mitrick indicated that she would not want to hold up the schedule that Mr. Stern had submitted, and they would be more than happy to meet with the Board prior to the Public Hearing or the next scheduled meeting regarding the subject. Mr. Maciejewski indicated he could meet any time Tuesday or early on Wednesday (before 2 p.m.).

**Consensus of the Board was to meet with the Planning Commission on Thursday, November 11 at 6 p.m.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern asked what he should do in preparation for that meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that Mr. Stern had asked them for their comments or recommendations on the Ordinance and the map. They had some questions on how it would be enforced.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost reported an update in addition to his written report, that Judge Horn had been assigned to the Livingston condemnation case. A pre-trial conference would be held in the near future.

Regarding the Flexible Development Zone, Solicitor Yost had dictated some comments to Mr. Stern, mostly from a legal perspective and structure as opposed to form.

Solicitor Yost reported that he had become the object of Donald Miller's ire for not having resolved the stormwater problem on Ridgewood Road. Solicitor Yost provided a letter to the Board which indicated this was not a legal problem, i.e., there is nothing that can legally be done to have the property owners correct the problem. The Township will have to correct the problem if there is a solution. This matter had been unresolved for two plus years. There are some legal rights that could be enforced, but there is nothing on the plan that can be legally enforced.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**Budget Meetings:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic had previously provided a report to the Board. He advised that the Budget Meeting for November 18<sup>th</sup> had been canceled. The current Budget Meeting schedule is as follows:

Monday, November 15<sup>th</sup> at 7 p.m.  
Monday, November 22<sup>nd</sup> at 7 p.m.  
Monday, December 6<sup>th</sup> – 7 p.m.

Mr. Amic added that the tentative Budget must be advertised 20 days prior to final passage.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the only action the Board must take is to approve the tentative budget.

**Park Fund-raisers – Newton Group:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that he, Chairman Mitrick and Dori Bowders met with the consultant. Information was provided on businesses in the township and members of certain service clubs. An approach was discussed. The Newton Group is developing a plan, and the recommendation will be received within the next few weeks.

Mr. Amic took the Master Park Plan of \$2,600,000 and added \$400,000 to make it an even \$300,000 and suggested that might be the number with which to work.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that Newton Group wondered if the Board was interested in considering the longevity of the park property; i.e., any interest to dedicate the property to Springettsbury Park forever.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the park is already dedicated. The township currently holds it in trust for park purposes.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that Newton Group is referring to a “forever” thing.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated it had been done in perpetuity. The only way it could be changed is by court order.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Newton Group wanted to know the sentiments of the Board if the plan moves forward, about taking major developments inside the park and dedicating those developments to the largest contributors.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he would have no problem with that. It's an appropriate thing to do.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed with Mr. Pasch that it was appropriate. Mr. Bishop cautioned the way in which the dedication is done, i.e. in good taste.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked about the question that arose from the Contributions Board (group from downtown). He asked whether the Board would be involved in those discussions.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the Contributions Board indicated they would not be interested in this type of project as it is a municipal project. They would not oppose it.

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Resolution 99-47 – Commonwealth/Springettsbury Township Winter Service Agreement (authorization for Chair to sign)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic summarized Resolution 99-47 covering the annual agreement between Springettsbury Township and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania covering the same roadways as in the past. Mr. Amic asked that the Board authorize the Chair to sign.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether this agreement was part of another agreement.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-47. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Ordinance 99-10 – Posting No Parking Signs – Whiteford Road (permission to advertise)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Ordinance 99-10 covered the posting of no parking signs at the cul-de-sac on Whiteford Road.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE ADVERTISEMENT OF ORDINANCE 99-10. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Ordinance 99-07 – Amending Ordinance 99-11 – Fire Sprinkler Ordinance (adoption)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Ordinance 99-07 would amend the 97-11 Fire Sprinkler Ordinance, which had been properly advertised. Request was made for adoption.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE 99-07. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that based on the information provided early during the meeting, BOCA is just a minimum, and he would favor more based on what was said. He would recommend keeping the current amendment but adding to it.

**HICKMAN** Fire Chief Hickman commented that 80% of fatalities do occur in residences. Early warning devices (functioning smoke alarms approved by the National Fire Protectors Association) do more to save lives than sprinklers. Based on an average 165 degrees would activate a residential sprinkler head. At that temperature the majority of the property within is already destroyed.

Chief Hickman continued that during the early 1990's a study done by CIGNA Insurance revealed that the study group (368 properties) found 59% of the sprinklers to be faulty. The problems were found to be 25% by design, 18% by water supply, etc. and within the 59% failures the codes which protected the structures protected them better than the sprinklers. They did not relax the building construction aspect of the structure (fire walls, reduced travel distances to exits, etc.). That information came from the National Fire Sprinkler Association. Chief Hickman stated that his opinion is that he would much rather see a stricter Building Code than a sprinkler system. He agreed with the use of sprinklers, but there are limitations. Alarm systems save buildings; sprinklers are 92% effective in containment. A fire sprinkler system is a containment tool, not a suppression tool, which information was obtained from an NFPA Code Book.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri referred to his earlier question about smoke from fire at 162 degrees. A lot of smoke would be generated before the sprinklers go off, and a person upstairs could very well be dead from smoke inhalation.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman added an additional comment that sprinkler systems push the super-heated gases (carbon monoxide) from the ceiling to the floor level, which would be difficult to survive. Chief Hickman added that sprinklers save property with no question. His primary concern is life, secondary property. An early detection system is far more valuable than a sprinkler system.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether, if the early warning system does more in terms of saving lives, the requirements within the Township for early detection systems are adequate.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that he agreed that the systems are adequate.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that in 1996 when the CABO Code was adopted for one and two-family dwellings, the new code required smoke detectors on every floor of the house in addition to every room in the house. When a fire starts in a basement, as soon as the smoke hits the smoke detector the entire house is alerted.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that the individual must be sure that the smoke detectors are operational.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that they are required to be hard-wired, inter-connected and battery backed up.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman added that smoke detectors do not actually pick up smoke per se'. It picks up products of combustion that have caused the active molecules in the air to become hyper-active. With a sprinkler system the fire has to reach an actual flame doing destruction before the sprinkler goes off at 165 degrees.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the idea of a minimum standard is looking at it backwards. He looked at the concept of the maximum mandate that is being placed on the matter. The BOCA Code is a minimum standard, but it does not prohibit anyone from adding sprinklers in a building.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that it's still a mandate, just a lesser mandate.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether Rutter's needed a sprinkler system.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he would rely on the people who are experts in the field. Sprinklers can be eliminated if there are a lot of other building requirements built into the building.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented that the building requirements are important, but in reviewing high rises and larger buildings, compartmentalization would not be effective.

**MOTION CARRIED. CHAIRMAN MITRICK AND MR. SCHENCK VOTED NO.**

**D. Ordinance 99-11 – Establishing a Management Program for On-Lot Systems (adoption)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Item D. would be held in abeyance until the next meeting. No action was taken.

- E. Ordinance 99-48 – Appointing Philip W. Ort to the Recycling Committee (adoption)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked for adoption of Ordinance 99-48 to appoint Philip W. Ort to the Recycling Committee.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-48 APPOINTING PHILIP W. ORT TO THE RECYCLING COMMITTEE. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND.**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what the term of this office would be.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the term of appointment is three years, commencing October 28 and expire on October 28, 2002.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

- A. Board of Supervisors Work Session – October 5, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION OCTOBER 5, 1999 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- B. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – October 14, 1999**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING OCTOBER 14, 1999 AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Mr. Amic to check on the expiration dates for the Zoning Hearing Board members and the Planning Commission. She was concerned that three may be expiring the same year.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented about a possible change in radio communication between the fire and police departments. There had been a previous effort to allow them to use the same frequency.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the Police Department had changed their frequency due to the fact that there was too much chatter on the line. Mr.

Amic added that it had nothing to do with the Public Works Department, and they are utilizing the frequency to full capacity.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that it was her recollection that it was the fire police and fire department that had not been on the same frequency with them.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it was the same frequency with the Public Works Department.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she believed the situation was brought about when the lights went out on Mt. Zion Road and Fire Police were there at different points with no communication with the Police Department. They did not know what to do at the top of Mt. Zion because they did not know what was going on at the bottom.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he would follow up and report back to Chairman Mitrick.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that there are a few items under New Business which were noteworthy, one of which was the Stock and Leader Labor Counsel Proposal.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic also commented that there is a Planning Commission Vacancy.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how the proposed rates coincide with the rates presently being paid.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the rates (Stock and Leader) are much higher.

**Walmart Sign**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that there had been some communication regarding the Walmart sign case. Mr. Bishop asked whether the Township should be defending the Ordinance vigorously or not.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated (with astonishment) that economics can make the difference.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that could be a factor in a dimensional variance.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether this was not the case.

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there were two reasons why this was granted. The first reason was that the total of the existing signs now was about 600 sq. ft. The height of the larger of the two signs is about 32-33 ft. The first reason why they thought it was okay was that they reduced the size of the signs from what is now there. The second reason was what is referred to as the Hirtzburger case. Their attorney indicated some reduction and the need to show a hardship. The Board agreed with that part of it as well.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether Solicitor Yost thought that the Hirtzberger case was not applicable.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that he did not think it was applicable with the knowledge he had of the case.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether Solicitor Yost felt that should be defended more vigorously.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that it would depend on how the Board felt about it. He cautioned that there may not be any time left. He asked Mr. Stern whether the 30 days was up.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the date of October 5<sup>th</sup> was the originating date.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he did not like the idea of having a Zoning Ordinance that could not be enforced.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the sign is 40 ft. high.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the sign was actually 39-1/2 ft. high. He added that one thing done by the Zoning Hearing Board was that they intended to place a condition on the motion that malls are allowed two signs in the Ordinance. The condition was going to be that if the variance were granted they only get one sign. When the motion was made the condition was not placed in the motion, and it passed without it. They could have come back and asked for another sign in addition to that.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that he could not say it was an absolutely clear-cut case because no one really knows what the Hirtzberger case means. As far as Solicitor Yost was aware, it had never been addressed in any reporting court decisions, but his analysis of Hirtzberger did not justify the granting of this variance.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what the minimum the Board would have to do to preserve its right to appeal.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**OCTOBER 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that a Notice of Appeal should be filed including the reasons.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that could be withdrawn.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that it could be withdrawn.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost what he would propose.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that he would propose to file the appeal.

**Consensus of the Board was to have Solicitor Yost proceed to file an appeal.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch brought forward the matter of the PSAT Township Building Code where PSAT states that they strongly oppose Senate Bill 647 and asked all townships to contact their state representatives to let them know of opposition to the Senate bill. He asked whether anything had been done or should be done in this matter by Springettsbury Township.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the House Bill was okay and that it is getting resolved in the Senate.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Bill would really impact Springettsbury Township.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the Senate Bill would take away the right to impose local ordinances, such as the sprinkler matter discussed earlier.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the Township should advise the legislators that Springettsbury is opposed to the Senate Bill.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he was not convinced that Building Codes that are more strict than the state-wide building code. He was in favor of having local control.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch would not be in favor of any legislation that would take away the enforcement by local municipalities.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the township can let Senators Waugh and Armstrong know that we agree with PSAT, and additionally at the County Convention a Resolution could be adopted to be sent with the other ones.

Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Amic to write a letter on behalf of the township to the Senators that the township's position opposes 647.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**OCTOBER 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he would communicate with Senators Waugh and Armstrong.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch also commented on a letter Mr. Amic had received from Ed Rendell regarding sponsoring a National Bible Week in Springettsbury Township. He would be in favor of doing that based on Mr. Rendell's letter. It would be an inter-faith observance during November 21 – 28 week.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck agreed.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost whether there was any problem with it.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded there was no problem.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic will prepare a Resolution for the next meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Amic would bring forward the Annual Police Report on the Agenda for comment.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 12:03 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**OCTOBER 14, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Mike Myers, Design Engineer  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Michael Hickman, Fire Chief  
Andy Hinkle, Manager of Information Services  
Mark Hodgkinson, Wastewater Treatment  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Dave Trott, Police Department Corporal  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting of the Board of Supervisors to order at 7:30 p.m. Chairman Mitrick announced that an Executive Session had been held at 6:30 p.m. regarding personnel.

**A. RETIREMENT RESOLUTIONS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the agenda called for Retirement Resolutions for three individuals.

- 1) **Resolution 99-45 - John Watkins, Wastewater Treatment Employee**

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**OCTOBER 14, 1999  
APPROVED**

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Watkins, Mr. Hodgkinson of the Wastewater Treatment facility and Don Bishop to come forward for the presentation of the Resolution.
- HODGKINSON** Mr. Hodgkinson commended Mr. Watkins for his 12-1/2 years of dedicated service to Springettsbury Township. He stated that Mr. Watkins had been a very hard worker, dependable and that he would be missed. He congratulated him and extended best wishes to him in his retirement.
- HODGKINSON** Mr. Hodgkinson responded that Springettsbury Township had been a nice place to work and a nice place to live. He thanked everyone for their good wishes.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop read Resolution 99-45 and wished Mr. Watkins and his wife, Edith, a happy and healthy retirement.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop also presented Mr. Watkins with a gold watch for his years of service with the township.

**2) Resolution 99-43 – Frederick L. Nestlerode**

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Police Chief Dave Eshbach, Frederick L. Nestlerode and Bill Schenck to come forward.
- ESHBACH** Police Chief Eshbach introduced Corporal Frederick L. Nestlerode and indicated that he had begun his service with Springettsbury Township as a Patrolman in April, 1973. Chief Eshbach provided details of Corporal Nestlerode’s career including special areas of commendation for conscientious work ethic. On behalf of the Springettsbury Township and the Police Department, Chief Eshbach congratulated him on his years of service and wished him well in his retirement. Chief Eshbach stated that Mr. Nestlerode would be working for the York County Sheriff’s Department.
- TROTT** Corporal David Trott presented Mr. Nestlerode with his service firearm complete with case provided by the Springettsbury Township Welfare Association.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck presented Resolution 99-43 to Corporal Frederick L. Nestlerode.
- NESTLERODE** Mr. Nestlerode stated that he had been in police work for 31 years, a profession he loved. He thanked all those he had worked with, as well as the Board of Supervisors for their graciousness to him.

**2) Resolution 99-44 – Patrolman Harry A. Edie**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Patrolman Edie to come forward.

**ESHBACH** Police Chief Eshbach introduced Patrolman Edie who began his employment with Springettsbury Township on April 1, 1966. He provided details regarding Patrolman Edie’s professional career, which included commendation and appreciation, as well as the Police Department’s Award of Distinction. Chief Eshbach commented on Patrolman Edie’s positive attitude no matter what hand was dealt to him. Chief Eshbach congratulated him on his retirement.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch presented Resolution 99-44 to Patrolman Edie. Mr. Pasch congratulated Patrolman Edie on his retirement.

**TROTT** Corporal Dave Trott presented Officer Edie with his service weapon, complete with case provided by the Springettsbury Township Welfare Association. Corporal Trott stated it was an honor to present this to him.

**EDIE** Patrolman Edie commented that he had been proud to work under the commands of Chief Shultz, Chief Kessler, and Chief Eshbach. He thanked the Board of Supervisors for all they had done for him.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick provided recognition that the three retirees were very fine individuals who had given over 71 years of service to Springettsbury Township.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

There were no communications from citizens.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober provided an update regarding the Harrowgate sewer replacement project, the Raleigh Drive project, the PLC System Upgrade and the Millcreek Interceptor project. Mr. Schober stated that each project was moving along well.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani provided an update in addition to his written report of October 6. He reported that the Pleasant Valley Road four-way stop sign would be in place in the next few days. Within four to six weeks an official change would take place.

**C. Design Engineer - Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**MYERS** Mr. Myers reported that the Status Report he provided might be the next to the last report for approvals on the project. In addition to R. K. & K.'s written report, the contractor's signed agreements, bonds, insurance certificates had been delivered to the Township Manager. DEP's approval on the Part B Permit was needed, which related to the grant, and was expected any day. As soon as Part B approval is received, Notice to Proceed would be given to the contractors.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the CSX issue had been resolved.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated it had been resolved in that there was no longer any challenge to the taking. An appraiser had viewed the property.

**MYERS** Mr. Myers added that it was good that an appraiser had visited the property, as it revealed the land to be nearly worthless and unbuildable.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that he had received a telephone call from Washington with news on the partial funding for the project. An application was submitted for additional federal grants. The House of Representatives placed an additional one million dollars in the bill, and the Senate placed half a million. The additional half million was restored on our request. Both House and Senate had approved one million dollars. This will go to the President for his signature. What is budgeted in the capital budget is close to reality if he signs the bill. Mr. Amic added that there was no new funding in the bill; only projects, which were in the bill, last year received continuing funding.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the East/West Interceptor comment.

**MYERS** Mr. Myers responded that there was a small area of corrosion resulting from hydrogen sulfide that some of the Wastewater Staff asked them to review. They made recommendation how they would repair it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether R. K. & K. had any communication from the York Chamber of Commerce about the Bio-solids Education Program. The Chamber of Commerce indicated they had some information they wanted to make available to R. K. & K.

**MYERS** Mr. Myers responded that they had received no communication.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he had no communication either, but indicated that he would contact Tom Donley.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 10/14/99**
- B. Hyder Consulting, Inc. – Risk Management – Final Billing - \$447.50**
- C. J. A. Myers Building – Old Orchard Road Retainage - \$1,178**
- D. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Harrowgate/Kingston – Progress Billing #9 - \$434.88**
- E. Reed Smith Shaw & McClay – Sewage Grant Funding - \$1,532.73**
- F. Murphy & Dittenhafer Architects – Municipal Building – Progress Billing #12 - \$1,139.63**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Amic whether the format had changed in the report. He would prefer that the capital letters be kept in the report as it had been easier for him to read.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch also asked about the item relating to Cloister Car Wash.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that this item covered the detailing of police vehicles.

**ESHBACH** Police Chief Eshbach stated that the amount would be the same monthly fee up until November, 1999 at which time it would change.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how much of a percentage increase would be taking place.

**ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach responded that a flat rate is paid for a fleet wash. Cloister preferred that the Township pay a per item rate. He guessed that the rate would change to about twice as much a month.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that one of the reasons why the township had switched car wash establishments was the reduced rate.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch recommended that pricing be obtained from Belmont again as it seemed to be half the price.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE PAYABLES ITEMS 4A THROUGH F AS LISTED ON THE AGENDA. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS AND QUOTES:**

- A. Buchart Horn, Inc. – 60 Hours Inspection – PLC System - \$5,500**
- B. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Harrowgate Inspections - \$6,365**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Items A and B were tied together. They were quotes by B-H for inspection and estimated hours on the PLC System, an estimated 60 hours of inspection for \$5,500. On the Harrowgate Sewer project it was 100 hours at \$6,365. The total estimated time on these projects was expected to take approximately 2 to 4 hours each week at the rate of \$63.65 each. These items involve periodic inspection by the professional engineers of a limited amount of time. Approval was recommended.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether these items should become a part of the original contract.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated agreement and stated that, even though the township had an excellent staff, he did not think they would be in a position to inspect in the same manner as the Environmental Engineers.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT BUCHART-HORN ESTIMATE FOR 60 HOURS OF INSPECTION FOR THE PLC SYSTEM AMOUNTING TO \$5,500 BE APPROVED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE WORK ASSIGNMENT TO BUCHART-HORN FOR 100 HOURS OF INSPECTION FOR THE HARROWGATE SEWER REHAB ESTIMATED TO BE \$6,365. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- C. Parallel Interceptor – Contract #3 – Permission to Complete Specifications and Advertise for Bid.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reviewed R. K. & K.'s specifications regarding the \$1,879,000 first estimate. The project was ready to be bid. The only variable in the estimated cost of \$5,332,000 is the interceptor that is yet to be bid. Two million dollars would be funded by the U.S. government. The rest would be shared by the nine municipalities in our system. Mr. Amic provided the above information in order to compare the cost. Also included was his analysis of the rate study. Approval was requested to finalize specifications and bid the project.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about attaching the other Millcreek Interceptor work with this in order to gain a better price.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that that approach would not be pursued.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO COMPLETE SPECIFICATIONS AND ADVERTISE FOR BID FOR THE PARALLEL INTERCEPTOR CONTRACT NO. 3. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Myers to advise Mr. Halbert of the approval.

**MYERS** Mr. Myers stated that he would do so, and added that Mr. Halbert was in New Freedom receiving Penmar's Board Member of the Year award.

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Land Development 99-09 – Wolf Printing (10/15/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented regarding Land Development 99-09 relating to Wolf Printing of 1200 Haines Road. Mr. Stern introduced Byron Scott of Gordon Brown & Associates and Barry Wolf, Wolf Printing to speak regarding the project.

**SCOTT** Mr. Scott reported that curbing would be added along Haines Road to existing curbing along the Edris Oil site and NelloTire, as well as sidewalk. Public sewer is via the existing manhole; stormwater management would be managed in two areas, one directly behind the area and the second area in two small ponds. The landscaping plan includes street trees and ornamental trees and shrubs. PennDot approval had been obtained for construction of the sanitary sewer. Site distance was adequate.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch called attention to a contradiction in that the Planning Commission recommended it conditioned upon showing a clear sight triangle, and staff indicated it should not show a sight triangle.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there is a small conflict between the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and the Zoning Ordinance. A sight distance would be used instead of a sight triangle.
- SCOTT** Mr. Scott stated that they were using a sight distance triangle; whereas the Ordinance required a clear sight triangle. Following that planning all of the parking changed. PennDot requirements had been met.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the Zoning Ordinance referred to streets, but the other section referred to access drives. The Planning Commission passed the decision to the Board of Supervisors.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about safety issues which might be present.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani commented that, typically a clear sight triangle is something used by landscape architects. Safe sight distance, a tool used by PennDot, is more critical and a better tool than a clear sight triangle.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that safe sight distance is more important. He asked whether the township has a problem with the sight triangle in our Ordinance.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that safe sight distance would be more appropriate.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that the Zoning Ordinance does include safe sight distance. Safe sight distance is included in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Clear sight triangle is in the Zoning Ordinance. Both can be utilized.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated for clarification that Mr. Stern was satisfied that the Planning Commission, even though a condition existed to show a clear sight triangle, passed over to the staff to say what should be done. Staff indicated they think this is a safe condition. It is a safe condition, which can't be altered since it is on the plan.

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the triangle was not shown on the plan; the distance was shown.
- SCOTT** Mr. Scott showed the area on the drawing, which was being discussed.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that stormwater management was being provided on site in accordance with the Ordinance. However, she had read where there was spillage onto Nello property.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that that item had been an issue discussed during the NelloTire building addition. Nello Tire and Wolf Printing both wanted the lot. The stormwater flows from Haines Road across the Nello property. Mr. Scott had indicated there would be two stormwater ponds. Mr. Luciani indicated he had concern that the amount of flow could not be handled; however, because it was a small area, the amount of flow would not be significant. He was satisfied with the plan.
- SCOTT** Mr. Scott indicated that because of their planning, the stormwater would be handled more efficiently.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated for clarification that an acknowledgment is being made that stormwater would be passing onto their property.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that the water flows there now and would continue to go there.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost whether he had any problem with that.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he had no problem with the matter.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Wolf whether there was a dumpster on the site at this time.
- WOLF** Mr. Wolf responded that there are containers but no dumpsters.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she visited the site and noticed a well. She asked who put the well in.
- WOLF** Mr. Wolf responded that he had put the well in earlier during 1999.

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the well had been put in in anticipation of not hooking up to public water.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there were two reasons for the well. One was an error made by Mr. Stern's department, and secondly, in order for them to determine whether the well would work or not, drilling had to take place to see how much water would be accessible.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there was public water to the site.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that was not necessarily true.
- SCOTT** Mr. Scott indicated that the water main is 730 feet away. York Water was not willing to extend the main for two customers. Mr. Wolf had been provided a price just for the pipe of \$32,600, which was not feasible for Mr. Wolf. That did not include work within PennDot right-of-way, which would have raised the cost to upwards of \$65,000.
- WOLF** Mr. Wolf responded that he had contacted York Water prior to putting in the well. His intention was to hook up, but the price extremely expensive. In addition, the state had just paved the roadway and Mr. Wolf would have to re-pave the roadway.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned what the Ordinance reads, such as within 1,000 ft., which required a variance.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that the matter would be addressed in a Land Development Ordinance.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the Ordinance allowed for the submission of a stormwater feasibility study to show why it's not feasible. The costs compared with the amount of water that would be used in the property.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch continued that a feasibility study would include economics.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that it's not Zoning. It's not like a variance.
- SCOTT** Mr. Scott added that Mr. Wolf uses all bottled water primarily for drinking. The only water used from public water now is for washing of hands and toilets, etc.

- WOLF** Mr. Wolf stated that the need for water is not great.
- STERN** Mr. Stern added that both Wolf and Nello Tire use less than 100 gallons of water per day.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there was any readiness necessary in case public water became available.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that the Ordinance required that in the event that public water became available that they have facilities.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented about fire suppression issues.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that Fire Chief Hickman had addressed fire issues. A hydrant is available 739 feet away.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she had opposed construction of a site without public water with Nello. She personally did not feel it would be responsible for her to give her approval for a development like this when public water was within close proximity of it. She understood the expense and indicated it was unfortunate that Wolf and Nello could not work together and share the expense for a public water connection. She stated she would not support the plan solely for that reason.
- WOLF** Mr. Wolf responded that he understood and added that he felt they had gone the extra mile to seek out what they could do before they began the development.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-09 FOR WOLF PRINTING WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND CONDITIONS:**

- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN,**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIRED SITE TRIANGLES BEING SHOWN ON THE PLAN,**
- **WAIVER FROM CONNECTION TO PUBLIC WATER,**
- **MODIFICATION FROM STREETScape BUFFERYARDS,**
- **CONDITIONED UPON APPROVAL OF PENNDOT HIGHWAY OCCUPANCY PERMIT FOR DRIVEWAY ACCESS,**
- **CONDITION UPON FINANCIAL SECURITY BEING SUBMITTED TO THE TOWNSHIP IN AN AMOUNT TO BE APPROVED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER AND,**
- **CONDITIONED UPON ALL PROPERTY CORNERS BEING SET.**

**MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. CHAIRMAN MITRICK VOTED NO.**

**B. Land Development 99-10 – Athletic Lettering (10/15/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern advised that Land Development 99-10 for Athletic Lettering is a proposal for a 14,735 square foot strip shopping center. Four tenant retail stores would be included, as well as a shop for Athletic Lettering. The area in question is near the former Best Products building. Previously a Subdivision Plan was approved to remove the back part of the Best parking lot to allow for rear access for the Athletic Lettering property. Planning Commission had recommended approval. Mr. Stern recommended approval with waivers and conditions. Mr. Stern introduced Bob Sandmeyer of Imagineering, and Jeff Folkenroth of Athletic Lettering.

**SANDMEYER** Mr. Sandmeyer indicated he would answer any additional questions the Board might have, and Mr. Folkenroth would answer questions regarding the business or the building itself. Mr. Sandmeyer stated that the entrance is on Eastern Boulevard. They are restricted by the island in the center of Eastern Boulevard to a right in or right out only. There are 46 parking spaces accommodated for the property. Athletic Lettering would utilize the largest rear section and the two smaller west buildings. Stormwater management would be managed on site by detention basin on the east side. Public water and public sewer are available to the site.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Stern whether the stormwater would come from the basin to the street. Planning Commission stated this was conditioned on the correction of all stormwater issues noted by the Township Engineer.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that a small amount of area drains out of the right-of-way into an inlet. A pipe parallels Eastern Boulevard. The discharge would be controlled with the stormwater basin.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani had some concern about truck traffic to the rear of the building with adequate space.

**SANDMEYER** Mr. Sandmeyer indicated they had accommodated truck traffic access.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the adjacent property is residential, and questioned whether there was something in the Ordinance that refers to a commercial use with a residential use that there must be screening.

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that when different zones are in use that would be the case. This particular piece of property is all the same zone.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated she had looked it up on the zoning map. She understood that these properties are commercial. Her question relates to the fact of a different use abutting property. Chairman Mitrick questioned the view from the apartment building with parking, etc. and asked whether there should be some type of buffer between the uses. She asked whether the Zoning Ordinance called for any type of buffer in this case.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded with the following: “The Board of Supervisors may require landscaping buffer yard between non-residential and residential uses when they abut within the same zone.”
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that on this plan there really is no room for landscaping.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that sewer capacity was taken from this property.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that sewer capacity was returned in the Chapter 94 report.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what the plan would be for screening around the dumpster.
- SANDMEYER** Mr. Sandmeyer responded that there were no plans for screening; however, there was no problem to do so.
- FOLKENROTH** Mr. Folkenroth agreed.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated she was glad to have Athletic Lettering coming to Springettsbury. She stated that, in reviewing the plan, it seemed enormous for this lot. There was very little landscaping, nothing in the parking lot, nothing along the adjoining properties.
- SANDMEYER** Mr. Sandmeyer stated that the main part of the building is large, but most of the building would be used for Athletic Lettering and

their employees for storage and shop. It's not like a large shopping center with people coming in.

**FOLKENROTH** Mr. Folkenroth indicated about 30 people per day visit their facility, because they are a wholesale company and go to the customer.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded to Mrs. Mitrick's earlier question, i.e. the building coverage is 20% of the lot area. With regard to traffic, in the Planning Commission study the issue was addressed and there was nothing left undone.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated other scenarios could develop in the future such as a bank, a credit union which would be worst-case scenarios, but which would create a significant traffic impact. Even though the Athletic Lettering business only utilizes about 30 vehicles per day, if there were other factors added there would be a larger impact on overall traffic. He quoted from the Ordinance that, "If there's a critical change resulting from the proposed development the applicant shall, at the applicant's expense, make improvements to substantially eliminate the critical change, or contribute funds to the enable the township to make such improvements." Mr. Luciani stated that the traffic study conclusions are important to address.

**STERN** Mr. Stern asked Mr. Yost whether this should be requested.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost commented that traffic studies may be required if you can demonstrate an access, turning, increased traffic and the improvement in question on an off-site improvement. There must be a definite nexus between the traffic generated and the need for the off-site improvement.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that with this plan at this point where Athletic Lettering only has a few cars a day, we don't know what the other retailers are going to do. She asked whether this would be based on the square footage.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that this would be based on the highest possible use.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost agreed that consideration would be from the highest possible use.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic interjected that another Land Development would come forth to place a bank at the corner of Kingston Plaza. The on-

going heavy commercialization of Eastern Boulevard would result in a lot of additional traffic problems.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that the Supervisors receive plans in pieces and while Athletic Lettering's piece may not contribute a lot to a traffic problem, but when all of the little pieces add up then the Supervisors have a problem.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the signage and whether it would be helpful to have a right-turn only sign, or utilize a township one-way sign across from the access point.

**SANDMEYER** Mr. Sandmeyer responded that they could accommodate a one-way sign at the exit out.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-10 FOR ATHLETIC LETTERING WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND CONDITIONS:**

- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN;**
- **WAIVER FROM SUBMISSION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY**
- **WAIVER FROM SUBMISSION OF A TRAFFIC STUDY;**
- **MODIFICATION OF REQUIRED STREETScape LANDSCAPING;**
- **MODIFICATION TO ALLOW STORMWATER DISCHARGE ONTO THE STREET;**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY IN AN AMOUNT TO BE APPROVED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER, WHICH WOULD INCLUDE THE ONE-WAY TRAFFIC SIGN IN THE MEDIAL STRIP OF EASTERN BOULEVARD;**
- **CONDITIONED ON APPROVAL OF THE SEWER FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE BY DEP;**

**MR. PASCH WAS SECOND.**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop requested clarification as to whether it had been determined that the Board of Supervisors has the right to require the screening (more than would normally be required between the different uses), pertaining to the back of that property and the small apartment building.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the Board of Supervisors may require landscaping and buffer yard between non-residential and residential uses when they abut within the same zone.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that doesn't mean landscaping; that means actually more space between, in this case the back of the building and the other use.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it could be done either way.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that there is no space provided for a buffer now because they do not own any more land.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Planning Module – Athletic Lettering – A3-67957-301-3 – 1,400 GPD  
(recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented with regard to the Planning Module for Athletic Lettering for 1,400 gallons per day, which is included in the Chapter 94 report. The staff had recommended approval.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING MODULE FOR ATHLETIC LETTERING – A3-67957-301-3 – 1,400 GPD. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick alerted the Supervisors of a subject discussed previously with regard to the frequency of modification of streetscape buffer yards. She commented that there had been two plans brought forward, and two modifications approved.

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

**Emergency Services Commission – Joint Operating Agreement**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reported on the three volunteer emergency service providers on Tuesday evening. Dan Flohr provided an excellent presentation of the Joint Operating Agreement as it presently exists. Mr. Bishop commented that there had been much discussion of different ways that things could be done. Tuesday evening, October 19<sup>th</sup>, another meeting would be held for the purpose of voting on that plan. Mr. Bishop added that the process would continue.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Bishop about the comments brought up by the people at the meeting. Chairman Mitrick stated that it seemed like they brought some of them up because they were issues that they wanted the Emergency Services Commission to consider. One issue related to the loans.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that he had every confidence that the issue with respect to the loans will be resolved. That had been one of the highest priorities placed on the process. The matter is one, which Mr. Bishop stated can be solved. He was not certain that the people who are concerned would understand that it could be solved. Solicitor Yost would provide reiterations of his opinions.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that he had again researched the matter and had dictated an opinion letter. He stated that his opinion had not changed. He added that an application was presented to him for a loan and that he reviewed the accompanying material indicating there's nothing to present any problems. The application form actually has blocks for additional participants, and the more participants there are, the happier PEMA is. It was Solicitor Yost's opinion that PEMA would be happy to have the participation of a Joint Operating Committee in the loan as it would add credibility to the ability to repay. He could not foresee PEMA being concerned at all that the entities had entered into the agreement.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether having answers to some of the questions asked during the meeting would have a more positive affect on the vote.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that there had been many questions all of which had been previously asked. He added that the current process is to flush out what really mattered to people. Postponing a vote would not change people's opinions, and having a vote is not the end result in the process.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch agreed that having the vote was important. If they vote the agreement down, the process should continue.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that his goal, if the agreement is voted down, is to have those who are there to vote participate in discussion about what matters to them. That's the one opportunity available to have the people who really decide this express their opinions, which Mr. Bishop added that he did not think that has been heard. Clearly, the members of the commission were happy, but that doesn't mean that the rank and file were happy.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commended the Commission and all the work put into this enormous project, which had been very time consuming. She expressed the hope that the outcome would be positive.

**Budget Meeting Date**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested that the Board establish a new date for a budget session.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he would send a memorandum to the Board following his review of the Code as there are a number of days prior to the end of the year that a tentative budget plan must be in place.

**Planning Commission Matters**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about a Planning Commission request to meet with the Board.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic had received a telephone call from the President of the Planning Commission, who had expressed a number of concerns, one of which was the resignation of a member. Every two or three years a joint meeting had been held with the Board as a work session to discuss general matters. The President requested that a date be set for a joint meeting.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there were specific items for an agenda.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there were no specific items, but rather procedural matters that exist between an advisory body and an elected decision-making body.

**Consensus of the Board was to meet jointly with the Planning Commission on Tuesday, November 23 at 12 Noon.**

**Zoning Hearing Board Matters**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Dori Bowders about the Letters of Interest for Zoning Hearing Board and whether interviews could be scheduled.

**Consensus of the Board was to meet on Thursday, November 11, at 7 p.m. for two interviews.**

**Planning Commission Matters**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested that advertisement be placed for the vacancy on the Planning Commission.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the Board directs that advertisement be done, but that the costs to do so are high. He indicated that the Board should be more specific as to what type of advertisements be placed.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that advertisements should be placed in the least expensive source that would provide some response.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that there are other ways that people could be encouraged to come forward.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that even though the Board members may know of people who may be interested, she considered it appropriate to advertise in the least expensive way.

**Street Cleaning**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that Todd Platts' office contacted her regarding concerns he had received from a resident representing many neighbors along Haines Road regarding street cleaning. He contacted Charlie Webb of PennDot, who indicated PennDot doesn't have the equipment to do that, and suggested that since Springettsbury loops around when it does the side streets, he would speak with Paul Amic or Charlie Lauer to work out something so that the complaints on Haines and also the ones received in the past from Edgewood could be answered.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the matter involved Springettsbury signing an agility agreement, which is written in a difficult structure.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether Springettsbury sweeps that section regardless.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that PennDot had abandoned the street cleaning service as much as possible. He indicated he would continue to work on the matter to get a permanent solution to the problem.

**Kingston Road Traffic Speed**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that a resident of Meridian talked to him about the speed of the traffic on Kingston by the park. Mr. Pasch had discussed this with Chief Eshbach, who had set the wheels in motion to ascertain whether this is a big problem.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost reported that he had nothing to add to his written report.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Solicitor Yost about the case on the Writer suit. He asked whether this involved a new precedent.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the precedent was not absolutely new; a couple of York County Judges are interested in and have promoted it. He explained that this was Judge Dorney's first attempt at a summary jury trial. It all came about as a result of the insurance carrier looking for an

alternative dispute resolution short of a full-blown jury trial. He reported that the insurance carrier would not agree to mediation which is a typical alternative dispute. Solicitor Yost stated that his own analysis was in retrospect that it was very advantageous. Solicitor Yost had not objected to it because he thought it could be done in an even-handed way. The bottom line is, since there are very few guidelines or rules, what would otherwise be inadmissible testimony was being presented to the jury.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he understood the Township was precluded from presenting some things.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the Township was not precluded from presenting it. He added that what was presented could have been presented better.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that he was concerned that if these kinds of things have to be faced because of sewage backups, it behooves the Board to do everything possible where there are problems and where there could be sewage backups to prevent them on the front end.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that this was a bad case for that very reason. A similar incident occurred 20 years prior and in 20 years essentially nothing had been done to correct the problem.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that this basin had been a problem for 25 years. Mr. Schenck asked what happened in this area during the last rainstorm and the repairs took care of the area.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that judges are moving in this direction to not have full jury trials because of the caseloads.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that was true. This was an abbreviated trial, which was more than cut in half.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that nothing had been set at this point in time, but there is a court order that sealing the verdict in this case so that it does not become a matter of public knowledge. It is not available to the newspapers. It's sealed in terms of the amount. The whole case is sealed. That was one of the ground rules going into the case because if it has to be re-tried there won't be prejudiced by what went before.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he had provided the on-lot Sewer Management Ordinance. In order to keep this program moving Solicitor Yost recommended that the Board authorize Solicitor Yost to advertise it for

adoption at the next meeting in summary form so that it can continue to be fine-tuned.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that there is a great deal of additional work to go with this. Mr. Hinkle has done some work on this, and a full report would be presented at the next meeting as well as a plan to go back to DEP for approval.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Amic envisioned any problems with going ahead.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded he did not see any problems and added that Solicitor Yost had a number of documents to work on and he had no problem with those.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE ADVERTISING IN SUMMARY FORM THE ORDINANCE FOR ON-LOT SEWAGE SYSTEMS. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he had nothing further to add to his written report.

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

There was no action to be taken regarding Ordinances, Resolutions or Agreements.

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. Board of Supervisors Work Session – September 21, 1999**

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 21, 1999 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Board of Supervisors Public Hearing – September 23, 1999**

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE MINUTES FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PUBLIC HEARING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 1999 BE APPROVED AS WRITTEN. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – September 23, 1999**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 23, 1999 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked about the 10/25/99 date shown for Item J.

**It was determined that the date should read 10/28/99.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated there were no items for action under Old Business.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that at some point the Board needed to comment on the Annual Police Report previously submitted to them. She requested it be placed on the Agenda for comment.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Item 13 was placed on the Agenda for information purposes. Mr. Hinkle had been reviewing the Telecommunications System proposal for the new building.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck interjected a briefing regarding a conversation he had with a state representative. The County Association would be forwarding a Resolution requesting a change in the Second Class Township Code to allow appreciation or awards functions for Township employees and volunteers. The state representative indicated he had no problem whatsoever in adding that to the next Bill he processes. Mr. Schenck will provide a copy of that Resolution to the state representative. Mr. Schenck indicated he did not know whether the effort would be successful. He planned to forward the information he has.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded that she favored the move and that the Board had been concerned about the fact that recognition could not be made to the employees and volunteers for some time.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that Mr. Gurreri would like to explore all possibilities that we might be able to do to express appreciation that would meet the approval of the Board.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick brought forward the Fire Chief's Report requesting some changes in his department.

**HICKMAN** Fire Chief Hickman had provided a written report to the Board addressing his concerns for the Fire Department. His major concern related to the times during his absence from the department when no one is available to take the responsibility of administration of the fire services. He stated that he was uncomfortable with that situation.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that the Board had generally supported the concept he proposed. His concern rests with the volunteers. He asked about the structure and how it would work.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that he had spoken with Doc Wolf, who supported the concept. He indicated he did not think this would be a detriment in any way to the volunteer services but would be a help. Chief Hickman stated that currently he handles the recruitment, the retention, the volunteer incentive, statistics, etc. Having an extra person will benefit the volunteers.

Chief Hickman continued that, as far as the current volunteer rank structure, it would not affect them the way he believed it would be perceived. This would add one more person in the chain of command directly below Chief Hickman and above the District Chiefs. This would increase the margin of safety, increase the span of control, allow more eyes, ears and thought processes to keep everyone safe, which Chief Hickman indicated was one of his main concerns.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether that, other than on a fire scene and a lot of the administrative work that Chief Hickman now does and has difficulty getting to, would that be a big part of this function.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that in the daily scheme of things it would free him considerably. The Deputy would take the responsibility of answering alarms, etc. Plan Reviews and Comments provided to the Township would be more expedient. He indicated he was seriously bogged down with the day-to-day operations. A Deputy in place would help make the process go much smoother.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether the Deputy and the Fire Chief would be working the same shift.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated that would be correct, and in that way the responsibilities could be separated.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what would be done with the other shifts.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated they would rotate the calls.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the criteria for the position had been established.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated it had been established.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there would be people within the existing fire protection services who would be eligible.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman stated that was correct. He explained how he derived the qualifications. He took the Fire Chief qualifications and lessened them a step. His opinion was that there are qualified candidates within the ranks of the fire service. He further stated that would be an added benefit as they would be familiar with the system. He would like to advertise in the normal procedure and establish a candidate list. He would remove himself from the selection in order to avoid favoritism.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that, other than tradition and the fire service following the command structure, what the advantage of that process would be.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman indicated he would be involved but the candidates would move through the process and meet all of the qualifications without being shown any favoritism. They would be chosen based on their education and experience.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman commented that currently a shortage exists in the number of volunteers.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how the fire scene is manned with the current shortage existing.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman responded that a skeleton crew mans the fire scene. Most of the volunteers do pay attention to their pagers. The average is between 4.8 and 5.1 volunteers per call. Having a Deputy Fire Chief would help the situation.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he favored this very important step for the department, and encouraged the move as a good proposal that had come forward. He suggested the Board move forward as quickly as possible to create the position.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she agreed and indicated that the need was very apparent. She had checked with Solicitor Yost who advised that the Board could ask Mr. Amic to begin the process to fill the Deputy Chief position.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**OCTOBER 14, 1999  
APPROVED**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the Ordinance currently already authorized the position.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was correct and that the Board could authorize the process to begin. He requested the Board to authorize him to proceed to fill the position.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE MANAGER TO DO WHATEVER IS PRUDENT AND NECESSARY TO FILL THE POSITION OF DEPUTY FIRE CHIEF AS DESCRIBED IN CHIEF HICKMAN'S MEMO. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether the motion as stated would place him in a bind.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it released him from the past direction of the Board.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 10:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**SEPTEMBER 23, 1999  
DRAFT**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Nick Guerreri  
Don Bishop

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Jim Crooks, Wastewater Treatment Department  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Michael Hickman, Fire Chief  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the General Meeting of the Board of Supervisors to Order at 7:40 p.m. Chairman Mitrick apologized for a late start due to the Public Hearing held at 6:30 p.m. Chairman Mitrick announced a meeting on Thursday, September 30, 1999 at 7:30 p.m. regarding the Police Pension Board. Chairman Mitrick announced, in addition, that there would be an Executive Session prior to the Police Pension Board on September 30<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m. regarding personnel.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick opened the meeting for citizens to speak to the Board about issues of concern to them.

**BROWN** Mr. Lee Brown, Brown's Tree Farm, approached the Board with regard to the burning law. Mr. Brown's farm consisted of about nine and a half acres for many years, and recently he purchased an additional nine acres. He had understood that he had been permitted to burn. The Christmas trees that Mr. Brown grows sometimes are diseased, and at times he might

have 10 or so trees that need to be burned. With the limited farmland in Springettsbury Township, even if all the farmers in Springettsbury burned at one time it would not cause any smog.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Chief Hickman to explain the Ordinance and how it would affect Mr. Brown's Christmas Tree Farm.

**HICKMAN** Chief Hickman referred the issue to Mr. Stern.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there are two sections in the Ordinance which deal specifically with farming. The first, if the Board approves the Ordinance, would allow fires set for the prevention and control of disease or pests when approved by the Department of Environmental Protection, a requirement. Also regarding fires set in conjunction with the production of agricultural commodities, accommodations are permitted if the fires are set in the premises of the farm operation. Mr. Stern continued that if Mr. Brown had ten trees that had to be burned because of disease, the property owner should notify DEP, which consists of a form to be filled out, which enables DEP to keep records of pests.

**BROWN** Mr. Brown asked if he had ground he were clearing what would be involved.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that another requirement would include fires set for the purpose of clearing trees and shrubs, the property owner should use an air curtain destructor.

**BROWN** Mr. Brown was not sure of that type of equipment.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that the equipment could probably be rented, and explained that this would act like a large fan placed over top of a pit in which you burn, which increases the heat of the fire so that complete combustion takes place.

**BROWN** Mr. Brown stated he could understand that this would enable people to burn and helps the farmers.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the air curtain destructor is required by the state if a farmer burns as York is in an air basin.

**BROWN** Mr. Brown asked what the requirement was a month ago or before the burning ban was enacted. Mr. Brown stated he came to the meeting to see what he could do to change the Ordinance to be advantageous to the farmers.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there are a few extra things you have to do, but it is required by state law regardless of whether the Ordinance is adopted or not.

**BROWN** Mr. Brown asked when the law came into affect and stated that if burning were done in the past it was against the law.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that it was his understanding from DEP that this took place when York became an air basin due to the poor air quality. The Township Ordinances comply with DEP requirements.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Brown if he had a better understanding of the matter.

**BROWN** Mr. Brown stated that he did have better understanding but, because it affects him, he wished he wouldn't need the air curtain to burn just to clean up a little bit of ground in the Township.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober provided an update on the two active construction projects. The Harrowgate project has begun ,and contractors are on site digging up pipeline. Things appear to be proceeding well.

Mr. Schober reported that the PLC Upgrade contractor has been moving on site replacing the input and output racks, stringing wire and running fiber optic cables. No questions or concerns have come from the contractors.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how the sewers function when any sewer rehabilitation takes place. Mr. Pasch wondered if a by-pass system would be in place.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that a by-pass pump is put in by requirement, and service is maintained.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Schober had heard from DEP regarding the 537 Plan sewage management program.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that Mr. Hinkle had prepared some work related to the on-lot sewage system. Solicitor Yost was working on the Ordinances. The matter is moving along.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani reported two updates, one concerning the traffic signal at Pleasant Valley Road and Mt. Zion Road. The consultant decided to re-program the signal, but unfortunately, the signal was hit by lightning, and in addition is hard-wired to the signal at Whiteford Road. The re-programming may be delayed as a result but should be completed within the next few weeks. Thirteen to sixteen seconds could be added to the green time on Pleasant Valley road, which would result in a significant change.

Mr. Luciani also reported that he and Charlie Lauer had visited some places within the Township following the rain damage. One of the areas visited was the Industrial Park near the prison, and this area will be monitored more closely in the future in order to make some improvements.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked Mr. Luciani whether he would provide something in writing relating to the concerns in that area. He stated that this was the third time that the flooding had occurred in Stony Brook, and arrived at the conclusion that at least partially the problem is the pond between Pleasant Valley Road and Route 30. Something concrete needs to be in writing.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated, in addition, that since the time the basin had been evaluated, every other development had provided independent storm water from that basin.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Amic whether there was any water damage where the Township might receive Federal money that was available.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there was no property or roadway damage to his knowledge. There may have been a few hundred dollars of overtime spent.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated that no damage occurred.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that perhaps the area under the railroad tracks may be different.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that pond discharges into other areas that were out over their banks in the storm. The Road House parking lot was completely under water. Mr. Schenck added that Mr. Luciani's thought of holding the water upstream in a pond would be a better solution.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that there are a lot of plans under consideration with more coming within the watershed. It does not have to be above Route 30 to cause a problem because if we're not holding the water above 30 it's compounding the problem. The other ponds within the Township were all doing their job. The pond under discussion is not doing what it was designed to do or was designed improperly.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Luciani about stop signs at the intersection of Memory Lane Extended and Pleasant Valley Road. He added that he had witnessed an "almost accident" there and last week witnessed an actual accident. Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Luciani to review it.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated he would do so and added that a Traffic and Engineering Study would need to be done in order to change the stop signs. Charlie Lauer could do the study any day. A flashing light up the hill could be added to make for a safer condition.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed and stated he had not heard any arguments against changing it.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that traffic coming down Memory Lane needs to be observed carefully due to the bend and slope. Adding a stop sign will be a dangerous situation coming down the hill.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani added that there would be a learning curve for the stop sign.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that there is a sharp right turn there, and motorists slow down to make that turn.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that most of the traffic coming down the hill are people who travel the road frequently.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked about the turning lane on Plymouth Road.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani reported that he spoke with the owner of Henry Beverage. One of the items that occurred since the last meeting is that the hotel is planning an expansion of rooms and a second hotel. As part of that one of their other entrances will be closed. Plymouth Road will be lined up with their entrance, which may warrant a signal at that location.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that the intersection is a dangerous situation where people turn into the hotel at Plymouth.

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated another item relating to East Market Street at the 83 underpass where the drains are showed that they worked very well in the last heavy rainfall with no flooding.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he heard that the area had been unbelievably improved.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned Erlen Drive during the storm.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that no flooding was reported in that area at all.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert provided an update on items of interest since his 9/15/99 status report, most of which centered around the Diversion Pumping Station. The two railroad property matters are nearly resolved. Norfolk Southern or Conrail is drafting a final agreement for not only the Diversion Pumping Station, but also the Parallel Interceptor. Those drafts should be received during the next week to 10 days. CSX had withdrawn their preliminary objection relative to the filing, and the conclusion will be a monetary matter. Solicitor Yost had completed the legal opinion and provided it to R.K.& K. That will be added to the other documentation referred to as Part B that DEP requires prior to the award. DEP also requires a “Finding of No Significant Impact” by EPA. They are completing that now with Fish & Wildlife Service finding no endangered species in the project area. They have officially received that document. All the bid information will be incorporated with some additional cost information requested from Mr. Amic, which will be placed on the proper EPA form, completed and sent to DEP. Then the contract can be awarded and a Notice to Proceed forwarded. We are missing one piece of information from the construction contractor, Phillips Brothers, the contractor providing electrical work for the Diversion Pumping Station. Some additional insurance and bonding information is due from them next week. Unless something comes out of the woodwork, we will be in a position to issue award. Mr. Halbert reported that there would then be a several months of construction.

Mr. Halbert reported on the Parallel Interceptor and stated that it is ready for bidding. One issue in question is whether or not the Millcreek Interceptor rehabilitation project would be incorporated. Mr. Amic had been provided a letter of recommendation of revisions to that contract form, which should substantially reduce the cost of that installation, whether or not it is a stand alone job or integral to the Parallel Interceptor. R.K.& K. will wait for a decision as to which direction they wish to go and then will be able to be in a position to advertise for the Parallel Interceptor.

One last item relative to Bio-Solids, Mr. Halbert advised he did receive an October, 1992 paper from a publication a number of years ago relative to sludge from Mr. Bishop. That information will be incorporated into the Bio-Solids study.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether the Murphy & Dittenhafer project is progressing.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he spoke with Todd Grove, architect with Murphy & Dittenhafer, and on Friday, October 1, or Monday, October 4 depending if all the contractors can be here, a pre-construction meeting is planned. At that time Mr. Amic hoped to grant a Notice to Proceed. Mr. Amic stated that by the second week of October construction will begin.

#### **Groundbreaking Ceremony**

The suggested groundbreaking ceremony being planned could be held mid week the second week of October. He asked the Board for their consideration for the groundbreaking ceremony. He will ask Mr. Dittenhafer to be present along with the Board. He requested the press to attend as he considered the matter an event.

**Consensus of the Board was to have the Groundbreaking Ceremony on Tuesday, October 5 at 8:30 a.m.**

#### **4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

##### **A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 9/23/99**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO PAY REGULAR PAYABLES AS DETAILED IN THE PAYABLE LISTING OF 9/23/99. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

#### **5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

##### **A. Professional Fund Raiser – Mt. Zion Park Master Plan**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that information had been received from the Professional Fund Raisers. Mr. Amic had spoken with the Fund Raiser who expressed continued interest and provided some additional thoughts on how to approach the campaign. Mr. Amic stated that the information was not exactly what the Board wanted.

**PASCH**

Mr. Pasch stated that he had contacted John Schmitt's office. However, he was out of town. Having made a number of telephone calls, Mr. Pasch reported that Bob Woods, President of the United Way, coordinates the Capital Campaign Review Board planning. He was not in, but Vickie Klinedinst advised that she thought there was a \$250,000 threshold, which if a project would be under \$250,000 they don't need to be involved. Another person, Dan Meckley, advised that the Board would like a presentation setting forth the goals, how much it will cost, how much the Township would commit, what is the money intended for, why do we think contributions should be solicited. What the Board would do is review, make suggestions, and try to be helpful in any way possible. He felt that they've been very successful in the campaigns, and the people who have come in for campaigns going through them for timing especially have been very successful. If you get two or three campaigns going at one time, or ten campaigns then nobody wins. He did provide a suggestion to go to Bill Zimmerman at the Wolf organization, and Bill is the Vice Chairman; John Schmitt is the Chairman. Bill said there are two steps, (1) to submit information through Bob Woods at the United Way as to what the Township would like, and Bob would let us know when there is an upcoming meeting of the Board. They usually meet in four to six-month intervals. (2) Have a Feasibility Study that would be presented to the Board. They would review and make suggestions on timing, content, etc. Bill made it clear that the Township does not need their approval; that's not necessary, but with their input we might have a better idea of the success and probably better cooperation within the community. Bill Zimmerman suggested that if we have a Feasibility Study consider having someone do a the study with the understanding that they would not get the job of the fund raising because it's in their own best interests to say that the Feasibility Study says go ahead. It's an interesting concept. He also said, as Dan had said, that we should be prepared with the goals and the Township involvement/commitment and the Feasibility Study before we went to the Board.

Some comments from some of the conversations Mr. Pasch had were that none of them could remember a municipality doing such a campaign for a park or anything like that in this area and that the leaders involved in this Review Board are people like Mr. Appell, John Schmitt, Bob Kinsley, Bob Stewart and Bill Zimmerman. These are all people in the community that have the potential to make sizable contributions. Mr. Pasch thought it would be in our best interest if, when we do this Feasibility Study, proceed then before we commit any additional funds and see what their "take" is on it. Whether they say you will succeed or the likelihood is that you won't succeed. It would be a good idea for us to do that. We should go with just a Feasibility Study.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic about the information before the Board tonight and added that it really doesn't offer that approach.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that it did in an off-handed way; "x" number of dollars to do this, and "x" number of dollars to do that.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that it was very similar to what we had.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that they are just putting a number at the bottom and saying if they go this far that's what it is.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether they understood what you were asking.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they understood that we wanted to see a staged approach to this much in line with what Mr. Pasch's comments.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that apparently the firm doesn't want to do this the way the Board wants it done.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that on this particular contractor, if we can't communicate at this level, then it's an indication of where we'll be down the road.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated agreement and added that Mr. Gurreri's comments are correct.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that with the other proposal, we have the ability to do what Ken suggested, i.e., to contract for the Feasibility Study. Mr. Schenck stated he would be in favor of that.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that in spite of what Mr. Zimmerman said about not offering the other contract, you still don't have to do that if you go for the Feasibility Study, but it can be colored. If we then go to the Capital Campaign Review Board and get their feedback and input based on what is gleaned from the Feasibility Study there would be a second input from them as to whether it will be worth it or not.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that it was his recollection that the Newton Group would go to the same Review Board.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that was correct, but that the Township has to be an integral part of going to that Board to hear what they've got to say.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she was assured that the group has a pulse on the money that is available.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the motion would be that the Newton Group should be commissioned to organize, arrange and conduct a six-week planning study on behalf of Springettsbury Township in the amount quoted in their April, 1999 report, which commits the Township to \$7,200. That's what that portion is, which is still considerably less than we were offered elsewhere.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED THAT THE NEWTON GROUP BE COMMISSIONED TO ORGANIZE, ARRANGE AND CONDUCT A SIX-WEEK PLANNING STUDY ON BEHALF OF SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP IN THE AMOUNT QUOTED IN THEIR APRIL, 1999 REPORT NOT TO EXCEED \$7,200. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Nitrification Tank Mixer Repair – Permission to Prepare Specifications and Advertise for Bid (recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that this item is a Wastewater Staff request for permission to prepare specifications and advertise for bid to repair three of the Wastewater Nitrification Tank Mixers. The estimated costs and the budget information was shown in his Manager's Report. The estimate for these repairs is \$12,855, and \$20,000 was budgeted. The gears themselves may need some replacement as well.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned the difference between capital and maintenance items.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that this item is a capital item.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck added that it is a capital item because existing pumps are being rebuilt.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the item is in the capital budget.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether it should be in the capital budget.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it's the same pump, and it's a repair. Mr. Amic indicated Mr. Schenck was correct to a point.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Crooks whether this work should be bid where people got into bonds and draw specs. A vendor would rebuild a mixer and would probably be the original manufacturer most likely.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks responded that the work would be done by a factory approved shop.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck restated the question as to whether it is necessary to bid specs and go through that whole elongated process.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that it is a repair. If it's the same item and it's not upgraded or made better, it's a repair. However, it must comply with the Code.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost added that a Second Class Township Code doesn't make any distinction between repair, just the dollar amount.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the expenditure alone requires that it be bid. It seems like we're going to spend a lot of money and a lot of time just to get someone to quote to rebuild these things.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated it was estimated to cost about \$20,000 and the Second Class Township Code requires bidding at \$10,000.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that they requested permission to draw the specs and bid the project.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO PREPARE SPECS AND ADVERTISE FOR THE BID OF REPAIRING THE NITRIFICATION TANK MIXER REPAIRS. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added a comment that if repairs were ordered only for one mixer it would be way under \$20,000, and the paperwork wouldn't be required.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that Mr. Pasch was correct. However, Mr. Yost should comment.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost added that if all three need the same repair at the same time that could be construed as avoiding the bidding requirements were we to piece-meal.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated this is something that should be reviewed.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that perhaps a maintenance schedule could be generated.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that a preventative maintenance schedule would indicate that equipment should be repaired within a certain number of hours but schedule one mixer at a time over a certain length of time and then the paperwork could be avoided.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks reported that there are two mixers involved. There were two mixers done last year, but because of what was found with those we felt it prudent to try to accelerate the repairs during the next three years. There are three scheduled for this year and three scheduled for next year. Originally it was felt it could be done under a repair basis without being a capital item but then it was found that because of the dollar amount it did need to be bid.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the two done in 1998 were bid.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks responded that they were not bid. The total expenditure was less than \$9,000 for the two of them.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch reiterated that some type of maintenance schedule should be devised to set these forth as to when they are to be done in order to avoid a lot of extra paperwork.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed but would not want to give the impression that they should postpone necessary maintenance in order to not have to bid certain items.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested that it be set up on a pre-arranged schedule.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that in this situation what was found was when they did it last year they discovered the equipment was in worse shape than anticipated so they had to accelerate this maintenance schedule. No amount of planning would indicate the shape of the equipment.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated that they do oil analysis and vibration analysis to determine without actually going into the machine, but the tests are limited. More damage was found when the unit was opened up than anticipated.

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Planning Module – Bruaw Track – A3-67939-325-3 – 20,000 GPD**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic briefly commented on the Planning Module from Manchester Township, their Church Road park in the amount of 20,000 GPD. The gallonage is in the Chapter 94 report.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE PLANNING MODULE FOR BRUAW TRACK A3-67939-325-3 – 20,000 GPD. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Planning Module Yorktown Heights – York Township – A3-67971-487-3 – 11,813 GPD**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic recommended the Yorktown Heights Planning Module. This item covered additional flow of 11,813 GPD, which is included in the Chapter 94 report.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO APPROVE THE PLANNING MODULE FOR YORKTOWN HEIGHTS IN YORK TOWNSHIP FOR 11,813 GPD. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Land Development 97-19 Two Ton, Inc. – Burger King – Granting Extension of Time to 12/9/99**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented on granting another extension of time to the Township for the Land Development by Two Ton, Inc. – Burger King to 12/9/99.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO ACCEPT THE EXTENSION OF TIME GRANTED BY TWO TON, INC. – BURGER KING FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT 97-19 THROUGH DECEMBER 9, 1999. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Subdivision 98-06 Two Ton, Inc. – Burger King – Granting Extension of Time to 12/9/99**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented regarding the Subdivision 98-06 for Two Ton, Inc. Burger King granting us an extension of time to 12/9/99.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO ACCEPT THE TIME EXTENSION GRANTED BY TWO TON, INC. – BURGER KING FOR SUBDIVISION 98-06 THROUGH DECEMBER 9, 1999. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**E. Land Development 99-10 – Athletic Lettering – Granting Extension of Time to 10/15/99.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented on Land Development 99-10 granting an extension of time to 10/15/99.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO ACCEPT THE GRANT OF AN EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ATHLETIC LETTERING LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-10 TO 10/15/99. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**F. Land Development 99-08 – Colony Park Lanes East, 3905 East Market Street – 9/23/99**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented regarding Land Development 99-08 for Colony Park Lanes East on East Market Street. This covered an addition of 1,044 sq. ft. to the front of the existing Colony Park Bowling Lanes. Mr. Stern advised that there is a waiver from the requirement to submit a preliminary plan, modification from buffering requirements and modification from the requirement to show topography for the entire site.

**TROUTMAN** Mr. Byron Troutman of Gordon Brown Associates, explained the project as an 18' x 58' building addition for the purpose of an eating establishment and a bar. It is an expansion of the existing luncheon area currently in use.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the addition would extend into the parking lot.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Messrs. Stern and Luciani whether all their questions and concerns have been met.

**STERN** Mr. Stern assured her his concerns were met.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated he had addressed all impervious areas; there were no stormwater issues, and Planning Commission had addressed it as well.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that they will be putting in fire doors and fire walls so that they won't have to sprinkler the addition.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there were any additional requirements for a sewage module.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded no. Sewer capacity is available in Chapter 94.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-08 FOR COLONY PARK LANES EAST, 3905 EAST MARKET STREET – 9/23/99 WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:**

- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **MODIFICATION FROM BUFFERING REQUIREMENTS**
- **MODIFICATION FROM REQUIREMENT TO SHOW TOPOGRAPHY FOR THE ENTIRE SITE.**
- **CONDITIONED ON SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY.**

**MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**G. Land Development 99-09 Wolf Printing – Granting Extension of Time to 10/15/99**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented regarding Land Development 99-09 for Wolf Printing granting an extension of time to 10/15/99.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO ACCEPT THE GRANT OF EXTENSION OF TIME FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-09 FOR WOLF PRINTING TO 10/15/99. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**H. Rocky Ridge County Park Pavilions – Waiver of Land Development (tabled)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented regarding the Rocky Ridge County Park Pavilions, which had come before the Board several months before. Mr. Mike Fobes and Mr. Tom Brant of the York County Parks Department were in attendance to speak for this plan.

Mr. Stern advised that he and Mr. Amic had met with representatives of the County Parks to discuss the pavilions. Messrs. Fobes and Brant will elaborate on this matter. They have some grant sources which will be lost if construction is not started. They have offered to us that, if construction is permitted, they will not put picnic tables in them until the transportation issues are resolved. The Deininger Road/Mt. Zion Road intersection may be included in next year's work along North Sherman and Mt. Zion Road. If not, then it would be elsewhere in the 12-year plan. PennDot had met with Mr. Amic and Mr. Stern to review the site. They tried to encourage PennDot to include that intersection along with the other project that's already scheduled for next year. No decision had been made.

**FOBES** Mr. Fobes stated that County Parks is going after funding to do a master plan for Rocky Ridge as an update to the last plan.

**BRANT** Mr. Brant indicated they are looking for an alternative entrance as well. They had also taken this issue to the York County Transportation Committee.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the one thing that concerned him was putting space in for 400 people, but that it wouldn't be used since no tables and chairs would be placed there.

**FOBES** Mr. Fobes stated that the next step would be to flag it off. We don't want to lose the grant money.

- FOBES** Mr. Fobes added that no parking near the pavilion would be in place.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that for people to use the pavilions a permit has to be issued. No permits would be issued for the new pavilion.
- FOBES** Mr. Fobes did not think it would be a big problem.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the justification appeared to be that there was grant money available and asked how much grant money was under consideration.
- FOBES** Mr. Fobes responded that the pavilions are funded by the Pennsylvania Conservation Corps. They pay 75% of the pavilion and do all the labor involved with the building.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked when the deadline for utilizing this grant money would be.
- FOBES** Mr. Fobes responded that review is completed on July 1, 2000.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether it could be done this year.
- FOBES** Mr. Fobes responded that one had been approved for this year and one approved for the following year.
- BRANT** Mr. Brant indicated their grant cycle runs July 1 to June 30. That's subject to an application about 6 months ahead of time.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether both pavilions have to be built by the end of the year.
- FOBES** Mr. Fobes responded that one is before July 1, 1999 and one is after July 1, 2000. That was part of the application to identify the work – to do a year-long project.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that personally she felt that realistically it would be very foolish of the Board to inhibit the ability to secure grant money for the pavilions. It may not be used through a formal permit and it may not have tables, but the people in the community would use those pavilions.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether, if you can't build these pavilions in Rocky Ridge, is there any way for you to take advantage of that grant in one of your other numerous parks.

- FOBES** Mr. Fobes responded that they had moved one down to Rudy Park, but that right now it was pretty full there.
- BRANT** Mr. Brant added that this area lends itself because it was the staging area for the landfill. When they left the area it was an area separate by itself. The access road into that area could even be closed to secure it.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that his question concerning the justification still does not address the traffic problem. If the justification is that you're going to lose 75% of \$17,000 or equivalent in benefit to the park service, are you losing that benefit completely or are you just needing to reorganize things and take advantage of this amount of hours you have available somewhere else. He questioned whether there would be a net loss to the York County Park system.
- BRANT** Mr. Brant stated they would have to go back to the state and change the scope of work.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that could be done.
- BRANT** Mr. Brant stated that it could be done.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that the intersection at Deininger Road is a very bad intersection, and something has to be done regardless of anything being done in the park.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch wondered whether in nine months the state would resolve the problem.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that he would not want to stand in their way of building the pavilions. However, the traffic issue there is there now and is a serious problem. There are three agencies here: a County Park with exits on a state highway in Springettsbury Township.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that it was his understanding that public safety in Springettsbury Township is the Board's responsibility. Public safety on roads is not particularly the responsibility of the County.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the pavilions could be erected in the park so as not to lose the grant money. However, the traffic problem has to be satisfied in his opinion.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch did not think he should be involved in determining which park they should put the pavilions in. It's designated because the use is there.

Mr. Pasch would not like to see them just take grant money and spend it some place where the use is not going to be.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that the only justification they came with was that they were going to lose money. They're not going to lose money.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that they would lose the opportunity. Just to take that and put it in another park where it doesn't get used doesn't make sense.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that there is a real demand for these places, and it would be utilized no matter where it was placed. People are using parks more and more in the last few years.

**BRANT** Mr. Brant stated that Rocky Ridge was identified over a year ago because of the opportunity that existed from the staging area when the landfill people moved out.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that he received correspondence today asking he and the Manager of Hellam Township for support of a comprehensive plan of Rocky Ridge Park. The County would be applying for significant funding for the expansion of the park. The two pavilions are probably not the end of what the County folks will do in the park.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called attention to the hour and the agenda.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the matter had been previously tabled.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Messrs. Fobes and Brant, if the matter were tabled again, how much time can you afford before you see that this project is lost in Rocky Ridge.

**BRANT** Mr. Brant indicated that Mr. Stern had suggested that earlier during the meeting with York County Planning Commission for them to move it up to change some of the scope of PennDot's projects.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that if PennDot agrees to approve the project for Sherman Street, then it will be done next year; if not, it would not be included in the 12-year plan until at least next year. The 12-year planning process was just begun. At the earliest it would be 2001 or 2002 before they could actually do the improvements at Deininger.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that was correct; the first priority was Sherman and Mt. Zion, the T intersection. Mr. Amic and Mr. Stern attempted to put Deininger in the package but do not know if they were successful at this point.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked for any further discussion. Hearing none, she asked for a decision. She asked Mr. Stern if the Board rejected the request for the waiver, would the project be dead.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that they could still do a Land Development study.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that at that point they could do a Traffic Study, which would bring them back to the same discussion.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that if a Traffic Study were done, there were traffic studies done in the past which indicated they were going to be an F situation and turned out to be less.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that was a good statement; it's shown as a Parks and Recreation Area on the zoning map. Traffic alone would be a weak grounds to deny the application.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the York County Planning Commission made any statements about this. He added that he noticed Commissioner Glass was at the meeting.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that she serves the Parks Board in some capacity.

**BRANT** Mr. Brant indicated she was with the York County Transportation Committee as well. That meeting was not focused on this intersection.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO DENY THE REQUEST FOR A WAIVER OF LAND DEVELOPMENT, COUNTY OF YORK, FOR THE ROCKY RIDGE COUNTY PARK PAVILIONS. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned Mr. Yost about this motion and the term "denial."

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated he had no problem with the motion.

**MESSRS. BISHOP AND GURRERI VOTED FOR THE MOTION. MOTION DIED. MESSRS. PASCH, SCHENCK AND CHAIRMAN MITRICK VOTED NO.**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT THE WAIVER BE GRANTED FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT TO YORK COUNTY PARK SYSTEM FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO PARK PAVILIONS CONDITIONED ON THE AGREEMENT THAT THE PAVILIONS WILL NOT BE PUT INTO USE UNTIL THE TRAFFIC ISSUES, PARKING, AND SITE PLANNING AND ALL**

**GENERAL PLANNING ISSUES ARE RESOLVED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND.  
MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI AND MR. BISHOP VOTED NO.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Messrs. Fobes and Brant understood what had taken place.

**FOBES** Mr. Fobes asked for clarification.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the waiver had been granted and permission had been granted to go ahead and construct the pavilions, but an agreement is in place with the Township that they will not be placed in use until the other factors are satisfied.

**I. Rocky Ridge County Park Pavilions – Waiver from Permit Fees (tabled)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern explained the Waiver request from building permit fees for park pavilions.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck added that, in the past when these waivers were granted, the Board still had expected reimbursement for actual expenses.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that was correct; however, on this project the expenses would be very minimal. He did not recommend that condition be attached.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO GRANT THE WAIVER FROM PERMIT FEES  
FOR THE COUNTY OF YORK FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO PARK  
PAVILIONS. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY  
CARRIED.**

**J. Rocky Ridge County Park – Seeking Permission to Erect PennDot “Tourist  
Oriented Directional Signage” (prohibited by Ordinance).**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented about item J for Rocky Ridge Seeking Permission to Erect PennDot “Tourist Oriented Directional Signage.”

**FOBES** Mr. Fobes and Mr. Brant displayed a sign, which would be similar to the one for Rocky Ridge. The state pulled the previous signs that were not part of the TODS Program. They had worked through the local PennDot office. They talked with Mr. Stern who advised them of Springettsbury Township’s Ordinance for signs. The proposed replacement signs would be placed at the entrance to Rocky Ridge.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the size of the present sign.

- FOBES** Mr. Fobes responded it was 36” and produced photographs of the present sign.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked where the new sign would be placed.
- FOBES** Mr. Fobes indicated that for the present a signature is needed on the TODS application for PennDot to view the site for placement. Unofficially they would probably be placed at the same location as the park entrance signs.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked Mr. Fobes if he agreed with the location of the signs.
- FOBES** Mr. Fobes indicated that PennDot may indicate the signs should be closer and probably there is a particular distance from an intersection.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether anyone had reviewed the application to be executed by Springettsbury.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic advised he had not but that he would review the document.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked about PennDot’s ability to place signs all over Route 30. If the Board granted permission would it be granting the right to plaster these signs wherever they want, or can the Board be specific to say we go along with what the County Park wants, which is two signs one on either side of the entrance to the park?
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated if the document to be signed were too involved he would ask Solicitor Yost for his review.
- FOBES** Mr. Fobes indicated that the signs are \$200 each.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that if the Board gave permission for two particular signs, that would not be giving carte blanche approval to do whatever they want.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated he would not think so, but it would depend upon the agreement. He hoped that the application form limited the approval, if given, to the two signs in question.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that upon review if he had questions he would fax his questions to Solicitor Yost. There is on-going concern in Springettsbury Township for PennDot signs and PennDot’s ability to permit signs.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that the park entrance sign that presently exists is confusing. Mr. Pasch also stated that the proposed sign would be a big

improvement, and as long as this would not be giving carte blanche to erect signs, he would be in favor of it.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated it would be to the County Parks' advantage to table the issue and to re-focus on it after the application could be reviewed.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked whether this item were something that needed to be addressed immediately. He projected it could be addressed in three weeks.

**FOBES** Mr. Fobes responded that it did not need to be immediately addressed.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that if, in fact, the Board were in support of the signs but do not have the authority to approve their signs, the Township would not want to delay them in whatever process they need to go through, either a variance or asking to amend the Ordinance.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that Mr. Stern made a good point.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost commented that it is a state program.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Stern if he was stating that a variance would be an alternative.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that was correct.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether there was a chance they could get one.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it would depend on Board support.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost for comment.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that if this is a fixed program of the state for all these types of park signs, they would either need a variance or the Ordinance would have to be amended.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that the alternative would be the impetus to start the process of amending it.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick directed her comments to Solicitor Yost. She indicated that it sounded as though there was a consensus of the Board in favor of this signage. She asked for his recommendation regarding the action to take.

- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that it would be up to the Zoning Officer. He stated that even if the Board agreed the Zoning Office would not issue a permit because it violates the Ordinance.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated then, that the choices are: (a) a Variance or (b) amend the Ordinance.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost agreed.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he is a Zoning Officer and recommended that the matter be varied. This can be written in such a manner that only these two particular signs can be erected.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that a Variance was clearly the correct procedure. Zoning Hearing Board action would not be necessary.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick directed that the County Parks apply for a Variance due to the fact that the Board had spent considerable effort to establish the Ordinance for signage and is protective of it.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic requested the County Parks representatives to meet with him about the process.

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck reminded the Board of the County Convention to be held on November 4. Registration begins at 4:30 p.m. Mr. Schenck indicated that the invitation had not gone directly to the Township auditors, but the intent is that they be invited. He asked Mr. Amic to send a copy out to the auditors. He added that any staff members who wished to attend are welcome. The speaker, Bev Zigler, is a professor at Penn State and will be addressing Public Policy.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would register everyone.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he received a communication referred to earlier about the sludge from a Township resident, Katie Dolan, who is married to Steve Baker, who addressed the Board at a previous meeting. The information entitled, "Sewage Sludge, a Dangerous Fertilizer." Mr. Bishop read the last paragraph, which indicated the same objective, i.e., that the information be provided to the elected officials in municipalities who have to make the decisions relating to sludge. This confirmed to Mr. Bishop that the Board is on the right track.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reminded the Board of the Emergency Services Commission meeting dates:

- Plan Presentation to Volunteers – Tuesday, October 12 at 7 p.m. at the Hampton Inn;
- Vote on the Proposal - Tuesday, October 19 at 7 p.m. at the Township Offices.

Mr. Bishop encouraged all of the Supervisors to attend as an indication of their support of the effort. There will be a time for questions and answers.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reported that he received a letter from Dave Eckman relating to the position of the Firefighters' Union. The union had a meeting and voted unanimously that they will recommend to all of their members that they abstain from voting on the Joint Operating Agreement.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether that would affect any requirement for a quorum or would this be a majority vote.

**BISHOP** There is no quorum requirements in any of these organizations.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that there are quorum requirements, which will result in them having no quorum so they will have accomplished their agenda.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked for explanation of this quorum, i.e., of who.

**HICKMAN** Fire Chief Hickman indicated it would be a quorum of the all of the members.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that each of the fire companies requires 12 active members to be present to have a quorum.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Ms. Bowders handed him a letter from the career firefighters that had been mailed suggesting to the public if they're called on a call and they do a good job, that they should call the Township and tell the Township that they did a good job.

**HICKMAN** Fire Chief Hickman advised that he had not known about the letter until he had been made aware of it by telephone this morning.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that she had received a letter from Mr. Schell of Martin Library requesting that the appropriations for the upcoming year be increased by \$1,000 from \$30,000 to \$31,000.

Chairman Mitrick asked for a decision regarding Trick or Treat night in Springettsbury Township.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that, unless there would be an exception, it would be held October 31<sup>st</sup>.

**Consensus of the Board was to hold Trick or Treat on Sunday, October 31, Halloween Night. They stated that Trick or Treat would always be held on October 31<sup>st</sup> in Springettsbury Township.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reminded the Board about Mr. Phil Ort's interest in serving on the Recycling Committee. Chairman Mitrick requested the Board to meet and interview Mr. Ort prior to the Regular Board of Supervisors Meeting held on October 14th.

**Consensus of the Board was to meet with Mr. Ort at 7:15 p.m. on October 14<sup>th</sup>.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Mr. Amic to write Mr. Ort and advise him of the meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick advised she received a telephone call from a resident regarding the condition of the bathroom at Springettsbury Park. There were no supplies in the bathroom. Chairman Mitrick requested Mr. Amic to address the situation.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that the EYC had offered to re-seat a set of bleachers in the park. There are two sets, one is wooden, which had been condemned. The other structure is a metal one, also condemned.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the insurance people came at his request to view the bleachers. Mr. Amic instructed Mr. Lauer to remove the bleachers, and the EYC was notified to repair theirs. Because the handrails only come down half way, some work needed to be done to lengthen the handrails. His recommendation is to repair them. Mr. Amic requested the Board's wishes.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Mr. Amic to obtain a report from Mr. Lauer concerning the bleachers.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that he received a letter from Paul Lutz of the York Little League. He would like to have an informal meeting with the Supervisors regarding the plans for Springettsbury Park and ideas for Shipley Field.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Shipley Field is being upgraded and would not be affected by the new Administration Building. He will respond to Mr. Lutz as the to appropriate time for a meeting.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost reported that CSX had seen the wisdom of withdrawing its preliminary objection filed to the Declaration of Taking for the Pump Station rights-of-way. Absolute right had been obtained. The City Sewer Authority had executed a right-of-way agreement. The only outstanding issue pertained to the Norfolk Southern Occupancy Permit, which Solicitor Yost indicated was forthcoming.

Solicitor Yost reported that the Amechi case was completed/dead.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic thanked the staff who put in extra time in the early morning hours during the tail end of Hurricane Floyd weather. A special thanks was given to Jim Crooks for the field work that he did, his attention and his communication to Mr. Amic. An additional special thanks was given to Mark Hodgkinson, who was successful in his efforts, as well as Charlie Lauer, who put in a lot of time and effort to preclude what could have been difficult situations. Mr. Amic provided a full description in his report to the Board.

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Ordinance 99-06 – BOCA National Fire Code Penalty Provisions (recommend approval)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented regarding Ordinance 99-06 which addressed any violation of the fire lanes, improper storage of chemicals, fire extinguishers or fire suppression in kitchens, all of which violations are considered penalties and misdemeanors. Along with the other different BOCA Codes, which were addressed, the Amendment to penalty provision was missed. The BOCA Code states that the penalties are misdemeanors. Mr. Stern recommended this be changed to match the other Codes in reference to Section 19 by the Ordinances of the Township which would make this a Summary Offense with a maximum fine of \$1,000.

**ESHBACH** Police Chief Eshbach addressed the issue. The Police Department had a problem with the parking violations with Justice Kessler's office as it's written because the violations are not listed as a Summary Offense. Therefore, if they are a Misdemeanor Offense his District does not normally handle those. He could not dispose of the Misdemeanor but could if they were Summary Offenses.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated there was no question that this should be a Summary Offense.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE 99-06. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Ordinance 99-07 – BOCA & CABO Building Codes – Sprinklers  
(recommend approval)**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that at the last meeting we had asked Mr. Stern to provide speakers who would provide information on both sides of the issue; unfortunately, he was only able to secure one side of the story. Before a decision were made on an Ordinance that was very time consuming in creating, she wondered whether the Board was interested in hearing the other side of the argument.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked her what she might be considering in terms of time, people, etc.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded that someone should come in with support of the issue.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated he had “struck out.” The next round of people he would ask would be Fire Chiefs from other communities. He added that he had called all of the sprinkler companies, and the Kinsley people had helped him.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated she had simply asked the question in the interest of the Board.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that, if there were somebody available on a quick basis, he did not think the matter was urgent. He commented that it had been there for a long time, and another month would not make a lot of difference, but he wondered whether there was anyone who was available. He questioned whether it simply delayed the issue.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded that she did not think it had been before the Board for a very long time. The information was brought up two meetings before, and Mr. Stern had been asked to provide speakers. Chairman Mitrick was not convinced that there isn’t someone out there who could at least present objectively the other side of the story. She indicated she was not doing this simply to delay it; that the vote would be the vote, but she would want her colleagues to be as informed as possible with the other side of the story.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he had no objection to tabling for a month and taking it up at the next meeting and having somebody there to talk about it. Mr. Pasch indicated agreement that if there were some very strong opposition to it, the Board should be aware of it.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri pointed out that this had been advertised and that a hearing had been held.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that was correct.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that if anyone had anything to say, it would have been presented then.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded that advertising and requesting speakers are two different things.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that Mr. Stern had done both.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated he was in favor of voting on the matter.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Gurreri whether he would cast his vote uninformed.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri responded that he believed he was informed. The Chief provided his thoughts, a resident gave his thoughts, and Mr. Stern provided input in favor of the BOCA Code limitations.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that he sat through all of the two previous sessions. It's not that difficult of an issue to understand. What it comes down to is more of the emotional kinds of pleas one way or another. The amount of work that goes into the BOCA Codes is not a particularly difficult thing and seemed to be one of the easiest ways to take emotions out of the issue.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated he could see no harm in waiting until the next meeting. If someone wants to come in, they can come in under Citizens Comments and give their input. In his opinion the only sense of urgency was to get it off the agenda.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that unless someone would come in with something very strongly opposed to passing this Ordinance, he would be voting for the Ordinance. He added that he is not opposed to waiting for another week.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he was in favor of voting now. (9/23/99).

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested a consensus. Mrs. Mitrick would like to wait, and asked Mr. Amic to make a strong attempt to find a speaker to discuss the other side of the issue. She asked whether there was a consensus to go ahead and vote on the matter tonight, or whether it should be tabled.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he would not be in attendance at the next meeting.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he would not mind waiting, but it would be a matter where the full Board should be available. He indicated he was a little uncomfortable pushing things back.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether any projects would be affected by this decision.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that those who know about it would delay getting their permits until it's resolved, Meinecke Muffler, for example.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the matter would wait until October 28<sup>th</sup> for the full Board to be present.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that he did not view this as a pressing matter.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he did not have a problem waiting a month but thought it a little unreasonable to put getting speakers to come before the Board on Mr. Amic's shoulders. It's not really his job.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck agreed and added that the format would be if someone wants to come in and speak against it, they could come in and speak under Citizen's Comments. This is the way the word gets out. Mr. Stern made a strong effort to secure someone to come in.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the sprinkler people have a vested interest. He asked Mr. Stern whether none of those people were interested in coming in to talk about it.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that one was interested, Jack Kunkle of Susquehanna, but he wanted to speak in favor of the change.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether anyone was willing to change their position on this. In the past Mr. Amic had been asked to do certain things, whether he delegates it to someone to find a speaker as we did for this meeting tonight or not, that's not inappropriate. Personally she would really like to have someone to speak on the other side of the issue for the meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup>.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that action should be taken to place it on the agenda for the 28th. Mr. Stern would not have to re-advertise the issue.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO POSTPONE ACTION ON ORDINANCE 99-07 AND PLACE THAT ON THE OCTOBER 28<sup>TH</sup> AGENDA FOR ACTION. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Ordinance 99-08 – BOCA National Fire Code – Open Burning  
(recommend approval)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented regarding Ordinance 99-08, an amendment to the BOCA Fire Code, to change the requirements for Open Burning.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Stern to review the matter regarding Lee Brown and burning a small pile of trees.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that there was no DEP definition. His understanding was that a small pile of Christmas trees is considered part of farming and can be burned without the air curtain. If, however, Mr. Brown were clearing brush in order to grow his Christmas trees, which he needs to do for the 10 acres he recently purchased, then that is definitely clearing for the purpose of doing something else. He needs to dig a pit 15 or 20 ft. deep, put the material to be burned in the pit and place the fan over the top. The point of this is to keep what's burning in the pit so that everything burns completely rather than having smoke and combustibles going up in the air. Regardless of whether the purpose is change or not, you would be required to do that because York is in an air basin. The state does allow inclusion in this Ordinance allowance for residential trash burning in a barrel. That was not placed within this Ordinance, however.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE ORDINANCE 99-08 BOCA NATIONAL FIRE CODE – OPEN BURNING. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked that Mr. Stern contact Mr. Brown to be sure he understood.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated he would do so.

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – August 26, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING OF AUGUST 26, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – September 9, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 9, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that there was no Old Business requiring action.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch brought up the matter from earlier in the agenda regarding Mr. Bishop's report on the Emergency Services Commission. On page 2, John Krout said that if there were not enough money generated that the Board of Supervisors would budget for it. Mr. Pasch had a problem with that statement.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that the statement was a personal opinion of Mr. Krout, not a matter that the Emergency Services Commission agreed upon.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch reported on a matter regarding a report from the Springettsbury Township Recreation, as of August 18, 1999. The total number of people using the park was running 8,000 to 9,000 from 1992 through 1997, but in

1998/99 the total was down to 6,500 to 6,700. Mr. Pasch asked whether there had been a big drop in the use of the parks. The figures indicated there was a significant drop and needs to be reviewed.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on the police report for the month in that there was a significant increase in the forcible type of crime, i.e., murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. To date in 1999 there were 564 incidents and last year 502. Mr. Pasch would like some indication from Chief Eshbach as to whether a trend is taking place.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported no further New Business for action.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that there would be an Executive Session regarding a legal matter following this meeting.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**SEPTEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Brian Funkhouser, Environmental Engineer  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Michael Hickman, Fire Chief  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting of the Board of Supervisors to order at 7:35 p.m. Chairman Mitrick announced that there would be an Executive Session following the regular meeting regarding personnel and legal matters.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**BAKER** Mr. Steve Baker, 2252 Dixie Drive appeared before the Board of Supervisors to state his concern regarding the bio-solids/sludge issue in the township. Mr. Baker expressed concern that the township is spending \$16,000 for a proposal regarding sludge and asked what the Board's intention was for this expenditure. Mr. Baker termed the proposal a possible "white wash" of an issue that he did not consider a black and white issue and requested more information. Mr. Baker suggested that there may be other options available and volunteered to participate on any committee that would pursue other avenues.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded to Mr. Baker that the Board had received his letter. Chairman Mitrick asked Robert Halbert of Rummel, Klepper and Kahl to address the subject.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that Mr. Baker was not alone in his concern regarding bio-solids/sludge. There is little known about municipal sludge generated by a community such as Springettsbury Township. Mr. Halbert reported that the focus of the information gathering and dissemination was strictly that – informational. He stated that a fair amount of published information is available, some of which is technical in nature; some is in the minds of engineers. That particular information would be difficult for the public to follow. The concept of the proposal presented is simply to get the facts in a form that the public would understand, i.e., the technical basis of what municipal sludge is, how to generate it, what the constituents are, how to treat it, and how in some cases it can be beneficially re-used. Generally that use is agricultural. Mr. Halbert posed the questions, “Is it acceptable? Why is it? Why it may not be in some cases?” The proposal calls for the information to be put in a format that is easily understandable.

**SCHMOTZER** Mrs. Connie Schmotzer of 2428 Schoolhouse Lane asked Mr. Halbert whether the information would be equally balanced with pros and cons.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that the information would be factual and would have no opinions.

**SCHMOTZER** Mrs. Schmotzer stated that there are quite a few scientists and facts against the issue, as well as in favor of the issue.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that their work would not be done in the area of opinions.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she hoped the overview would be helpful.

**SCHMOTZER** Mr. Michael Schmotzer of 2428 Schoolhouse Lane read a letter he had written to the Board. He provided further information from the Texas Water Resource Institute stating a favorable position on the use of sludge. Included in the article were some cautions as to the concentrations of heavy metals. Mr. Schmotzer also provided information from “E”, the environmental magazine, indicating some cautionary facts. The issue of sludge becomes a public health field with an obligation to make informed decisions.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned Mr. Baker's interpretation regarding the Board's intention, i.e., to "white wash" the subject based on what the Board had set out to do, which was to have professional engineers come up with the best factual information available and present that predominantly to the Board and to other decision makers in other communities who have to make decisions about the issue. The idea of forcing the idea of sludge down people's throats is a concept that could not be further from the truth. In reality Springettsbury Township has farmers who want to have the bio-solids to apply to their fields. It can't be forced on anyone. The decision is made by individual, private farmers who are business people who want this material on their fields.

The type of information mentioned such as Texas sludge is part of the point of what is being done. The Board wants to provide information about what actually comes out of Springettsbury's plant. Mr. Bishop's understanding is a lot is known about what's coming out of the plant, what is being done to it and the safeguards in place to make it as safe as it can be. The Board wants to have that kind of information available to people who have to make decisions about using this material rather than basing it on studies from Texas or Arizona and different kinds of soils or people in England. The other comment made was that the composition of sludge is highly variable. The Board wants to know how variable it is out of Springettsbury's plant, and provide that information and to be able to compare that and know to what that is compared.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked both Mr. Halbert and Mr. Bishop for their comments.

**MEYERHOFF** Mr. Randy Meyerhoff, 11 Willamette Court (755-4870) stated that he resides in an area that has a cul-de-sac with a green space in the center. One of the neighbors parks a large pick up truck in the space. Mr. Meyerhoff had approached the Township office and had been directed to the Police Department. He discussed the matter with Officer Bailets who stated that nothing could be done since the cul-de-sac is a common area. Mr. Meyerhoff finds the pick up truck visually offensive and asked what the Supervisors might be able to do in this situation.

**ESHBACH** Police Chief Eshbach responded that because the properties have a common area there is nothing that can be done, since each property owner owns a piece of that area. If the truck is tearing up part of Mr. Meyerhoff's area possibly there might be something that could be done in Civil Court to remedy the situation.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated there might be a possibility in the Zoning Ordinance about parking. The kind of parking described might be remedied through the Ordinance. Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Amic and Mr. Stern to review the matter and respond to Mr. Meyerhoff.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri thanked Mr. Smotzer for bringing his concerns to the Board.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that the Board is looking for answers concerning bio-solids.

**SCHMOTZER** Connie Schmotzer stated that the public realizes that Springettsbury has a difficult by-product to deal with and there may be ways other than land application.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that in 1993 Springettsbury Township spent considerable money studying the problem in the Sanitary Plant. At that time there were four or five options/approaches presented to the Board. That study was provided to R. K. & K. to review what took place in the past. A lot of money had already been spent looking at options on bio-solids.

**BAKER** Mr. Baker stated that the situation would not become any easier as time goes by.

**2. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**FUNKHOUSER** Mr. Funkhouser stated that Mr. Schober had provided a written report to the Board. Mr. Schober was unable to be present. Regarding the 537 Plan DEP is reviewing the Plan and comments are expected. Concerning contract 99-04 for Harrowgate/Raleigh Drive Sewer Rehab submittals for the manholes and the line have been reviewed. PLC System Upgrade contractor has begun submitting drawings. The submittals for the computer hardware and PLC have been reviewed and approved. A meeting is being held with the contractor-reviewed drawings for the control panels and IO configurations. Contractor will be on site next week to install the fiber optic cables. Regarding the Millcreek Interceptor Messrs. Schober and Amic visited the site of the damaged fiberglass pipe. Alternatives were discussed for repairing the pipe as the bid of \$82,000 was extremely high.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the PLC system is on schedule.

**FUNKHOUSER** Mr. Funkhouser responded that it was on schedule.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani had previously provided a written report dated 9/1/99. Mr. Luciani had been reviewing Land Development/Subdivision Plans, which are going through the Planning Commission phase. Mr. Luciani urged the Board to voice any concerns/comments as early as possible in order to make the necessary changes prior to Planning Commission review.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked when these plans would come before the Board.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that they would come in October and November.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert provided an updated status report and comments. DEP Part II approval had been received from the state. Spring Garden Township Board of Supervisors had approved their portion. Yorktowne Paper right-of-way fee simple purchase agreement was completed. Regarding CSX a Condemnation filing which required a special document, had been provided. With regard to the impact of CSX on the schedule, the Notice of Intent to Award was sent to the three contractors requesting their performance, payment bonds and insurance certificates. Following approval from EPA the award would be made.

All right-of-ways need to be cleared; however, one item needs to be dealt with as part of the force main on the north side of Route 30 before it crosses Codorus and goes over to the York City. The CSX property is at issue. Mr. Halbert reported that he and Solicitor Yost discussed the right-of-way and suggested a second option, which would involve negotiation to accept a caveat of opinion, based on receiving all right-of-ways except this portion. The contractor would not be allowed to touch that area until the time that the right-of-way is cleared. This option would enable the project to move forward on schedule.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost whether he had any anticipated amount of time for such issues.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that he was optimistic that the entire matter would be worked out within 7 to 10 days. However, he agreed with Mr. Halbert on the contingency plan.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether, in the week to 10 days, that would be a negotiated settlement.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that was correct. He was optimistic that nothing would impede the progress of the project. Solicitor Yost expected a telephone conference call the following day to discuss the matter.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that, even with the contingency plan, getting CSX approval may not happen overnight. However, he would encourage Solicitor Yost to allow three or four days to pass prior to beginning another action.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether there had been any objections other than money.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that there had been no other objections and that they are past the time for filing any legitimate objections. They have not challenged the authority to take the property.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert reported on the parallel interceptor. He had reviewed the Millcreek Interceptor repairs, a potential change over. In addition to that contract there is a mechanism whereby the parallel interceptor contract working adjacent to this could add that to his contract efficiently. They would appreciate the time to evaluate this concept.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that physically was at the same place.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that the parallel interceptor is adjacent to it.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 9/9/99**
- B. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Diversion Pumping Station – Progress Billing #1 - \$4,484.57**
- C. Murphy & Dittenhafer – Municipal Building – Progress Billing #10 - \$4,728.71**

- D. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Overview/Mt. Zion Sewer Rehabilitation – Progress Billing #7 - \$814.18**
- E. Reed Smith Shaw & McClay – Progress Billing #5 - \$6,052.63**
- F. Murphy & Dittenhafer – Municipal Building – Progress Billing #11 – \$3,081.55**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked for further information regarding the sewer fund and odor problem items.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that this process is a temporary short-term fix to the odor problems, which occurred at various times in the Township. It is a type of misting which had been done in the interim to help alleviate the difficulties for the close proximity neighbors.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether he had conveyed this effort to the residents, particularly those who had come before the Board.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicate he had not previously communicated with the residents.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested that Mr. Amic communicate that fact with the residents.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would do so.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO PAY REGULAR PAYABLES AS DETAILED IN PAYABLES LISTING 9/9/99 COVERING ITEMS A. THROUGH F. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

**A. Professional Fund Raiser – Mt. Zion Park Master Plan**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that it was his understanding that the Board wished to discuss the professional fundraisers. He had provided information in his report to the Board.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked the Board whether this item was something they wished to make a decision on or review further.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he did not see any reason to wait.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that, in his opinion, once the Board starts moving on this process, they would be heading toward completing the project. The fundraisers work will bring out what funds are available and then the Board will have to decide how much Township funds will be added.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked for clarification as to whether, no matter what amount of money could be raised, that the township will pick up the rest.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded no. Depending what the fundraisers learn and depending upon what can be raised, the Board is going to have to do some more hard work and decide how much we want to spend. Maybe we want to turn it into a \$2 million project. The Board should be willing to see it through.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that if the fund raisers go out for money, the Board should have some kind of commitment as to exactly what will be spent.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that was what he wanted to be sure that the Board members understood.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that if the Township were going out to raise the funds from the community, the Board should have a commitment that the Board of Supervisors is willing to commit x-number of dollars to this project – whether that is \$500,000 or \$1 million.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that had been discussed with the fundraisers. There was some reservation on their part that was not necessarily the way to proceed. The first phase of their study would indicate at what level we want to commit.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned Mr. Schenck that he was separating their initial work as commitment to do the study which would reveal their best guess of how well the campaign is likely to do rather than committing to doing the whole project.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that once they are done with the initial study we're going to have some hard work to do. His intentions would be then to get it through the whole process. He added that the process outlined was excellent and one he had never heard.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that when the two proposed the plan to the Board in difference phases, it provided opportunity for flexibility. She agreed with Mr. Schenck in that it is important information to

ascertain how much money is in the community that could be earmarked for this. Chairman Mitrick stated it was difficult to determine how much money she would be willing to invest in Township dollars until she knows what's available.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the fundraisers also want some type of commitment that says that the Township is committed to this as a governmental body.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that if the proposals would be reviewed, both contained different language that indicated they would do a six-week planning study. It's phrased differently. That response would be what is potentially available. The second contract is more definitive. You sign the contract and pay per month. He recommended that if you commit to #2 you're committing all the way through, but if you commit them to #1 you're committing to less money.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on the #2 contract, he would not like to make a decision as to which group should be involved based solely on the fact that you can't get out of the contract. He suggested that if the Board desired a study phase, then each group should be asked to provide the same type of study.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed in that the two fundraisers provided two different proposals and stated that he was unsure whether they all had the same thought process when they put the proposal together.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic if he wished to speak with the fundraisers and ask for clarification.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that if there is a question he would discuss it with the two groups and advise them.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that one of the things he feels important is to have the plan to present to the community. Mr. Pasch indicated that the park could be done in phases.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the Master Park Plan was what was given to the fundraisers. The estimates for that park were provided.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri spoke of the amphitheater as a point that could spend another million and seemed to be a real selling point.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she felt very comfortable with the Master Park Plan that if money weren't the issue that is the plan that which is

appropriate. It was based on the survey of the public and meetings with the Park and Rec Board. If that is something we can't afford we have to be realistic about it.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that was fine, but it should be stated up front.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that with the fundraisers there is not an equal choice to make since the proposals are not equal.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that there was a small group of people who had to be included in the solicitation.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he had spoken with John Schmitt, and he had not yet responded back to him.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that the Board should go back to the fundraisers and have them both structure their proposal in the same manner.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to go back to the fundraisers with the concerns of the Board.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would have them restructure the numbers so that we can consistently look at both firms.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the processes seemed to be the same, i.e. a planning study to determine what's available. Then we can decide where to go from there.

**B. Proposal for Construction Phase Services – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Amending the Agreement of July 23, 1998 to a Not To Exceed Total of \$254,689 (recommended approval).**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding the proposal from R.K.& K. related to the construction phase services that will extend their agreement of July 23, 1998 to a not-to-exceed amount of \$254,689. Mr. Amic provided a spread sheet and reminded the Board of the original quote where a large part of the increase which amounted to \$89,669 covered the basic service for the operational phase of the Parallel Interceptor work.

**MR. PASCH MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT WITH RUMMEL, KLEPPER AND KAHL FOR THE PUMP STATION AND PARALLEL INTERCEPTOR BE AMENDED TO NOT EXCEED A TOTAL OF \$254,689. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- C. Penns Valley Publishers – Recodification - \$16,200 (recommend approval).**
- AMIC** Mr. Amic recommended that the recodification of the work of the Township which provided updates of Ordinances. Mr. Amic had discussed this with Solicitor Yost and stated that it is the law that this material be kept up to date.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the Township Ordinances do not have to be codified, but they are. They have not been kept up to date and added that a layman cannot complete the work. Solicitor Yost recommended that a professional be brought in to bring the codification up to date and then keep it updated on an annual basis at a reasonable cost.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that Penns Valley would not redo work already done. Included in this work would be the Land Development and Subdivision work.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented on an item in their proposal where they indicated they provide a separate editorial report explaining in each and every instance where items are not in conformity with existing State and Federal law.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated they will state, in their opinion, and we will check to see if they're correct, and if so, fix it. His guess is they're going to find very little, if any.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the original high price of \$7,000 was the reason we re-evaluated the project, but one of the other items was the benefit of doing it in-house and having it on a word processor here was that we were then going to be very easily put all of those Ordinances on a web site so that they were readily accessible to anyone who wanted to read them without having to make copies of things, etc.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he had not presented that part of the proposal. They will provide the means to place it on the web site.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that Mr. Bishop's comments were an echo of his and that it had been hoped that this information could be captured in an electronic version, which could be distributed in like fashion. This firm would be supplying the information electronically with a search engine. He questioned whether there would be anything, which would prevent staff from posting it. Mr. Schenck asked for assurance that the information would be received in electronic form and that the Township could utilize the information as it would see fit.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that he had been involved in the meeting with this supplier and had questioned whether the information would be received electronically and whether the Township would be able to utilize it. Mr. Stern received the response that it is not copyrighted and the law is public domain and provided to us to do whatever the Township wished. Their suggestion about maintaining a website is a laborious chore that no one wants to undertake.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that a review of the agreement would state that fact.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated his appreciation for facing this situation as a failure and obtaining a solution for it.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed with Mr. Schenck that the Township is going in the right direction. This issue brought home to Mr. Bishop how very disappointed he was that the Township is unable to focus at all on using the Internet to provide information that had been discussed. Mr. Bishop stated he thought it was made clear that we wanted to do that there seems to be no one on staff focusing on doing at all. At some point this Board need to make it clear, clear among ourselves whether we think that's a priority. Clearly I think it is a priority that we use this technology to get all the information we possibly can out to the public and I think that we need to be clear among ourselves whether that's the will of the entire board and then make it clear to our staff that that needs to be a priority because from what I have seen there has been very close to zero effort put into doing that. That's something that he personally thinks has to change.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded to Mr. Bishop's comment in that it was not that the staff had not received the message.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that the Board had then made clear that's what is desired. He asked if the Township Manager was being insubordinate.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic replied that he chose not to go there, particularly in this venue.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that Mr. Amic had received the message. Mr. Amic requested that the Board approve the Penns Valley Publishers item with the conditions discussed. She called for a motion with condition.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO RECODIFICATION OF ORDINANCES TO PENNS VALLEY PUBLISHERS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$16,200 PROVIDED THAT THE**

**CONTRACT WITH PENNS VALLEY WILL PROVIDE ELECTRONIC COPY OF THE RECODIFICATION THAT THE TOWNSHIP CAN USE FOR ITS OWN WEB SITE SHOULD IT CHOOSE TO ESTABLISH ONE. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Planning Module – St. Onge Company – A3-67957-297-3 – 4,550 GPD  
(recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided comments recommending the Planning Module for St. Onge Company in Springettsbury Township for 4,550 gallons per day of additional flow. He added that this item is included in the Chapter 94 report and is recommended by the Wastewater staff.

**MR. SCHENCK RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING MODULE OF ST. ONGE COMPANY IN THE AMOUNT OF 4,550 GPD. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Land Development Waiver Request – First Capital Federal Credit Union**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided information regarding the Land Development Waiver Request by First Capital Federal Credit Union. York County Planning had no reservation about the issue of parking and drive-in traffic flow. Jim Barnes of Holly Associates and Dennis Flickinger, President and CEO of First Capital Federal Credit Union provided responses to questions by the Board. The proposal intends to alleviate the current traffic flow.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned the stacking area.

**BARNES** Mr. Barnes explained that the backup with the drive through is extending vehicles back. Motorists who are parking can't back out and/or get passed the cars that are stacked to get through to leave. Mr. Barnes added that the proposal would eliminate the present drive and move it to the far end of the property in order to allow for a larger stacking lane.

**FLICKINGER** Mr. Dennis Flickinger stated that studies had been done and information reviewed from the years of the former York Tracktown's experience. The combination of the addition of the First Capital membership has overwhelmed the present physical status.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch reiterated the problem of possible violence is based on actual feedback from irate customers rather than just a sign of the times. Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Stern if everything is in conformance.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that another issue is the screening. If they were to do a Land Development Plan they would have to block the site. They wanted to modify that they would have to provide minimal low shrubs, bushes rather than large shade trees and evergreens. Traffic will be there inevitably, but this just improves the circulation of traffic. Mr. Lauer reviewed the relocation of the driveway and had no problem with that.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the expansion of the canopy is part of this parking lot improvement.
- FLICKINGER** Mr. Flickinger responded that the canopy was not part of the plan currently, but that they would like that provision for the future. If this does not satisfy the situation, in the future they would like to request a third drive up lane.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the plan currently under consideration is only for the traffic and parking.
- BARNES** Mr. Barnes stated that this action is an attempt to try to take care immediately of the parking and traffic situation.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked what exactly was asked to be approved.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he was requesting that the Board approve a waiver to Land Development for originally a parking lot, but if you choose to add the canopy he didn't have a problem with it, with the understanding that they would modify the landscaping and would remain within the Ordinance.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Stern if the Board was asked to approve the drawing.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that could be done.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that if you don't go through the process then you don't really know exactly what it is that is being approved. That's why the process exists. We agree to waiver on things that are very clear and even when they're very tiny we still get nervous that we're not sure how someone will interpret whatever we've approved.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated the Board could approve the waiver just for the change in the parking and stacking lane and the curb cut.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost suggested the Board just waive that portion and not authorize the canopy.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Planning Commission had reviewed this item.
- STERN** Mr. Stern advised that they had not yet reviewed it.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what the estimated construction time would be.
- FLICKINGER** Mr. Flickinger responded that several paving companies indicated they would react as soon as possible, which would be in the next couple months.
- BARNES** Mr. Barnes indicated that storm water management must be provided and some additional items that staff will need before issuing the permit.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether Mr. Barnes had some idea of how to accommodate storm water management.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated storm water management had been discussed and would have to be approved. There would be some underground storage.
- BARNES** Mr. Barnes added there presently are underground seepage pits.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that it had been indicated there is immediate need for parking. Even though Chairman Mitrick respected that there was a need, she was uncertain that the need called for immediate response by the Board. Secondly, she indicated that what Mr. Stern had reported related to the parking and traffic flow and that there were no comments related to the additional canopy.
- FLICKINGER** Mr. Flickinger responded that the immediate need is for the parking and stacking lane. If the Board would not want to approve the canopy and third drive up lane that would not be a problem at this point. That's a potential future solution.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the staff did not have a big problem with the canopy and he did not have a problem with it either. However, he stated that the canopy is a surprise.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that if the canopy is an item that staff learned about yesterday or a week ago yesterday, he questioned whether they really have thought it through. He added that was the reason the process is in place. Mr. Bishop stated that if the Board approved this, it placed more responsibility on the staff and the engineers.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that this is a very basic plan, which may not have required a Land Development. Mr. Stern had not felt comfortable making a free lance decision. They would have gone through the same process.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he had no problem approving it.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the likelihood of this being turned down, even if they go through all the steps, is pretty remote. Traffic on Memory Lane is horrendous.

**FLICKINGER** Mr. Flickinger responded that he and his staff take these matters very seriously. There had been incidences experienced which have given them concern.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he had no problem approving the waiver with apologies to the Planning Commission and saying that this was a special situation. He had no problem with changing the curb cut, the stacking and the parking. However, he had the same caution that the canopy should not be included.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE LAND DEVELOPMENT WAIVER REQUEST – FIRST CAPITAL FEDERAL CREDIT UNION WAIVER OF SUBMISSION OF LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN MODIFICATION OF LANDSCAPING AND BUFFERING EXCLUDING THE CANOPY.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Solicitor Yost’s assistance with the motion.

**MR. GURRERI WITHDREW HIS MOTION.**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO GRANT THE WAIVER FOR THE SUBMISSION OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITH THE MODIFICATION FROM THE LANDSCAPING AND BUFFERING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE ADDITIONAL PARKING AREA AND CURB CUTS AND CLOSING AN EXISTING DRIVEWAY ON THE SITE PLAN PRESENTED BY THE APPLICANT AND EXCLUDING THE CANOPY**

**SHOWN ON THAT PLAN. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED.  
MR. BISHOP VOTED NO.**

**C. Community Map**

**STERN** Mr. Stern brought forward a community map item for consideration. A zoning base map of Springettsbury Township would be provided to the printing company. They do the art work. The Township would provide them the authority to solicit for the ads. Projected cost is about \$300 - \$400. Mr. Stern thought the idea would be good. Mr. Gurreri agreed. Mr. Stern added that having a map of this nature had been a goal of his department.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned the matter of the firm mailing it to all the residences and businesses. Would they also provide a number for the Township office.

**STERN** Mr. Stern advised they would prove the Township with a crate full.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked where they would get the list of all the businesses in the Township.

**STERN** Mr. Stern was not sure about the list.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she thought the idea was a good one.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what it meant when we say we give them authorization to solicit advertisements.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the Township would give permission to the representative of Community Map Co. to solicit the business in the area on her behalf as its payment for providing the map free. Advertising will be sold by a Community Map Co. representative.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that he was in favor of the project. The service would be provided to the community. There's a lot of information in a map.

**Board consensus was to proceed with having Community Map Co. provide a Springettsbury Township map and to delegate the responsibility to Mr. Amic and Mr. Stern.**

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported on the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary parade which was very successful and a lot of fun for the Supervisors.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Gurreri for making the arrangements.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri brought forward a “Save the Parking Lot Next to the House.” Utilizing the parking lot next to the house would provide parking for tennis, for bus trips, overflow for the new Municipal Building and for Shipley Field. This would alleviate traffic from the signaled intersection and traffic in the playground areas, provide another inlet and save money. Mr. Gurreri asked for the Board’s comments.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she had reviewed the parking lot with him and that was part of the early part of the study, i.e., placement of the building on this property. Because the engineers advised that Pleasant Valley and Mt. Zion intersection was not 90 degrees it would be difficult to maximize the building space on that type of a corner.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the merits of Mr. Gurreri’s plan were irrelevant because a decision had been made, and a contract had been let. There was no need to consider it at this point.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the topography makes the difference in terms of the filling, cutting, etc. There may be no difference but just changing the position of the building changes the topography.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani added that with an L shaped building really cuts off the parking. At this point there is no physical way to get from the back of this building to that parking lot when the new structure goes in. It will be blocked.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that part of Mr. Gurreri’s plan was to move the building.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that the contract had been let, the site work had been done. The architectural work is done, the geo-technical investigation is done. The bridges had been crossed. There had been 20-some meetings involved in the decision making. The one big selling features of using the existing driveway was the fact it was signaled for safe ingress and egress.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he thought it was a good idea and wanted to bring it up again. He thanked the Board for listening to him.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that Mr. Gurreri's frustration follows his appointment to the Board came at a time when a lot of the work had already been investigated. Each Board member had gone through that when new to the Board. Some business is already in motion and you just sit there and disagree but know that it's going on.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented on a communication he had received from Stan Saylor, which the other Board members had received.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch referred to Pleasant Valley and Mt. Zion in that a citizen asked him coming East on Pleasant Valley that many of the people coming there are wanting to make a right turn but because a lot of people are going straight through; they're in the same stacking lane. If there were another lane there where they could make a right turn it would improve the traffic flow. The indication that he gave was that there is not enough room there. It should be investigated as the traffic there is getting severe backing up.

Mr. Pasch was accosted by an individual at a Yard Sale. He had to pay \$30.00 for a special event at the St. Joe's Yard Sale rather than \$5.00 for a Yard Sale. Mr. Pasch questioned when a yard sale becomes a special event. If there's a neighborhood with 14 or 15 homes having a yard sale, do they pay for one permit, or do they pay for each individual.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that each individual pays.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick received a letter from Reverend James Nace who is concerned about the noise created by Jake brakes along Route 30 between North Sherman Street and Mt. Zion Road. He had read of Mr. Pasch's comment regarding Jake brakes in the newspaper. Reverend Nace included in his letter a copy of a newspaper article stating that Manchester Township was investigating an Ordinance regarding Jake brakes. Reverend Nace requested assistance from the Township to correct the situation. Chairman Mitrick stated that the matter of Jake brakes had come before the Board previously and that Mr. Amic was in the process of investigating Ordinances regarding the use of Jake brakes, i.e., New Oxford.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that he had investigated the Ordinances and included it in his report to the Board. Mr. Amic provided the Gettysburg Borough and New Oxford Ordinances and the Manchester Township experience which Solicitor Yost reviewed. PennDot approval is necessary for any changes. For Manchester Township PennDot did a survey of the streets and highways upon which Manchester wanted to impose a prohibition. Consideration was given to grades, traffic volume, accident reports, etc. and trucks were granted 3 out of 10 streets on which they wouldn't permit

a prohibition. Pennsylvania Motor Vehicle Code requires all trucks of 80,000 pounds or more to have Jake brakes as a safety feature. Because the Jake brakes are necessary for safety, there is a reluctance to prohibit their use. If the road in question were a flat piece of road, it is possible there could be a prohibition, but on a hilly or a road on which there had been a number of accidents it will be difficult to get any type of PennDot approval.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he did have a call from a trucker following his comment in the newspaper regarding Jake brakes. The trucker advised that Jake brakes are a safety concern and that the important thing to recognize if there is a road where the speed is more than 40 miles per hour think twice about putting a prohibition on Jake brakes. At speeds over 40 miles per hour what the Jake brakes effectively do “will reduce the stopping distance by half.”

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked the Board whether they felt the need for further investigation. Residents had voiced this concern repeatedly.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that he had done some checking in the trucking industry as well and learned of the state requirements for truckers. The complaints are coming from areas in which PennDot would not allow Jake brakes, such as coming off Route 83 we would not want to prohibit Jake brakes. Mt. Zion Road obviously we would want them there. He had followed a dump truck down Market Street and every 20 feet he hit the Jake brake. Flat road 30 mph.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost reported that he had been in a traffic situation where a Jake brake saved his life.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck added that many of the newer trucks include the Jake brakes as part of the engine management systems.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost commented that he would be interested in how frequently it happens in a given area. If his sleep were interrupted once a month that would not bother him.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch would be disturbed even if he were awakened once a month by a Jake brake. However, he cautioned that great care should be taken in this matter because of the safety concern. Mr. Pasch asked Chief Eshbach if anything could be done.

**ESHBACH** Police Chief Eshbach responded that there was nothing that could be done, even if an Ordinance were created it might not stand up in court as a noise issue versus a safety issue.

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated it was unfortunate that there is nothing the Board could do in this regard which had come before the Board numerous times.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that there is a specific area under consideration. He asked what the likelihood would be of PennDot granting an approval to prohibit Jake brakes in that area.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Police Chief Eshbach what the speed limit is on North Sherman Street at Mt. Zion Road.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach responded that the speed limit is 40 miles per hour.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she supports taking a stand with this issue and see what PennDot 's response would be.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri suggested the use of signs asking for cooperation.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that most of the complaints come from state highways or federal highways. They aren't coming from Quaker Drive or Deininger Road. The people who have the authority to regulate these issues, our legislators and senators should regulate these matters. It's their highways. Route 30, for instance, we enforce the speed limit, but we have nothing to say about the speed limit on 30. We have no say about any signs posted on Route 30.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the question should be asked of PennDot about the likelihood of their allowing prohibition on that stretch of Route 30.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to pursue that matter. Chairman Mitrick provided Reverend Nace's letter to Mr. Amic.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that many municipalities had been labeled "thorns" because they had not paid their contribution to the SPCA. She asked Mr. Amic whether Springettsbury had paid its contribution.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Springettsbury had paid its contribution but that the SPCA was unhappy with the amount. SPCA requests a different format.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck reported he had a telephone call from a York Little League representative. The call relates to the storage shed and the new building. The Little League wants to get rid of the green storage trailer. He wanted to see whether the contractor building the new building wanted to use that as their storage trailer during construction since it has electric run to it, and when the new building is built, the contractor would remove it. Mr.

Schenck directed the gentleman to contact Mr. Amic since it is a Township matter.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added a comment about the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary parade. The Fire Department and Fire Chief had volunteers in the parade, and Chief Eshbach drove the Police Department vehicle.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop received a note from Frank Schmidt who sent him an article from The New York Times in light of his interest in the study of the sludge problem. Mr. Bishop intended to provide the article to Mr. Halbert. The article discusses use of reed beds to process sewage sludge and turn toxic waste into clean water in a natural way.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reported that the Emergency Services Commission met last night in a special meeting to try to tie a few loose ends in the Jt. Operating Agreement. Some concrete process toward getting things to happen. There will be an additional meeting of the Emergency Services Commission. The regular meeting will be held September 16<sup>th</sup> at which time it is anticipated that a final agreement will be executed. Two meetings were scheduled with all of the members of the volunteer organizations. The agreement will be presented one week and then one week later a vote will be taken. Those meetings are scheduled for October 12<sup>th</sup> at a place to be determined and October 19<sup>th</sup> at Springettsbury Township for taking the vote. Mr. Bishop continued that progress is being made.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick brought forward the Athletic Field Policy, about which Messrs. Lauer and Bainbridge had coordinated their thinking regarding rest periods for fields. Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to formally communicate to Mr. Bainbridge and the Park and Rec Board so that they know they can proceed with this Policy. It appeared to be exactly what was needed. She relayed one suggestion regarding the application for field use, i.e. to attach the rotating schedule to that application to let the applicants know that the procedure is being followed.

## **8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost apologized for not being able to get his Solicitor's Report to the Board prior to the meeting. He had been out of town from August 23 to September 7<sup>th</sup>.

Solicitor Yost discussed the CSX Condemnation action, which had been previously discussed. He had nothing further to add other than to repeat that he was optimistic and hopefully would have a better sense of where

the Township stands on September 10<sup>th</sup>. He will continue to pursue the matter and move it forward.

Solicitor Yost added that his opinion on Jake brakes was included in his written report.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that Halloween falls on a Sunday, October 31<sup>st</sup> and asked the Board for their thoughts as to whether Springettsbury Township should celebrate Halloween on Sunday.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether any information was available about what other communities are doing.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that Springettsbury celebrated it on Halloween last year.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that in the past the Township statement had been, Halloween is Halloween, and that was when it would be celebrated. She asked the staff for an opinion.
- SPEICHER** Mrs. Speicher responded that she understood Trick or Treat would always be on Halloween night, no matter what day it fell on.
- BOWDERS** Mrs. Bowders pointed out that the York Halloween Parade is held on Sunday. She recalled that in the past, when Halloween fell on a Sunday, the question would come up whether the Township was going to celebrate Trick or Treat on Sunday evening, or move it to another evening. She suggested this possibly was due to the fact that residents may be at the parade and would not be home in time to participate in Trick or Treat. Otherwise, she recalled that Springettsbury Township's Trick or Treat night was always on October 31<sup>st</sup>.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to find out what the other municipalities are doing.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic asked the Board what they wanted to do about having a ground-breaking ceremony for the new Administration Building.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated his preference would be to have the ground-breaking some time before the construction begins, but as soon as it is known when they will start.

**Board consensus was to have the ground-breaking a week before the actual construction starts.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic will telephone the Board members to arrange the ceremony.

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Agreement York Water Company – TDC – York LLC and Springettsbury Township (recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic discussed the York Water Company Agreement with TDC – York for the extension of the water line. Springettsbury Township is a co-signer of this Agreement.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE AGREEMENT WITH YORK WATER COMPANY AND TUCKER DEVELOPMENT. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND.**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked why the Township has to pay half.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that this pertained to a 1970 Agreement with York Water Company and added that the money the Township pays is then received back in reimbursement.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that there were no Minutes provided for Action.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic pointed out that this was not due to the stenographer. The Minutes were provided by the stenographer, but Mr. Amic did not have the time to review them.

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that there was no Old Business requiring action.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether any advertisements had been issued for the Zoning Hearing Board vacancies.

**BOWDERS** Mrs. Bowders responded that two advertisements had been written.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there had been any responses.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**SEPTEMBER 9, 1999  
APPROVED**

**BOWDERS** Mrs. Bowders reported that no responses had been received, but added that the ads just had been issued.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reminded the Board of a letter from the Recycling Committee regarding a request to appoint Mr. Phil Ort to that committee. A contact had been made with Mr. Ort and requested that he write a letter of interest, as well as an opportunity to meet with him. Chairman Mitrick spoke with him. He stated that he was very interested in serving on the committee, but he wanted the Board to know that he is in the recycling business, i.e. a business where they recycle pallets. He felt that if the Board saw this as a conflict of interest he would understand and withdraw his request to serve on the Board. At the same time he would come to the Board with a lot of information that would be beneficial to a Recycling Committee.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated the business of recycling pallets should not be a conflict of interest. The Township does not recycle pallets. Mr. Pasch stated Mr. Ort would bring a lot of good information and contacts which would be beneficial.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that, if that is the general feeling of the Board, she would telephone him and have him come in and meet with the Board.

Chairman Mitrick reported that she had contacted Bill Schell at the Library regarding the mysterious poster. She left two messages but had not received a response. She will continue to follow up.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**AUGUST 26, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Charles Rausch, Acting Solicitor  
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
Mike Myers, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Frank Dittenhafer, Murphy & Dittenhafer  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Jim Crooks, Superintendent, Collections & Maintenance  
Jim Noel, Wastewater Treatment Plant  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Relations  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors to order at 7:30 p.m. Chairman Mitrick called attention to the three legal pages of Agenda and asked cooperation toward keeping the meeting moving.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**YINGLING** Clarence Yingling of 2800 Cambridge Road, York, PA came forward to register a complaint against a Township Police Officer for the way that he treated him regarding the drought emergency law. Mr. Yingling indicated the Officer had visited his property on July 9 with a neighbor's complaint that he had used a hose to water his lawn. Mr. Yingling stated that he had not used his hose to water his lawn but that he had used it to water his flowerbeds. The Officer acted in such a way as to upset Mr. and Mrs. Yingling in his manner of registering the complaint. Mr. Yingling did not remember the Officer's name. Mr. Yingling would like to have his name taken off the Officer's "warning list" and he would like to have an apology from the Officer, and have the Township instruct him in the laws for proper enforcement.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked Mr. Yingling to step into the lobby in order to ask him a few questions regarding the situation.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick assured Mr. Yingling that Mr. Amic's office would follow up on the entire matter and communicate with him.

**Biosolids Educational Program – First Communication**

**SMITH** Ms. Sandy Smith of 1650 Furnace Road, Brogue, PA 17309 approached the Board to comment on the Biosolids Educational Program.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether Furnace Road is located in Springettsbury Township.

**SMITH** Ms. Smith stated that what is proposed with the Biosolids program would affect not only Springettsbury Township but also York County.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked the Board whether a policy is in effect regarding allowing non-residents to speak to the Board especially given the lengthy agenda. Mr. Bishop suggested that there be a time limit agreement for comment. The Communications from Citizens is intended for citizens of Springettsbury Township. Mr. Bishop stated that he did not oppose listening but asked for guidelines.

**SMITH** Ms. Smith stated she had called ahead of time.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether five minutes of time would be satisfactory.

**SMITH** Ms. Smith indicated that would be acceptable. She indicated that the people she represented are from all over York County.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked for re-assurance that she had called the Township ahead.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked with whom Ms. Smith had spoken.

**SMITH** Ms. Smith stated that she had spoken with a woman. She had asked whether she needed permission to be placed on the agenda. She said no, the meeting was rather informal. She had asked whether there was a time limit and she had been informed none existed as long she spoke in a timely manner.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether she understood why the Board was imposing a time limit.

- SMITH** Ms. Smith indicated she understood.
- Ms. Smith displayed a Petition with 2,000 alleged signatures from people all over York County including Springettsbury Township against using Biosolids or against using sludge.
- Ms. Smith showed a poster providing the ingredients in average sludge.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the ingredients she showed on the poster were the ingredients in Springettsbury Township's sludge.
- SMITH** Ms. Smith stated that the ingredients are found in all sludge, which include heavy metals and pathogens.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reiterated that the ingredients are in typical sludge.
- SMITH** Ms. Smith replied that the ingredients are in typical, average sludge according to American Civil Engineers.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the ingredients are not necessarily in Springettsbury Township's sludge.
- SMITH** Ms. Smith indicated the ingredients could be found in Springettsbury Township's sludge, i.e., heavy metals, lead, mercury, cambium, hepatitis A and B.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked for the background, i.e., how she obtained these facts.
- SMITH** Ms. Smith stated that the information comes from the American Society of Civil Engineers.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated he wondered if the American Society of Civil Engineers had tested Springettsbury Township's sludge.
- SMITH** Ms. Smith indicated she was familiar with what's in Springettsbury Township's sludge and knowledgeable that there are 10,000,000 gallons a day of effluent creating approximately seven tons of sludge a day. Over 800 tons a year are sold for compost that goes throughout the county totally unlabeled. Approximately 2,000 tons of sludge is spread upon farmland all over York County in which food is grown. Ms. Smith does not think it's prudent to suggest or to take the taxpayers money and go on a mass media education program to say the sludge is good and more should be spread on the land because the Township is running out of places to spread it. It is not needed and is not good for anyone.

Ms. Smith passed out information to the Board and asked them to listen to the rest of the story. She read from the information further statistical information regarding sludge. A portion of that information indicated that “The European Union, England and so forth are refusing American food products because they are not labeled to show whether or not the product was genetically engineered or grown in sewage sludge.” European countries don’t want it. McDonalds in England has been forced to show where their meat is coming from, how it is grown and fed and with what. Del Monte, Heinz, Pepperidge Farm, Libby, Birds Eye, American Frozen Food Institute, Hanover Foods, National Food Processors Association, etc. including Japan will not accept food grown on sludge. Sludge farmers across the U. S. wanted to get in on the big money that organic food is now bringing in the U. S. The Department of Agriculture has been asked to change the organic standards including genetically engineered food grown on sludge. It made sense to the USDA since Biosolids sludge is allowed. The USDA has never in the time of its existence received so many letters and comments as they did on this particular factor. Does Springettsbury Township really want York County to be out of the market in producing food because the idea of pushing sludge on the farmers is going to put them automatically out of selling food to the major food producers in the U. S. for export to NYC restaurants, etc.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that time was up and requested a concluding statement. She indicated the Board would review the information provided.

**SMITH** Ms. Smith requested the Board to please read the information. She urged the Board not to proceed. She stated there are other alternatives for getting rid of sludge and indicated the landfills are the best option.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri thanked Ms. Smith for providing the information. Mr. Gurreri stated that he understood that any of the sludge put out has food growing on it but only for corn for livestock.

**SMITH** Ms. Smith indicated that it is being used for soybeans. She indicated she had photos of the Springettsbury Township trucks traveling down the road uncovered with the sludge spewing all over.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated Ms. Smith could leave the photos with the Township Manager and stated that the Board needed to move on in the Agenda.

**Biosolids – Second Communication**

**PASQUOCHE** Mr. Peter Pasquoche, 2810 Delta Road, Airville, PA 17002 asked what the educational factor proposed is for. He questioned what sludge is, what it does, what the benefits are, and what the defects are.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Pasquoche whether he was asking what the program is.

**PASQUOCHE** Mr. Pasquoche responded that was correct.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick referred the question to Mr. Bishop.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that the initial idea and what the Township engineers put together toward the objective was to be able to explain principally to other municipalities' elected officials what sludge (bio-solids) are. The Township wanted to be more knowledgeable regarding the science behind it. Elected officials in other municipalities are being called upon to make decisions and enact ordinances about these matters for their communities.

Springettsbury Township officials felt the need for getting some scientific information into the hands of elected officials so that all elected officials could make rational decisions about whether biosolids is something that should be allowed in each of their townships. Each elected official has a right to know both sides of the issue, as well as to be knowledgeable about what kind of Federal and State regulations currently are in place and specifically what Springettsbury Township's history is.

**PASQUOCHE** Mr. Pasquoche indicated he understood the reasoning with regard to the government level.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reassured Mr. Pasquoche that was the only aspect of the educational program.

**PASQUOCHE** Mr. Pasquoche asked whether the public officials should be the ones that are putting their names up front saying we're going to give you the information. He hadn't seen any data to reveal the whole story.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that was the reason for the educational program. He indicated that a misconception exists that this is some sort of massive public relations campaign. What the Township engineer came forward with is a program to put forward the scientific information and the practical information that is available.

**PASQUOCHE** Mr. Pasquoche asked whether that information is available.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that some information is available.

**PASQUOCHE** Mr. Pasquoche asked whether the information is available with both sides of the story.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated all that is suggested at this point is the proposal to put together the information.

**PASQUOCHE** Mr. Pasquoche asked whether moneys should be spent toward that investigation.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he personally wanted to know what the case is. That is what is being put together. As a public official Mr. Bishop stated that he would not want to rely on Mr. Pasquoche or Sandy Smith to provide that information. He wanted to have the engineering firm investigate and provide their best understanding of the information, which is what the program is about. The information is being created in a way that it can be communicated to other people.

**PASQUOCHE** Mr. Pasquoche asked where the information will be coming from, i.e., who is doing the investigation.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that Springettsbury Township's engineering firm, R. K. & K., had been proposed to develop the information. It is not Springettsbury Township's employees; it's not Wastewater Treatment employees.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated the Township would not hire any firm, which would not provide the best information available.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated R. K. & K. is a nationally recognized firm.

**PASQUOCHE** Mr. Pasquoche thanked the Board for their response.

**A. Ms. Sharon Nichols**

**NICHOLS** Sharon Nichols, 3416 Overview Drive, York, PA 17402 approached the Board as a representative of the Recreation Board with regard to the Proposed Athletic Field Policy, a copy of which has been provided to the Board. An Athletic Field Policy is needed because there are growing needs for field usage. This helps to prioritize who can use the fields and when. It also provides for a registration deadline, which gives teams time to organize. It asks the teams to sign a contract requesting that they take care of the fields, and if there are worn areas that they replace badly

damaged areas with soil and seed or whatever is needed, with the primary focus as safety.

Ms. Nichols also provided an individualized Parking Policy for each park asking that the parents of the players park on one side of the road in the neighborhood so that it would eliminate double parking on narrow roads making it safer for the children.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that somewhere on the form there should be a notation that “at times it will be the decision of Springettsbury Township that some of the fields would be closed for play so that the fields can be revitalized.” She continued that there may be seasons where a field might not be available at all.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether she had any input from any of the leagues.

**NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols responded that for a short while there was a board member also in a league who provided some input. One of his main concerns was the registration deadline.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked for clarification regarding the deadlines.

**NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols responded that if it was a fall sport they would turn in the contract by June 15 and the Rec Dept. would notify them by June 30 what fields would be available to them for use.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether Mr. Bainbridge felt that could be done in that short amount of time.

**NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols indicated it would give two weeks to look over all the requests. Mr. Schenck was assured that would be enough time.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned the Parking Policy. She asked whether there would be enforcement questions.

**NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols responded that there is no need for the police to enforce this. The policy simply provides an avenue to go back to the organization if there were complaints from the neighborhood.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the Proposed Athletic Field Policy is very comprehensive. The Board of Supervisors had requested the Recreation Board to tackle this project, and Chairman Mitrick indicated that she appreciated the work that had been done.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that this policy would be an unenforceable contract but that it would depend upon the goodwill of the league officers and the people participating. There should be something to indicate that any league not abiding by the rules must be advised that in the future they would not be able to use the fields. Mr. Pasch stated that should be noted.

**NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols agreed with Mr. Pasch and indicated that there had been no negative comments about field usage or parking. She indicated a notation would be made.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that it would fair to state that parking had been an issue in residential neighborhoods. It is a concern that cannot be overlooked. She asked that an additional item on the second page regarding Springettsbury Township residents be included in order to provide an accurate measure regarding non-resident players.

Chairman Mitrick asked Ms. Nichols to address the issue of the grading at Penn Oaks.

**NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols stated she had spoken with a representative of the Army Corps of Engineers. She asked what their policy would be toward coming into a township and leveling fields. Penn Oaks bids have gone out for large sums of money, and the Army Corps of Engineers would come in and level the fields free, but they wanted to make sure that there wasn't any controversy about the leveling of the fields; also that it was township-owned property. They asked for a letter of request that they come in to do this work. They use that as a way of practice training their people in leveling airfields.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that Penn Oaks had been included on several Road Tours.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the subject had come up before, and the Army Corps of Engineers would not absolutely do that. Mr. Pasch indicated that the information Ms. Nichols had was great.

**NICHOLS** Ms. Nichols indicated the request had been made, which does not guarantee the work. They will take it under consideration and advise. She added that she did not know how fine the grading is.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Ms. Nichols to keep in communication with Mr. Amic regarding this item.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer - Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that Mr. Schober of Buchart Horn was out of state. He informed Mr. Amic that his report was complete. If there was anything the Board would like Mr. Schober to do, Mr. Amic would notify him.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani provided a few updates. Regarding Academy Road Mr. Lauer laid the pavement. The water problem there has worked itself out, and the project is completed.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that Mr. Lauer had spoken with the resident, who indicated she was extremely pleased with the work done, especially that her home won't be flooded in the future.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated Mr. Lauer had overlaid the entire road, which was over and above what was initially expected.

Mr. Luciani reported that Mr. Lauer, Tom Austin and he met at Harley Davidson. They are reviewing some signal changes on Eden Road and Route 30. It appears that vehicles on Route 30 continue to try to make the yellow light and gridlock Eden Road. Signs may be needed to prevent vehicles from blocking Eden Road. Fine tuning the signal changes is being done to try to improve traffic movements.

Mr. Luciani continued that a Conference Center is being planned by the hotel. Discussions indicate that it will tie into the Plymouth Road improvements. The design work is proceeding for Plymouth to enlarge the radius to allow cars to make left turns, but as the hotel goes through the design process all the efforts are focused toward Plymouth Road. The ultimate design for Mt. Rose Avenue will require five lanes. Ninety percent of that roadway with five-lane geometry with one segment in between will allow the Mt. Rose Avenue to become the major corridor that it really is.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether that meant that the Township would be held up in the turning lane process for Plymouth Road.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani continued that he and Mr. Amic met with the beer distributor owner. There are a few things to fine tune but the curb could be placed. The hotel may not start for eight months to a year. By the time they have their improvements it will be two years. The geometry will not change that much. It had been lined up in anticipation of signalization.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented on Pleasant Valley Road. The match between Pleasant Valley and Whiteford Road is not a very good gradation. There is a possibility for accidents there.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that the stop signs may be placed the other way. PennDot has some counters there, and they are going to reprogram the signal at Whiteford and Pleasant Valley. He also noticed that cars continued to use the old road. He will re-address this with Mr. Lauer.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri suggested a sign, “bump ahead.”
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that that would be reviewed.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick observed that instead of going forward onto the new section of the road off Memory Lane, motorists turn right and catch the old way because when traffic going west on Whiteford has the arrow it’s a long arrow. People turn right and make up time by going up the old part of the road.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that there is a combination of items. The stop signs are in the wrong direction, as well as the fact that the signal is not timed for the new route.
- C. **Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**
- MYERS** Mr. Myers provided an updated status report on the schedule. The DEP Part II permit was received in time for bid opening on the pump station. Continuing to work with Don Yost’s office regarding the CSX condemnation issue. A new plan had been requested in compliance with the eminent domain codes. Bid results for the pump station were received. The parallel interceptor project was completed. Mr. Myers requested permission from the Board to advertise that project now that the pump station is underway.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the report contained good news.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the CSX property would hold up the project.
- MYERS** Mr. Myers indicated it would not. The Declaration had been filed.
- RAUSCH** Acting Solicitor Rausch responded that Declaration of Taking was filed on July 22.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the request for Permission to Advertise to get bids appeared on the Agenda.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether Mr. Myers was asking the Board to take that action. He would prefer to wait to make that decision until later.

**Consensus of the Board was to not take action toward Permission to Advertise.**

**D. Architectural Engineer – Murphy and Dittenhafer (Withdrawal of Bid of Marroquin, Inc. for Municipal Building)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic requested Mr. Rausch's comment. Action was needed by the Board.

**RAUSCH** Mr. Rausch stated that he would prefer to review this item later in the agenda. The item was placed in Bids, Proposals, Quotes.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 8/26/99**
- B. Hyder Consulting - Risk Management Program -  
Progress Billing #6 - \$447.50**
- C. Reed Smith Shaw & McClay - Progress Billing #4 - \$7,407.44**
- D. Buchart Horn, Inc. - Mill Creek Interceptor Repair -  
Progress Billing #5 - \$1,016.70**
- E. C. S. Davidson, Inc. - East/West Interceptor -  
Progress Billing #7 - \$735.15**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked the Board whether they had any questions.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the Cloister Car Wash cost of \$365.00.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the amount covered a two-month period.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about a billing for business cards for former Fire Chief Siegrist.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the amount covered business cards ordered long before Mr. Siegrist departed. The bill had recently been forwarded for payment.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the hydro clipper motor repair in the amount of \$2,700. and asked whether the amount was reasonable for a large mower.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic assured him the cost was reasonable.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked for further information regarding the Highway Reserve Fund indicating three payments to the York Water Co. for Mt. Zion Water District Application.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic advised the items covered refunds as a result of deposits having been refunded.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he had received a citizen complaint about the Township flag indicating it was tattered and soiled.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the flag appeared extremely small. He commented that the flags had been given to the Township by public officials at no charge. He will address the matter.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE A. THROUGH E. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

**A. 1991 Chevrolet Caprice Police Vehicle - 247728 Police Cars Unlimited - \$1,818 (recommend award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated a bid had been received regarding the 1991 Chevrolet. The low bidder was Police Cars Unlimited at \$1,818.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that Mr. Amic's report indicated Chicago Motors did not submit a bond.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic clarified that Chicago Motors did not submit a bond and that the specifications are very clear that a bond must be provided.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the bidding procedures might change, i.e., could a bid of this nature be accepted in the future.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that would be a legal question to be investigated but that the Township Code states a 5% bid bond must be received.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that his understanding was on the small items a bid bond may not be required.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated there would be nothing to be done concerning the item under discussion, but that it would be something to look into for the future.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE BID OF 1991 CHEVROLET CAPRICE POLICE VEHICLE - 247728 - POLICE CARS UNLIMITED FOR \$1,818. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. 1995 Chevrolet Caprice Police Vehicle - 166684 - Police Cars Unlimited - \$3,942 (recommend award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding this item indicating the low bidder to be Police Cars Unlimited for \$3,942.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE SALE OF THE 1995 POLICE CAR - 166684 TO POLICE CARS UNLIMITED FOR \$3,942. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. 1977 International School Bus (recommend re-advertisement)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that no bids were received on the 1977 International School Bus. The item is to be re-advertised.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how much it costs to advertise.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated the cost would be approximately \$350.

**RAUSCH** Mr. Rausch asked what the value of the vehicle would be.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated the value is usually what someone would be willing to pay.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested that if it is imperative that the vehicle be advertised twice there might be other places, such as church bulletins.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick clarified that a motion must be made to re-advertise and that if the value is estimated at \$1,000 it must be advertised twice.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated agreement.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO RE-ADVERTISE TO REBID THE 1977 INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL BUS. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. 1995 Chevrolet Caprice Police Vehicle - 165684 - Douglas J. Harmer - \$1,011 (recommend award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the above item and indicated the low bidder was Douglas J. Harmer for \$1,011.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE SALE OF THE 1995 CHEVROLET POLICE CAR - 165684 TO DOUGLAS J. HARMER FOR \$1,011. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- E. 1995 Chevrolet Caprice Police Vehicle - 165279 - Shawn D. Rohrbaugh - \$3,060 (recommend award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the above item and indicated the low bidder was Shawn D. Rohrbaugh in the amount of \$3,060.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE BID OF 1995 CHEVROLET CAPRICE POLICE VEHICLE - 165279 TO SHAWN D. ROHRBAUGH FOR \$3,060. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- F. Biosolids Public Education Program - Rummel, Klepper & Kahl - \$16,102 (recommend award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the proposal of R. K. & K. for a Biosolids Education Program with a quote of \$16,102. Award of this quote was recommended.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that as a result of the request for quote from the engineering firm, they are to supply the information that is available.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated agreement.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AWARD THE BIOSOLIDS PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM CONTRACT TO R. K. & K. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$16,102. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- G. Wilshire Drive Collector Line Repair - Springfield Contractors - \$48,750**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the bids for Wilshire Drive. The low bidder was Springfield Contractors in the amount of \$48,750. The staff recommended this bid be awarded. This project is a small project but needed as the potential is present for the sewer to back into the homes.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated that this project affects about 15 homes on the upper portion of Wilshire Drive. The sewer is old and in danger of collapse. Mr. Crooks considered this need to be a threat to the sewer service for the residences.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE WILSHIRE DRIVE COLLECTOR LINE REPAIR TO SPRINGFIELD CONTRACTORS FOR \$48,750. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**H. Sale of One 1985 GMC 4X4 (permission to advertise for sale)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the new vehicle is in place, and that the 1985 GMC could now be advertised for bid.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE FOR SALE ONE 1985 GMC 4X4 TRUCK. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether advertisements had ever been placed in any of the township/municipal trade magazines.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the township had never advertised in the township trade magazines but that it was a good idea and he would pursue it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck added that when vehicles are to be sold in that way there would be no need for bidding, etc.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that if there were no need for expensive advertising there would be a greater net amount received.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that a listing of all municipalities and phone numbers is available. York County municipalities should be notified as well.

**I. Wastewater Standby Generator Upgrade Proposal - Rummel, Klepper & Kahl - \$4,812 (recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding the R. K. & K. Proposal, information previously provided in his report. The Wastewater staff requested that the proposal be accepted in the amount of \$4,812. He emphasized to the Board that this item covered only stage one and added that considerable money will be involved following this item.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel stated that this proposal will be a definite advantage to the operation of the treatment facilities. If an extended power outage were to occur, the treatment capacity at the plant would degrade significantly after 24 hours. At that point there would be a very high risk of being in non-compliance with the discharge permit. Mr. Noel stated he could not speak as to why this was never looked at during initial construction. This is something that would provide continuity at the treatment plant and the best availability to treat our wastewater. Mr. Noel strongly urged the

Board's approval to evaluate what can be done and the best way to approach it. At that point the work will have to be put out for bid.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that this does include, assuming the project goes forward, that all the installation and construction and supervision would be built into that.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel stated that this includes the study, putting the design documents together, advertising, bidding, and consultation time during construction. The only thing it doesn't include are the construction costs.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that after 24 hours there's not enough storage capacity and raw sewage would go into the Codorus.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel responded that after about 24 hours the ability to treat the wastewater would disappear. They would treat as much as possible and put as much chlorine in as possible.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that it would be partially treated but not to the extent that is required when it hits the creek.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel indicated that was correct; it would be very basic level treatment.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned whether this was on any capital plan.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it was not on any capital plan.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether it fit within the budget.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether it was a shared expense.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it was a shared expense and would fit within the budget.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE WASTEWATER STANDBY GENERATOR UPGRADE PROPOSAL BY RUMMEL, KLEPPER & KAHL FOR \$4,812 BE APPROVED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**J. Chlorine Contract - Manley Reagan - \$0.1695 per pound - Extension of One Year (recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the item to extend the Chlorine Contract with Manley Reagan Chemical to provide liquid chlorine for an additional year at the same price of \$0.1695 per pound.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked why there was an option in that contract that has to be agreed to by both parties.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated this was done simply by the way it was written.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether this procedure gives the Township any advantage.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that their approval is necessary.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether any other pricing had been obtained.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that Mr. Noel could speak to that question.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that a benefit to the Township would be that there would not be the need to bid it again.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel stated that he had made several calls to two other vendors, which indicated that chlorine prices are rising. This was a two-year contract, which could be extended two years with mutual consent.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated assurance that the base investigation work had been completed.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE CHLORINE CONTRACT WITH MANLEY REGAN AT \$0.1695 PER POUND BE EXTENDED FOR ONE YEAR. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**K. Mill Creek Interceptor Repair Project (recommend re-bid)**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that his report provided information against accepting the bid and recommended a re-bid. Mr. Amic questioned whether \$80,000 should be spent for 10 feet of pipe.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that not recommending re-bid only but also looking at recommending changing the bid qualification is the issue.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it would have to be re-bid with different specifications.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that what is needed is for the Board to reject the bids that were submitted.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would then bring the specs back to the Board.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Board needed a reason to reject a bid.

**RAUSCH** Acting Solicitor Rausch responded that the Board would simply reject the bid.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO REJECT THE MILLCREEK INTERCEPTOR REPAIR PROJECT BID. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Architectural Engineer - Murphy and Dittenhafer (Withdrawal of Bid of Marroquin, Inc. for Municipal Building)**

**RAUSCH** Acting Solicitor Rausch stated that for the general construction bid on the New Municipal Building and the Renovation of the Present Administrative Offices, bids were put out. The bid opening took place on Friday, August 6. As a result of the bid opening, the apparent low bidder was Marroquin, Inc.

On Monday, August 9 the Township, through the Architect, received a written request by Marroquin to withdraw its bid due to an arithmetical error that they had made in the calculation of that bid in the amount of \$175,000, roughly equivalent to the next highest bid. As a result of that request, which was made within the two-business day requirement where a public contract is involved, Mr. Amic and Mr. Rausch met with Marroquin representatives for explanation of the error to be certain that it was a truly unintentional error in substantial omission of work. Under the law, if a bidder does make an unintentional clerical mistake and it is withdrawn within two business days, the Board can accept the withdrawal of the bid. Based on the information that was provided to the Township and review of their worksheets, it appeared that one of the items had been missed for \$175,000. Marroquin had been advised that the Board has the discretion to accept the withdrawal of the bid and additionally has the discretion then to either award the bid to the next lowest bidder or to re-bid. Marroquin can have no further connection with the project directly or indirectly. If the project were re-bid they would have to bear the cost of the re-bidding and would not be able to participate in any re-bidding, nor could there be any collusion with any other bidder. Marroquin submitted a letter that they have no connection and will have no connection with the project if the bid withdrawal is accepted by the Board.

Acting Solicitor Rausch continued that the item before the Board is a withdrawal by the low apparent bidder Marroquin, Inc. to have its bid withdrawn due to an unintentional clerical mistake that resulted in an

omission of a substantial quantity of work. Mr. Rausch stated his opinion that this matter meets the requirements of the Public Contracting Law.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what the costs might be to re-bid.

**RAUSCH** Acting Solicitor Rausch indicated the project would have to be re-advertised. It would probably entail a few thousand dollars to re-bid. Mr. Rausch continued that if the Board did not accept the withdrawal of the bid, Marroquin would be notified that the Board does not accept the withdrawal of the bid. Marroquin would then be entitled to a hearing, followed by an administrative route to contest the refusal to accept the withdrawal.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that, based on the initial meetings, it would seem that Marroquin will prevail. They have the right under the law to withdraw if there were a material clerical error.

**RAUSCH** Acting Solicitor Rausch stated they have to come forward with evidence to show that it was simply an unintentional mathematical error.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch continued that additionally if they just missed that and the Board accepts the fact that they missed the \$175,000 it puts Marroquin and the next low bidder very close. This reflects what the market is for this project.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he and Mr. Rausch were convinced this was an error by this company.

**RAUSCH** Acting Solicitor Rausch added that this entire procedure would be done without forfeiture of their bid bond. If the Board accepted their withdrawal because they've complied; they've met the technical requirements of the Public Contracts Law, they would not be forfeiting their bid bond.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that Mr. Amic had made all of the specifics apparent in his report to the Board.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic requested a decision by the Board.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT THE BOARD ACCEPT THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE APPARENT LOW BIDDER, MARROQUIN, INC. FROM THE PROJECT DUE TO A CLERICAL ERROR AND THAT NOTIFICATION BE SENT TO THEM OF THE ACCEPTANCE OF WITHDRAWAL. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- L. General Construction Bid - New Municipal Building and Renovation of Present Administrative Offices - East Coast Contracting, New Cumberland, PA - \$1,834,000 (recommend award)**
- AMIC** Mr. Amic discussed the General Construction Bid for the New Municipal Building and Renovation of the Present Administrative Offices. The low bid is East Coast Contracting of New Cumberland, PA in the amount of \$1,834,000. Mr. Amic recommended approval of this bid by the Board.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether all of the requirements of this bid specification had been met, such as bonds, insurance, etc.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether he would make a general statement to the Board as to his review of all of the information that came forward.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic provided a general analysis of the bids, the economy, increases in energy costs, construction costs including prevailing wages. He commented that all the bids were extremely close and in his opinion costs will not decrease but rather increase in the short run.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there are good penalty clauses in the contracts for non-completion on time. Mr. Pasch observed that there was one local bidder whose price was extremely higher than any of the rest. That local bidder understands that there just aren't any people in the area. Contractors are having an extremely difficult time getting qualified people to work for them.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed with Mr. Pasch. Mr. Amic and Mr. Dittenhafer had discussed the bids previously and indicated that one particular bidder which came in can do the work now.
- DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer stated that the particular bidder is coming off a public school job, which had to be done before the start of the school year. This bidder is anxious to continue working and has the manpower available.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that she had been on the Board since 1992 and prior to that the Board had been looking into the need for additional space for the administration. The concept of this project has been on and off the agenda for many years. There had been a very consistent thread to it, that being the need for additional space. There had been a very thorough process of evaluating several different options, progressing from adding on to the existing building to looking for a different site within

Springettsbury Township. Mrs. Mitrick indicated she felt a very comprehensive study had been done as to the needs for more space.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that he agreed with Mr. Amic that if the project were re-bid next year the cost would be higher.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION BID OF THE NEW MUNICIPAL BUILDING AND RENOVATION OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE TO EAST COAST CONTRACTING, NEW CUMBERLAND, PA FOR \$1,834,000. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- M. Mechanical Bid - New Municipal Building and Renovation of Present Administrative Offices - Deroche Industries, Inc., York, PA - \$291,625 (recommended award).**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the Mechanical Bid for the New Municipal Building and Renovation of Present Administrative Offices. The low bidder was Deroche Industries in the amount of \$291,625. This award was recommended.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AWARD THE MECHANICAL BID FOR THE NEW MUNICIPAL BUILDING AND RENOVATION OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES TO DEROCHE INDUSTRIES, INC. FOR \$291,625. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- N. Plumbing Bid - New Municipal Building and Renovation of Present Administrative Offices - Frey Lutz, Lancaster, PA - \$120,485 (recommended award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the Plumbing Bid for the New Municipal Building and Renovation of the Present Administrative offices. The low bidder was Frey Lutz of Lancaster, PA in the amount of \$120,485. Award was recommended.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO AWARD THE PLUMBING BID FOR THE NEW MUNICIPAL BUILDING AND RENOVATION OF PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES TO FREY LUTZ, LANCASTER, PA. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$120,485. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- O. Electrical Bid - New Municipal Building and Renovation of Present Administrative Offices - Shannon A. Smith, Myerstown, PA - \$446,500 (recommend award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the Electrical Bid for the New Municipal Building and Renovation of Present Administrative Offices - Shannon A. Smith, Myerstown, PA - \$446,500. This award was recommended.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned this item as it was shown on Mr. Amic's report that there were only two bidders. The next bidder was for \$684,417. Mr. Pasch questioned whether there would be concern when there was a 50% difference.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the first bid opened was the high bidder; the second bid was for \$446,500.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Dittenhafer how that fit in terms of the original estimates. Is the apparent successful bidder in around where we estimated it should be.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer responded that the Murphy & Dittenhafer electrical engineers reviewed that and discussed it with the apparent successful bidder. Everyone is very comfortable and this is in line with their estimates.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO ACCEPT THE ELECTRICAL BID FOR THE NEW MUNICIPAL BUILDING AND RENOVATION OF PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES BY SHANNON A. SMITH, MYERSTOWN, PA IN THE AMOUNT OF \$446,500. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**P. General Construction Bid - Farmhouse - MPJ Construction, York, PA \$61,100 (recommend award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding the General Construction Bid for the farmhouse. The low bidder is MPJ Construction of York, PA in the amount of \$61,100. This bid is recommended.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether there was still some thought being given to having a service club taking this on as a project.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck responded that his opinion was to not have a service club involved. There is good opportunity to tie the farmhouse in with the campus approach that was discussed, and it should be part of the entire project.

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the renovations will bring it up to what it needs to be. Mr. Gurreri reminded the Board of the heat bills for the farmhouse.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated the amount was more money than he thought it would be to renovate the farmhouse. He had some concern to renovate space that is not really needed.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked if there were any other hidden costs.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he had not heard any comment about furniture and fixtures, which would be the only other costs.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri mentioned again that this might be a project for some local service club. Mr. Gurreri stated he is against spending the money on the farmhouse.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated the cost is more than he anticipated but asked what the useable square footage would be.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it would be about 2400 sq. ft.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch compared the costs for 2400 sq. ft. would be about \$40.00 a foot. Mr. Pasch agreed with Mr. Gurreri, but comparing \$40.00 or less a foot to renovate versus the tearing down cost, renovation is more economical. Mr. Pasch continued that his recollection was that it was being set up with meeting rooms for the public, etc.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that those uses were forced. There was discussion to utilize the space for a potential library.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that \$85,000 is being invested in the building, but the Supervisors are not addressing insulation, windows needing replacement, doors to be replaced and basement repairs.
- DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer responded that a new heating plant is being installed.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the heating bills will be lower due to better efficiency.
- DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer added that there would be a comprehensive repair of the exterior.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that going into the basement in the wintertime it's cold.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that when discussion took place about possible use of the building, it was linked into the survey that had been conducted regarding the Springettsbury Park Complex. The result of that survey was that the public would appreciate the opportunity to have meeting space. Discussion had taken place about public groups coming into the Administration Building. That was some support to move forward with the renovations on the farmhouse.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch reiterated that the costs are somewhat higher than expected. Mr. Pasch stated that the bids can be rejected.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer stated that three of the prices provided are alternates due to the main building.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated the contractors are already mobilized on site and if it were to be split off the next time it will cost more money.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that he would not want to build the new building and leave the eyesore sitting there without doing something to it.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that money would be spent on the farmhouse in order to tie it into the new building.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri recommended tearing it down.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AWARD THE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION BID FOR THE FARMHOUSE RENOVATION TO MPJ CONSTRUCTION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$61,100. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI VOTED NO.**

**Q. Mechanical Bid - Farmhouse - Deroche Industries, York, PA - \$14,465 (recommended award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding the Mechanical Bid for the Farmhouse by Deroche Industries of York, PA in the amount of \$14,465. This award was recommended.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AWARD THE MECHANICAL BID FOR THE FARMHOUSE TO DEROCHE INDUSTRIES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$14,465. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI VOTED NO.**

**R. Plumbing Bid - Farmhouse - Frey Lutz, Lancaster, PA - \$4,100 -  
(recommended award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding the Plumbing Bid for the Farmhouse by Frey Lutz in the amount of \$4,100. This award was recommended.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE PLUMBING BID ON THE FARMHOUSE BE AWARDED TO FREY LUTZ IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,100. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI VOTED NO.**

**S. Electrical Bid - Farmhouse - Shannon A. Smith, Myerstown, PA - \$6,962 (recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic spoke regarding the Electrical Bid for the Farmhouse by Shannon A. Smith of Myerstown, PA in the amount of \$6,962.

**MR. PASCH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE ELECTRICAL BID FOR THE FARMHOUSE BY SHANNON A. SMITH OF MYERSTOWN, PA. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$6,962. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI VOTED NO.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Frank Dittenhafer and his firm for the excellent service that had been provided throughout the design stage of the project. Obvious from the vote this evening the Board is anxious to move forward.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated for the record that the Board of Supervisors attended 19 different meetings with regard to the building. This was not an easy decision nor was it a decision taken lightly.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she hoped that the reporters present heard Mr. Amic's comment as well.

**T. General Construction Contract 99-1 - Diversion Pumping Station - Allan A. Myers, Inc., Worchester, PA - \$2,631,890 (recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented with regard to the General Construction Contract 99-1 and stated that the low bidder was Allan A. Myers of Worchester, PA in the amount of \$2,631,890. This bid was recommended.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked what the total might be on this project.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it is over \$3 million.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that he knows Allan Myers. He had done work in Scranton and is very reputable contractor.

**MYERS** Mr. Myers stated that Allan Myers had worked with R. K. & K. and had similar good results.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT 99-1 FOR THE DIVERSION PUMPING STATION TO ALLAN A. MYERS, INC. OF WORCESTER, PA IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,631,890. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- U. Electrical Contract 99-2 - Diversion Pumping Station - Philips Brothers Electrical, Glenmore, PA - \$435,400 (recommend award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented with regard to the Electrical Contract 99-2 for the Diversion Pumping Station. Philips Brothers Electrical of Glenmore, PA was the low bidder at \$435,400. This bid was recommended for award.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE ELECTRICAL CONTRACT 99-2 FOR THE DIVERSION PUMPING STATION TO PHILIPS BROTHERS ELECTRICAL, GLENMORE, PA IN THE AMOUNT OF \$435,400 BE APPROVED. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- V. HVAC/Plumbing Contract 99-3 - Diversion Pumping Station - Johnston Construction Company, Dover, PA - \$131,158 (recommended approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented with regard to the heating, air conditioning and plumbing contract 99-3 for the Diversion Pumping Station to low bidder Johnston Construction Company of Dover, PA in the amount of \$131,158. This bid was recommended for award.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE HVAC PLUMBING CONTRACT 99-3 FOR THE DIVERSION PUMPING STATION TO JOHNSTON CONSTRUCTION COMPANY OF DOVER, PA. FOR \$131,158. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

- A. Planning Module - Windsor Commons (Windsor Township) A3-67966 - 275 - 3 - 30,300 GPD (recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented with regard to Planning Module for Windsor Commons A3-67966-275-3 for 30,300 GPD. This item was

recommended for approval by the Wastewater staff and was included in the Chapter 94 report.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING MODULE - WINDSOR COMMONS (WINDSOR TOWNSHIP) A3-67966 - 275 - 3 - 30,300 GPD. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Subdivision 99-06 Springettsbury Township Diversion Pumping Station/Yorktowne Paper (re-approve)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern reported that this item covers the Subdivision for the Diversion Pumping Station. The staff was unable to record this within the 90 days allowed due to the negotiations with Yorktowne Paper. Mr. Stern requested the Board to re-approve and re-sign the paperwork.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO RE-APPROVE SUBDIVISION 99-06 AS ORIGINALLY APPROVED ON MAY 13, 1999. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Planning Module - Village of White Landing East (Windsor Township) A3-67966-271-3 - 9,450 GPD (recommend approval)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented with regard to the Windsor Township Planning Module, the Village of White Landing East in the amount of 9,450 GPD. This is included in the Chapter 94 report and recommended by the staff.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE PLANNING MODULE - VILLAGE OF WHITE LANDING EAST (WINDSOR TOWNSHIP) A3-67966-271-3 - 9,450 GPD. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Subdivision 99-07 - Eastern Development - East Market Street (9/23/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern reported that Subdivision 99-07 related to Land Development 99-07 (also on the Agenda as Item E). Included in this project were the following properties: The Boston Market, now Arby's, Parts America, now Advanced Auto Parts, Golden Corral (Land Development previously approved but not developed). Eastern Development requested subdivision of the parcel into two parcels of land (3.367 acres and 1.964 acres). Mr. Stern spoke in behalf of the project, and the Subdivision planning was reviewed by the Board. Patrick Kildow of Meineke Muffler, Shawn Mathias of Eastern Development, Randy Shearer of Eastern Development and David Keech of Coldwell Banker spoke in behalf of the project.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the 100 foot frontage is available.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that Lot 4 has frontage on Northern Way; Lot 3 has frontage along Market Street.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION 99-07  
EASTERN DEVELOPMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:**

- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN;**
- **WAIVER FOR THE DRAWING SCALE REQUIREMENTS**

**MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**E. Land Development 99-07 - Eastern Development - East Market Street  
(Meineke Muffler & Office Building) (9/23/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern advised that Land Development 99-07 encompassed the development of the two parcels referred to in SD 99-07. Mr. Stern reported that one parcel would be a 50,060 sq. ft. Meineke Muffler and the other 12,850 sq. ft. retail professional office building. Mr. Stern had previously provided a memorandum covering recommendations from the Planning Committee. All items had been addressed with the exception of an agreement.

**KILDOW** Mr. Kildow reported that agreements were needed from what was the Boston Market property to extend curbing on their property. Also needed was agreement from Advance Auto Parts store in order to line this intersection up. Advance Auto Parts had not been willing to grant agreements to line up the intersection. The alternative was to keep the curbing the way it was and there would be a slight offset in that intersection. The agreement with Boston Market property had been obtained.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented that waivers and conditions had been obtained including a letter TRG indicating there was a waiver granted for Golden Corral. The two proposed uses are much less intensive than Golden Corral at which time a full traffic study had been completed.

**KEECH** Mr. Keech stated that reduction of entrances had been done with the foresight in anticipation of the total development of the site including the back two parcels. The attempt to design it and reduce the amount of traffic flow as much as possible on Market Street and Northern Way anticipating that the total site would be developed at some time in the future and that access would be using the internal roads in the plan and design.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated it is a much better use of the site traffic-wise than the Golden Corral would have been.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that because of the entrance modifications, the developer had been requested to provide an agreement modifying curbs on properties of others.
- KILDOW** Mr. Kildow provided a print of elevations for the property.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop clarified that the property would be subdivided but both parcels would be owned by Meineke.
- KILDOW** Mr. Kildow provided input regarding the new Meineke facility with a view of the office building.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned the intention for signage for the rear lots.
- KILDOW** Mr. Kildow responded that a single identifier sign would be sufficient and stated that there is an existing sign.
- STERN** Mr. Stern added that there might be a multi-tenant sign.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Luciani if there were a problem regarding the alignment.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that the Planning Commission discussed it and indicated it was desirable.
- SHEARER** Mr. Shearer added that they had provided for a 3-way stop but traffic moving in will keep moving.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned whether stormwater right-of-way might be an issue.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that stormwater for lot 3 goes over to lot 4 but that an agreement had been provided if Meineke were to sell their property.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the legal agreement was in place.
- KEECH** Mr. Keech confirmed that he had the agreement.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck confirmed what was being conditioned as the execution of the legal agreement to extend the curb.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern whether all items from York County Planning had been addressed.

**STERN** Mr. Stern advised that all the items had been satisfied.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-07 WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND CONDITIONS:**

- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN;**
- **WAIVER FROM DRAWING SCALE REQUIREMENTS;**
- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A COMPLETE TRAFFIC STUDY;**
- **CONDITIONED ON SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY TO THE TOWNSHIP IN AN AMOUNT TO BE DETERMINED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER;**
- **CONDITIONED ON FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SEWER PLANNING MODULE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION;**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE EXECUTION OF THE LEGAL AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE CURB INTO LOT #1.**

**MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reminded the Board of the 250th Anniversary parade on Sunday, August 29th. Mr. Gurreri suggested that the Supervisors meet at the township building at 12:30 p.m. to participate in the parade.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked how long the parade and celebration might last.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated the function would take about two to three hours.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Dori Bowders about the sign.

**BOWDERS** Ms. Bowders indicated the sign was white with black letters, stating "Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors."

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that Keith Wolf, a resident of Stonewood Road, telephoned him. He has contamination in his well, which he believed was coming from the Waste Management dump. Mr. Gurreri had no way to prove the fact was true but if so, it should be investigated.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated some neighbors had complained about speeding on Carroll Road. Stop signs at Cortleigh had been previously requested by the neighbors.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**AUGUST 26, 1999  
APPROVED**

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether any additional information had been obtained about the Post Office.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the Chief Eshbach was notified the Postmaster is not interested in making any changes to the driveway. Mr. Amic intends to pursue the matter.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that a wrap up meeting regarding the Community Picnic had been held. Discussion had taken place regarding volunteers and staff being paid. Mr. Gurreri did not agree with that and was proud of the staff because they would not accept money. The Community Picnic will be held again next year. A Chairman is needed, someone from the Board; Mr. Gurreri prefers not to Chair it next year.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked why Mr. Gurreri recommended the Chairman should be a Supervisor.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that the Board wished to have control. He felt that the presence of a Board member was a positive influence on the Committee.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that the budgeted money accounting presently showed \$5,208, which will be lower as money is still coming in.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Committee thought the Chair should be a Supervisor.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that was his opinion.
- SPEICHER** Mrs. Speicher stated that this was a general consensus of the committee.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated there was no way she could commit to that in view of her present schedule.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that it was a good thing to do and an opportunity to give back to the community. There had been some discussion about having the picnic the first two to three weeks of June.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Gurreri if he could go back to his committee and see whether they would be interested in having someone else serve other than a Supervisor.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated Gail Reed would serve.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**AUGUST 26, 1999  
APPROVED**

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that he was unable to make a commitment at this point.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Mr. Gurreri contributed an unbelievable amount of time bringing everything together. The day of the picnic he was at the Township building from morning until night. Without Mr. Gurreri's efforts the details would not have been taken care of. Mr. Amic suggested that the Supervisors could attend meetings as available. There are Honorary Chairmen. The Board needs to be identified with this celebration. Mr. Amic felt it was very important.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that he had a great committee, and they deserved the credit.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to keep this item on the Agenda for further discussion.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that a Full Committee Meeting of the Local Government Advisory Board - Assembly of Government would be meeting at Wisehaven September 29 at 5:30 p.m. Chamber of Commerce of York is in charge of the meeting.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated reservations would be made for all of the Supervisors to attend.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop clarified that the Police Pension Board is September 30th.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck reported that the Pennsylvania State Association of Townships provides the Milton Delancy award for youth groups. Mr. Schenck had received a packet of information indicating that applications are due in several weeks. This award (\$100) applied to youth groups which have made significant contributions to the community. Mr. Schenck indicated he would supply information to any youth group interested.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck reported that September 9th is the York County Industrial Development Authority's function at the York Water Co. facility at 5:30 p.m. Mr. Schenck commented that a Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held the same evening at 7:30 p.m.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch reported that the Principal of St. Joseph's school, which has an enrollment of about 500 students, contacted Mr. Pasch indicating that an emergency plan is being developed and they are working with Chief Eshbach and a few other schools in preparation due to the signs of our times. They are trying to set up an emergency plan with First Church of

the Brethren and Suburban Middle School as well. Mr. Pasch offered whatever help he could give but he called it to the Board's attention for moral support and support of the Chief in whatever he does to help them come up with a plan.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded that the Supervisors support Mr. Pasch and Chief Eshbach in this matter.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reported on the Emergency Services Commission meeting. A meeting was planned for 7 p.m. at Commonwealth Fire Co. on Wednesday, September 8th, in addition to the regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, September 16th.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she had attended the last meeting simply as a resident of Springettsbury Township. Chairman Mitrick commended Mr. Bishop and Mr. Gurreri for their persistence with this effort. She witnessed a lot of push for progress.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reminded the Board of several meetings scheduled:  
Development Zone Meeting, 7 a.m. Tuesday, September 21  
Emergency Services Commission, Thursday, September 16  
12-Year Transportation Plan (Stan Saylor), Thursday, September 16

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented on the Park and Rec Board's Minutes of June 16th, which mentioned an action item to contact the York Daily Record regarding possible fields available for soccer use in the community. Mrs. Mitrick spoke with Sharon Nichols and advised that before they contacted the newspaper they needed to go through Mr. Amic's office.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that a letter had been received from Steven Baker regarding the sludge proposal. Also a letter was received from Robert Shoup regarding Pension Benefits, and a letter regarding Police Benefits from Harry Edy.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick advised she had given a copy of a letter received from Doris Weaver who resides in Boulevard Commons. Mrs. Weaver included a number of condominium promises not kept and requested Township help.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether the Township could take any action against Boulevard Commons.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**AUGUST 26, 1999  
APPROVED**

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the only item that might be enforceable is the jogging path. If it were on the plans, and not provided, that might be enforced.
- RAUSCH** Acting Solicitor Rausch commented that usually a developer maintains control until a certain number of units are sold. There would be a declaration filed if it is a condo association, which can be formed, but the homeowners really don't have a say.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Mr. Amic to investigate and respond to Mrs. Weaver.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern about a letter from Lee Brown who wanted to have added security. Mr. Brown had telephoned Mrs. Mitrick about his right for open burning. Mrs. Mitrick asked Mr. Stern whether he had had any contact with Mr. Brown.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he had spoken with Mr. Brown and that the matter of open burning was scheduled for later in the Agenda.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that Mr. Brown supports open burning.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated Mr. Brown has a Christmas tree farm.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated Mr. Brown stated that if some of his Christmas trees become diseased he needs to get them off the property so that they don't damage the other trees. He would like to be able to burn them.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that his understanding is that in agricultural they are permitted open burning.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated the Ordinance must be adopted.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Mr. Stern to represent the Historic Preservation Committee with information relating to signs.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that Old East York became a National Register District. Pleasureville will probably become one in February. The Historic Committee wants to put signs up and had provided some possible signs for the Board's review. Mr. Stern reviewed the different possibilities.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked where the signs would be placed.

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that private property owners are being asked to place them on their property on the north and south side of Market Street.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked who would pay the cost of the signs.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the Township would pay the expense.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that it would be appropriate to place a sign at each end of the district and have a single-sided sign. Luther Sowers advised that there were some property owners in that area who would appreciate this on their property.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested the Board's willingness to give permission to proceed looking into a governmental sign.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Zoning Ordinance gives any guidance about appropriate governmental signs.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the only item stated is that PennDot signs are not permitted.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that money had been spent to get this historic approved. He would like to see a sign placed in good taste that looks well.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck agreed with Mr. Pasch. The money had been spent for the designation giving the right to put the sign up. Also since the business community is made to conform with the sign ordinance, then the Township should abide by those rules.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed with Mr. Pasch. If it is to be done, it should be done properly. He also agreed with Mr. Schenck's concern. If we're going to make other people follow the rules, we follow them too.
- STERN** Mr. Stern asked whether there was a cost that the Board would have in mind.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that the costs should be kept within their budget.
- STERN** Mr. Stern commented that that expense would be included in next year's budget which is being prepared. Next year Pleasureville would be included so four signs will be involved (roughly \$6,000).
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that one of the arguments in favor of the government sign was consideration to the property owner that if you were

to put a sign on the property that was supported by posts it may be better received than a strongly constructed sign with a brick monument.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the Board could give guidelines the signs should stay within our Ordinance but should be done in a way that is tasteful and not cheap.

**STERN** Mr. Stern also reported that Charlie Lauer is working on changing the street name signs. The green signs must be changed due to Federal requirements which state they must be 8" tall.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that the Supervisors had received a copy of a Petition from homeowners and business owners residing on or near Memory Lane Extended regarding their opposition to closing off Memory Lane Extended.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that Mr. Amic received a letter from Mr. Snodgrass, who lives near Haines Road by Manor Care Nursing Home. He complained about the trash being picked up in the middle of the night. Mrs. Mitrick asked Mr. Amic if he had an opportunity to respond.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he had not yet responded and added that this is an every six-month occurrence. He will request the waste management people to be more quiet, however, the waste management contract is not a Township contract but a contract with the nursing home.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether there is a way to regulate that.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he did not think the Township can regulate this problem.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to contact the hauler and remind them again that the area is being disturbed.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**RAUSCH** Acting Solicitor Rausch had nothing further to report other than what was provided in Don Yost's written report.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether Mr. Rausch would convey to Mr. Yost the September 8th date for the next Emergency Services Commission Meeting.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that Mr. Bishop asked him to prepare a capital and cash requirements rate study for sanitary facilities, and added that the report is in the packet.

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Agreement Commonwealth Fire Company - Springettsbury Township**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that this Agreement relates to the on-going saga of the recreation area. Solicitor Yost drafted the agreement, and Mr. Amic recommended that the agreement be passed.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT THE BOARD AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO EXECUTE THE GROUND LEASE AGREEMENT WITH COMMONWEALTH FIRE COMPANY IN SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Amic to communicate with Mr. Bashian that this is not the last and final offer but is acceptable to the Board.

**B. Ordinance 99-06 - BOCA National Fire Code - Penalty Provisions (permission to advertise)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern spoke for Ordinance 99-06 and recommended that this Ordinance be changed to be in compliance with Section 1-9 Code of Ordinances in the Township which would make violations summary offenses. Mr. Stern asked for permission to advertise.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THAT ORDINANCE 99-06 BE ADVERTISED WITH THE INTENT OF ADOPTION. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Ordinance 99-07 - BOCA and CABO Building Codes - Fire Sprinkler Requirements (permission to advertise)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that there had previously been some difficulties with the amendments to the BOCA Code related to fire sprinklers. Mr. Stern, Fire Chief Hickman and Ron Simmons discussed the sprinkler requirements. The sprinkler requirement should follow the BOCA Code requirements as published, as opposed to our local amendments. Mr. Stern requested permission to advertise.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he would not want to force someone into putting sprinklers in when not necessary.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that some time ago the sprinklers started with the idea that everything gets sprinklered and then worked backwards from that. Mr. Schenck recalled the pain of making the changes at that time.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that this issue was being battled out in the building community. Nearly everyone except the fire fighters believes that the codes should be followed as written.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that as much as possible should be done to comply with the BOCA code.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick recalled many meetings regarding the sprinkler requirement. She would like some time to review this matter.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated this is simply permission to advertise, not a final decision so time is available. Mr. Bishop stated he agreed with Mr. Pasch that getting in sinc with the BOCA code made sense to him.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that at the time Chief Segrist brought in substantial research to support making the requirements more restrictive. Other communities extending the requirements from the BOCA code. She continued that she would like time to review her files.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether this would be part of the Code of Ordinances.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that was correct. No public hearings would be involved.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that it might be good to have a Public Hearing.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT THE BOARD GRANT PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. CHAIRMAN MITRICK AND MR. SCHENCK VOTED NO.**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop requested a Public Hearing before one of the next Regular Meetings.

**STERN** Mr. Stern asked whether Mr. Bishop had in mind the general public or to have someone from both sides of the issue present something to the Board. Such as advocates of sprinklers being a fire service and advocates of the building code as it's written which would be York County Builder's Association.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the experts, i.e., engineers and fire code people input into the decisions.

**Consensus was to schedule a Public Hearing for Thursday, September 23 at 6:30 p.m.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated he would have someone speaking on both sides for 15 minutes each and then open for general comments.

**E. Ordinance 99-08 – BOCA National Fire Code – Open Burning Regulations (permission to advertise)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that our Ordinances are not in accordance with the requirements for Open Burning. Section 129.14 lists things that are permitted to be burned. One of those items is prevention and control of disease or pests, which could be plants or production of agricultural commodities which includes Christmas trees.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE ADVERTISEMENT OF ORDINANCE 99-08. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated he was somewhat disappointed that there were two significant items on the agenda relating to fires, and the Fire Chief was not present.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that the Fire Chief was in court in Ocean City.

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. Board of Supervisors Public Hearing – July 22, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PUBLIC HEARING JULY 22, 1999 AS SUBMITTED. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. SCHENCK ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**B. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – July 22, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING JULY 22, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Board of Supervisors Work Session (Development Zone) – July 26, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION – DEVELOPMENT ZONE JULY 26, 1999 AS**

**SUBMITTED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Board of Supervisors Work Session (Park Master Plan Fundraisers) – July 26, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION – PARK MASTER PLAN FUNDRAISERS – JULY 26, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he had no Old Business which required action.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Professional Fund Raisers – Mt. Zion Park Master Plan**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Board had interviewed the two professional fundraiser organizations. It had been placed on the Agenda to focus attention on that matter. Should the Board decide to make a selection it will be moved up on the Agenda.

**B. Resignation of Mr. Jeffrey Nicodemus from the Zoning Hearing Board**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic announced that Mr. Nicodemus had resigned from the Zoning Hearing Board. The Township will be looking for someone to fill this vacancy.

**C. Amendment to Agreement – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl/Springettsbury Township**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the Amendment to Agreement related to an item not previously bid and held in abeyance. In their original agreement there was a piece that they were to provide later. This matter will be brought up at the next meeting.

**Zoning Hearing Board Vacancy**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented regarding the Zoning Hearing Board vacancy. She reminded Mr. Amic of a letter, which had been received from Charles Stewart indicating at the end of the year he would not be serving any longer. Chairman Mitrick indicated advertising both of these positions would be in order.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned advertising in the legal page. He stated he did not think people read the legal page. He suggested that what is intended is like a Press Release type of thing that the newspapers would pick it up.
- BOWDERS** Ms. Bowders suggested an “Attention Springettsbury Township Residents” notice.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that newsletters and other kinds of avenues could be utilized.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Ms. Bowders about the next newsletter.
- BOWDERS** Ms. Bowders asked Chairman Mitrick what the Board’s wishes would be.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that discussion had indicated that it would be too soon to coordinate with Recreation. His thought was to wait until early winter to catch the two up together. The Recreation newsletter was scheduled to be mailed the end of August.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the question is on the table as to whether to combine the two newsletters.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that the idea was to see what the reaction from the residents was to the Recreation newsletter. There was no burning need to put a newsletter out quickly.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked about advertising for the Wastewater Treatment Director or Assistant Manager position.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated she had discussed the matter of the open position with Mr. Gurreri and that Mr. Amic wanted some time to prepare something for the Board’s consideration.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated Mr. Stern had provided some ideas. He also indicated that budget time would be coming up and discussions will ensue about personnel.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that it is a budget issue.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that he would entertain discussions regarding long-range planning.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked how long it would take to advertise for professional positions.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**AUGUST 26, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated the process takes between four to six months.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to provide an action plan for the next meeting.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he would have a full report by September 17, 1999.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop would like related discussion 20 minutes before the next meeting in September.

At 6:30 p.m. the Board will meet as an Executive Session on September 30 to discuss personnel issues.

The Police Pension Board will meet on September 30 at 7:30 p.m.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri would like discussion about the park issues.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that all those issues relate together including the fund raisers.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 11:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Jim Noel, Wastewater Treatment Plant  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors to order at 7:35 p.m. Chairman Mitrick announced that there would be an Executive Session following the Regular Meeting regarding legal matters.

Chairman Mitrick reminded the Board members of two meetings scheduled for Monday, July 26 at 7 a.m. to further discuss the Development Zone, and Monday evening at 7 p.m. to discuss the Professional Fundraisers regarding Redevelopment of the Park.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**FRY** Mrs. Margaret Fry of 619 Arsenal Road, York thanked the Board of Supervisors for taking the time to review her concern about trucks parked on Industrial Highway. Action had been taken to alleviate the situation.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

Mrs. Fry discussed a storm drain at the bottom of Mac Alley, which does not take the water that comes through the cut in road placed there when PennDot worked in that area. The water that comes down Sherman and flows down the cut in road by-passes the drain to the right approximately 10 inches. In the midst of the flow of water is a stop sign, which actually had been moved by the force of the water. The drain is not effectively catching the water.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic if he was aware of this location.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he knew the location of the problem.

**FRY** Mrs. Fry further stated that she had discussed this storm drain situation with Ron Simmons, who indicated he would look at the drain.

Mrs. Fry also commented on a piece of land adjacent to the parking lot at Rutters, which was initially all mud. Mrs. Fry understood that PennDot owns the land, and to correct the problem of the mud, PennDot stoned the land. When cars or tractor trailers travel in that area, the rocks and stones are thrown all over Mac Alley against the property owner's fence. One of Mrs. Fry's neighbors had been in touch with PennDot, but Mrs. Fry personally had discussed the matter with Chris Leiphart. The neighbor was told that funds are not available to pave the area. Mrs. Fry is concerned with children who play on the property adjacent to the cut in road near the stone area. The stones have flown as far as 15 to 20 feet when the tires spin. The stones had been swept back into place about three weeks ago. Chris Leiphart had advised Mrs. Fry that perhaps "No Trespassing" signs might help the matter. Mrs. Fry asked the Board whether they could be instrumental in correcting the problem.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the staff would be requested to check the problem and contact PennDot if something can be done.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would follow up.

**SHAFFER** Mrs. Sandy Shaffer, 1891 Mt. Zion Road, York, PA  
(Telephone: 757-5831)  
Mrs. Shaffer asked the Board to look at a storm water pipe placed on her property. She had not been able to get any help previously from the Township regarding her property. Mrs. Shaffer asked whether she could fill the pipe with ground.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked whether she was referring to the pipe that runs north and south on Mt. Zion Road, or the pipe that exits going east on the property.

**SHAFFER** Mrs. Shaffer responded that this pipe is the one that is damaged.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked whether the pipe is the one that goes under her driveway.

**SHAFFER** Mrs. Shaffer responded that was correct.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that if she were to fill up the pipe the water would come out of the ditch and over the driveway.

**SHAFFER** Mrs. Shaffer requested that something be done about it.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that her original complaint came through Representative Todd Platts' office. Representative Platts requested Mr. Amic to review the situation. Mr. Amic and Mr. Lauer had visited the property and determined that the area is in the State right-of-way. The Township did not put the drain there. The Township did contact the State and suggested that the problem should be reviewed. Mr. Amic suggested Mrs. Shaffer advise Mr. Lauer when she would be at home so that he and Mr. Amic can visit the property again.

**SHAFFER** Mrs. Shaffer indicated she would appreciate any help that could be provided.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineering – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**SCHOBBER** Mr. Schober provided updates to his written report of July 15<sup>th</sup>. He reported that there was nothing new regarding the 537 Plan. The State is reviewing the permit application for the pump station. The bids for the PLC had been received, and the low bid was \$174,000 from GES. A bid protest was received from a bidder who was not on the list of approved bidders. Mr. Schober indicated there had been some correspondence between the protester and Solicitor Yost. The bids for the Mill Creek Interceptor were received, reviewed and forwarded to Mr. Amic with recommendation for award.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked about the PLC Upgrade. There were two parts to the bid, one being if they got the PLC's from the local distributor, and Mr. Schenck noticed that the price difference was substantial.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that this had been set up to evaluate the bids and they could provide whomever they wanted to, or have it provided by a local distributor. There could then be a value judgment made as to why it would be worth going that direction. One bidder did not propose to provide a local distributor, and that was the high bid. The low bid proposed to use a local distributor. Mr. Schober stated that whether it was the price of the local distributor or not that made the difference was not known.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that then Mr. Schober would not know whether that was the only component that made the difference; it wasn't broken out.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober indicated that was correct.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated then, that as far as the Board is concerned, the main reason for awarding the bid to this particular contractor for \$174,000 is because they were the low bidders by over \$100,000.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober added that they had worked extensively with that particular firm and have the assurance they can do the job.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani reported that he and Mr. Amic met with the owner of Henry's Beer Distributor on Plymouth Road. The right-of-way was defined and the parking will be reconfigured. They are looking at some of the issues for curbing the area.

Mr. Luciani also updated the Board on the Pleasant Valley Road project. Tom Austin, Charlie Lauer and Mr. Luciani met there to review the line striping. With the CNA Building and Graham Packaging moving into the structure, there are many turning movements required. The goal is to create a free lane roadway where the center lane would be a left-turn lane, which would allow through traffic with three 12-foot lanes. The lines will be painted some time in the next week or so.

Mr. Luciani reported on the issue of stop signs. Further review and test runs have revealed that the through movement which had been desired may be possible. Before this is done he would like to see a shift in the traffic, and when that becomes evident by shifting over the one lane on Pleasant Valley Road, the transition becomes better. As you drive west on Pleasant Valley Road, minor tweaking will allow a nice transition in the

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

new road, which will work out well. By early next week striping will be done.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked for clarification as to where the stop signs will be placed.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that at this time the stop signs are currently on Pleasant Valley Road. When Mr. Amic and he met there three or four times, there was a concern about cars traveling west on Pleasant Valley. They pick up a little depression in the roadway. Mr. Luciani drove it at 35 mph, and it's evident there but it's not unlike a lot of intersections. By putting a jog line and shifting just a foot to the left will get traffic out of the deep depression and create a smoother transition. Once the traffic patterns change, the through street initially desired can be achieved. Initially the stop signs will be on Pleasant Valley Road, and within a month or two, the traffic engineering study indicates the changes can be made. Before that is implemented on Memory Lane Extended north of Livingston's parcel, a sign would be erected indicating a stop sign ahead because of a blind turn, and some flashers would alert motorists to the new change in direction. Initially it will stay as is, but by the next Board meeting discussion will take place concerning revisions in compliance with the traffic and engineering study.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that there are resident concerns regarding putting the stop sign on Memory Lane because of the curve and the fast movement of the traffic.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that matter had been reviewed again and typically the stop signs should be facing the travel lane that has the lesser volume. There had been further discussion about a speedway on Pleasant Valley Road, but one of the goals and the entire purpose was to move traffic efficiently through that area.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Mr. Lauer became quite concerned because with Graham Packaging moving into that building, there are a number of vehicles parking along Pleasant Valley Road. Every parking space in the lot was filled, and there were five or six cars parked on the west side of the Road in front of CNA. Additional information in John's report is one of the reasons for the turning lane. This would force cars to not park there without posting it.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what the reason would be to not post it.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the three lanes would give people the message not to park along the highway.

**ESHBACH** Police Chief Eshbach commented that if you have a lane of travel marked, and someone is parked in it, the car can be moved immediately.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that, in fairness to Graham, the Township should send a letter letting them know (since they're parking there now) that it would be a travel lane and to let their employees know.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Luciani whether the flashers warning of the stop signs would be a temporary measure.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that this would be a temporary measure until the transition takes place.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Luciani about the property in the area off Mundis Mill, involving concern about water coming down the hill onto the Snyder property.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that Messrs. Eckert and Schenck had visited the property.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that the one concern was the lot that was under development. A sedimentation trap was installed at the end of the property, and the grass seeding helped. As additional homes were developed along the street, all the people built seepage pits in the back of their yard to control the run off.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**HALBERT** Mr. Robert Halbert reported that approval had been obtained to advertise from EPA and the project is currently advertised. Bid opening will be August 13. There are 16 grant conditions that apply to the \$1 million, all of which are in the process of being met. Mr. Halbert updated the status report and advised that the Part II Permit is being reviewed by the State and is expected to be completed by the last week of July. Mr. Halbert does expect an Addendum to come from that review. Conrail received approval of their review by Frederick R. Harris, and R. K. & K. is waiting for the lease agreement. Frederick R. Harris is awaiting the engineering agreement from Norfolk Southern before they release the lease agreement. R. K. & K. is encouraging Norfolk Southern to execute the agreement to release the lease agreement. The PUC issue is completed. Regarding the

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

subdivision plan, Don Yost's signature has been forwarded, and easements and rights-of-way continue to be processed.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether the contract could be issued if all of these issues were not cleared.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that a right of possession will provide what is needed, and possession can be taken. Mr. Yost provided further input on the status. A verbal settlement has been obtained from Yorktowne, and the documents have been drafted for signature. Mr. Yost believes that the Yorktowne process was successful, but needed to be implemented. Associated Wholesale had been completed. Regarding CSX, the Declaration of Taking was filed. Regarding the City of York the Authority Solicitor is preparing the right-of-way.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the access point to the City plant troubled the Plant Director, and he asked to have it moved.

**YOST** Mr. Yost indicated that this has stirred the Authority. They want to build those items into the right-of-way agreement and he needed the language.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert recommended that R. K. & K. meet with the City Authority to review the details.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that it was his understanding that agreement had been reached. It was to have been put in writing.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert reiterated that if there were any additional paperwork to be accomplished that might hold up the process, R. K. & K. would provide whatever is questioned and finalize the matter.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated he would push for a draft of that agreement.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated he would contact the City to learn if anything specific is required.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the City would want to put in the right-of-way agreement where the access point can be planned. There are no other agreements, which will state that point.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert added that EPA is looking for documentation that the recipient shall submit an acceptable legal opinion to the necessary sites and that these rights-of-way have been obtained, and they are free from

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

any restrictions or encumbrance that might restrict their use for the purpose that was intended.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 7/22/99.**
- B. Murphy & Dittenhafer – Municipal Building – Progress Billing #9 - \$4,290.10**
- C. Reed Smith Shaw & McClay – Phase II Grant Effort – Progress Billing #3 - \$7,885.63**
- D. C. S. Davidson – East/West Interceptor – Progress Billing #6 - \$359.63**
- E. Buchart Horn – PLC System Engineering – Progress Billing #5 - \$2,079.25**
- F. Buchart Horn – Mill Creek Interceptor – Progress Billing #4 - \$578.49**
- G. Buchart Horn – Harrowgate/Kingston – Progress Billing #8 - \$994.48**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF ACCOUNTS PAYABLE, ITEMS A. THROUGH G. WITH THE CORRECTION OF THE AMOUNT IN ITEM F. FROM \$758.49 TO \$578.49 FOR MILL CREEK INTERCEPTOR PROGRESS BILLING #4 SHOWN ON THE AGENDA. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

- A. 1991 Chevrolet Caprice Police Vehicle – 247728 – Mileage 87,718 – Permission to Advertise**
- B. 1995 Chevrolet Caprice Police Vehicle – 166684 – Mileage 97,713 – Permission to Advertise**
- C. 1977 International (School Bus) – 21361 – Mileage 103,768 – Permission to Advertise**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic requested permission from the Board to advertise items A., B., and C. for sale.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO ADVERTISE FOR THE SALE OF THE TWO SURPLUS POLICE VEHICLES AND THE 1977 INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL BUS. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- D. Mill Creek Interceptor – (Hold in Abeyance)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic recommended that the Board hold the Mill Creek Interceptor item in abeyance for further review.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- E. Engineering Selection for Utility Water System – Recommend Rummel, Klepper & Kahl at a not to exceed cost of \$19,760.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Item E. relates to the engineering quote for the Utility Water System at the Wastewater Treatment Plant and recommended award for this project to Rummel, Klepper & Kahl.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO AWARD THE ENGINEERING SELECTION FOR THE UTILITY WATER SYSTEM TO R. K. & K., AT A NOT TO EXCEED COST OF \$19,760. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- F. Sale of 1988 GMC Truck to Jefferson Township, Berks County - \$7,000**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic referred to the purchase of the last truck. At that time Mr. Lauer had requested that the Township not utilize the trade in portion of \$2,500. A quote was received from Jefferson Township, Berks County for \$7,000, and Mr. Amic recommends proceeding to sell to Jefferson Township.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE SALE OF THE 1988 GMC DUMP TRUCK TO JEFFERSON TOWNSHIP, BERKS COUNTY, FOR \$7,000. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- G. PLC Upgrade – GES Technology - \$174,000 – (Recommend Award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic referred to his previously submitted report, as well as his correspondence with Solicitor Yost with regard to a protest from a non-qualified bidder.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost reported on the protest. Pennsylvania does not provide a method of protesting bids in municipal contracting; consequently, that does not require Springettsbury Township to do anything. Solicitor Yost indicated he was satisfied that a prequalification provides that bidders can be prequalified, which provides for a fair playing field. A disappointed bidder has no cause of action against the Township, and for that reason there is minimal risk to award this contract.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he had read Solicitor's report and his concern was what the process is in terms of qualifying the bidder. If the process is such that a bidder would be excluded that may be qualified and may have bid a lower price on the work that would be a missed opportunity. Mr. Pasch questioned how a bidder is determined to be qualified.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that these were firms that Mr. Schober's company had worked with in the past and were familiar with this kind of work.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober indicated they had reviewed the process for other projects where the general contractor is limited to a certain number of systems integrators to do this type of project. The integrators are very familiar with the process that is used and with the fact that they will be prequalifying. There are many contractors that have tried to get prequalified, and there are always a few that try to call up a day or two before the bid who would like to be pre-qualified.

Mr. Schober additionally stated that the gentleman who protested never called and never came to the plant to look at the project; never made any inquiries at all.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that Buchart-Horn, as the engineering firm, determines who is and who is not prequalified. The bidders have enough opportunity to become prequalified from the time the bid goes out until the time it's due, and it so states they've got to be prequalified.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober stated that was correct.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri questioned whether re-bidding would solve the problem.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that it would solve the problem except that if there were still pre-qualifying that particular bidder would have to be given the opportunity to pre-qualify.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what the cost would be to re-bid the project.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that there would be specification and advertising changes.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober added that there would be advertising and pre-bid conferences and a bid opening, which would not preclude the other bidders to protest if they were not pre-qualified. The only other option would be to leave it open to everybody. The low bidder wanted the job.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the low bid was within the cost of what was estimated originally.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober indicated that was correct.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri questioned litigation.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the Township was within normal risk.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the one thing the Township needs to insure is that it is a level playing field for everyone who wishes to be pre-qualified. Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Schober how the Township could insure that all bidders are treated the same.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober stated that everyone is given the same opportunity to be prequalified. The four firms that were listed are well established firms in the area with whom B-H had worked. They've done good work and have the capabilities to do the contract as it was set up. Anybody else has the opportunity.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked, when the project is announced for bid, whether there would be time to pre-qualify someone new if they came in time to do that.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that the process allows for prequalification within a 30-day bid period especially if a new bidder applies within the first week or two.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost added that the protester in this instance never applied to B-H and asked to bid.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AWARD THE PLC UPGRADE CONTRACT TO GES TECHNOLOGY FOR \$174,000. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Planning Module – Equine Meadows (York Township) A3-67971-4863 – 86,250 GPD**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding the Equine Meadows Planning Module, which was recommended by the Wastewater staff and noted on the Chapter 94 report.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE PLANNING MODULE, EQUINE MEADOWS (YORK TOWNSHIP) A3-67971-4863 – 86,250 GPD. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**B. Planning Module (Windsor Township), Carl L & Betty L. Hamm  
(Windsor Township) A3-67966-286-3 - 700 GPD**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic spoke in favor of the Planning Module for Carl L. and Betty L. Hamm for 700 GPD and indicated this Planning Module was recommended by the Wastewater staff and is included in the Chapter 94 report.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING MODULE A3-67966-286-3-700 GPD FOR CARL AND BETTY HAMM IN WINDSOR TOWNSHIP FOR 700 GPD. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Transfer of two (2) EDU's (700 GPD) from the present Diehl Motor Company location to Whiteford Road (lot in front of CNA Insurance) for new Diehl Service Center (Recommended Approval)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented regarding the transfer of two EDU's. Diehl Motor Company is creating a new service center and asked to move the two existing EDU's to the new center. DEP has approved this transfer.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the ownership of the property had been transferred.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated the property had been transferred to the best of his knowledge.

**LOVE** Monica Love of Sight Design Concepts, spoke for the project and confirmed that the ownership had been transferred.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked where the property is actually located.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated it is on Aspen Road and Myrtle Avenue.

**STERN** Mr. Stern showed the Board a map where the property is located.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO TRANSFER TWO EDU'S OF 700 GPD FROM THE PRESENT DIEHL MOTOR COMPANY LOCATED TO WHITEFORD ROAD FOR THE NEW DIEHL SERVICE CENTER. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Planning Module – 2810 E. Market Street A3-67957-700 GPD  
(Recommend Approval)**

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding Planning Module A3-67957 which was recommended by the Wastewater staff and is included on the Chapter 94 report.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE PLANNING MODULE 2810 EAST MARKET STREET A3-67957-700 GPD. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**7. COMMUNICATION FROM SUPERVISORS:**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he had a resident complaint regarding truckers using Jake brakes on Market Street and Mt. Zion Road creating screeching, etc. Mr. Pasch indicated that he referred to the existence of a safety liability. The resident was referring to a state road. Mr. Pasch asked whether the state also has the safety liability issue. The indication from this resident was that there are other townships in the area which have restrictions against the use of Jake brakes.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that recently New Oxford initiated some Ordinances limiting Jake brakes. Mr. Amic volunteered to investigate how New Oxford handled this matter and will report back to the Board.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that he had received a letter from the County Commissioners regarding the 250<sup>th</sup> birthday celebration August 19<sup>th</sup> from 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.. The Board of Supervisors was invited to attend the birthday celebration, and Mr. Gurreri urged the Board members to attend.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that Representative Stan Saylor would host a meeting regarding the 12-year Plan of the Department of Transportation September 16<sup>th</sup> in Red Lion, which the Board should attend.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that these meetings were very informational, and Representative Saylor spent a lot of time answering questions. Mr. Amic planned to attend the September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported he attended a concert at the park featuring "Re-Creation" and approximately 1,200 people were in attendance. Additionally, he had received a telephone call following the concert indicating that no traffic directors were there to let people out. Mr. Gurreri suggested that Mr. Bainbridge telephone Chief Eshbach and request someone to direct traffic.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that there are wonderful programs in the park, but the township needs to make sure that people can get to them and away from them safely.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that one traffic director would be sufficient. He added that when a citizen walks from the concert area down to the lower parking lot it's very dark and rough terrain. Mr. Gurreri indicated a concern for the safety factor that there are no lights there. When the park is redone this will be better lighted.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported on the 250<sup>th</sup> celebration Community Day. There were a lot of volunteers. Springettsbury presented the colors, and it was very hot. The staff was very involved, and Mr. Gurreri recognized the contributions of Paul Amic, Jewel Frey, Betty Speicher, Andrew Stern, Charlie Lauer, Barry Myers, Brian Kauffman, Gail Reed and her committee. Mr. Gurreri also recognized contributions in other areas by St. Joseph's, the Fire Police, newspapers, WSBA, etc. It was a good day; a lot of food vendors were there, and they would like to come back next year.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch thanked Mr. Gurreri and his committee. The Board had given Mr. Gurreri a difficult time on the budget, and he went ahead and it came off very well. The publicity was great. There would have been a lot more people during the daytime, however, it was extremely hot. It was difficult to be there during the day, but at night there was a really nice crowd. Mr. Pasch indicated that the Board owed Mr. Gurreri a vote of thanks, and Mr. Pasch extended his personal appreciation.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the celebration did not run over budget, but the complete financial report will be provided when the final bills have been paid.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri mentioned the little 6-year old girl who sang the National Anthem was a great hit. Mr. Schenck presented the Proclamation on the Historical District. Luther Sowers presented his "Springettsbury Moments." Finally, Mr. Gurreri asked whether the Board would like to have this Community Day again next year.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he had received indications from a number of people in that they would like to see it continued next year.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that if the Board desires to hold this again it is important to begin immediately with planning in order to get bands in place, etc. He encouraged one Board member to be in charge of it.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she would be interested in reviewing the summary report from the committee and learning how they feel about continuing to do it next year.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the day of the celebration most of the volunteers came from the staff.
- SPEICHER** Betty Speicher indicated that she was in favor of doing it again next year, but that there is a need to determine where improvements could be made in certain areas and provide more volunteers. As far as a time change, Betty indicated she was in favor of July. Once a date is established, stick with that and people can plan ahead.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the weather this July was extraordinary for the middle of July.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that this would be the time to change the date if it were necessary. He cautioned the Board not to change the date every year.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick agreed with Betty, that if you establish a date very early then it can be incorporated into all of the newsletters as a means of communication to the public.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated he had not heard any arguments against continuing it. It is a great opportunity to have the community get together.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that it is a nice event to have, particularly in the time frame of the redevelopment of the park to stimulate people's interest early and make a greater participation in the redevelopment.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that he had been impressed with the amount of work that had been put into making the day a great celebration.
- Consensus of the Board indicated that Mr. Gurreri should go back to the committee with the hopes that it would be continued.**
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Gurreri in behalf of the Board of Supervisors for his leadership of this event, and indicated his efforts were appreciated.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that there is a parade coming up on August 29<sup>th</sup>. He encouraged the Board to attend, and he has a Cadillac convertible lined up for them.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reported on the Emergency Services Commission, which met on Thursday, July 15<sup>th</sup>. The priority topic was the proposed Joint Operating Agreement between the three volunteer organizations. The Emergency Services Commission unanimously agreed that the Joint Operating Agreement was the appropriate way to resolve the matter. The Emergency Services Commission requested that the Board of Supervisors express their agreement or non-agreement with this as an approach to dissolving some of the problems.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked for clarification that this was a unanimous opinion of the Emergency Services Commission.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that was correct.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Bishop whether he was satisfied with the attendance, i.e., it was fully supported in light of meeting attendance.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that he could only go by who showed up at the meetings. Mr. Bishop opinioned that there are people who would just as soon put their heads in the sand and not have to face the issues; the Minutes can be reviewed to see who had been at meetings and who hadn't. The Commission acted and acted unanimously. One of the first issues that came before the Commission over a year ago was that the people that showed up there were very unhappy with the Board of Supervisors because the Board of Supervisors named one person from each volunteer organization to be on the Commission. A number of the people came forward and said well that's not right, what if we can't be there; we're not going to be represented. We need to have a provision for an alternate, so the Board of Supervisors took that advice and made provisions for alternates for every one of the volunteer organizations to address that issue. Mr. Bishop indicated he could not recall one time when an alternate actually showed up. Everything that can possibly be done has been done to have everyone have opportunity to say their piece.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Bishop was requesting Board support.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that the Resolution is on the Agenda and could be discussed at that time. The time table the Commission is operating under right now is that it had been determined that interim Fire Chief Flohr is going to take the lead to communicate this plan to all of the members of the Fire Company and everyone involved. He is getting ready to work with Chief Eshbach and other members of the Commission to put together a presentation. He will organize that, present his ideas on how it will be presented back to the Emergency Services Commission at the next meeting, which is the last week in August so that the Commission can then determine exactly how it's going to be presented to all of the actual members of the various organizations and not just the leadership. The hope is that there can be one meeting where all the members of Springetts Fire, Commonwealth Fire, and the Ambulance Club can come together and hear the exact same presentation all at the same time, basically put together by Dan Flohr with the idea that once everyone hears it, has an opportunity to ask their questions, and then at that same time the organizations will go on their own and have their votes whether they're interested in participating or not. It's not cast in stone but that's the concept that's been put forward. The two fire companies have to have rank and file votes yes or no. The only way they can make a decision like this for the fire companies is for the majority of the members to approve it. The Ambulance Club is a little different because they're governed by a Board of Directors. There's no provision in the Ambulance Club for the members of the Ambulance Club to vote on things, only the Board votes on things.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that this has been going on for months and the agreement had been revised three times internally. Mr. Gurreri added that the Committee thinks this is a good agreement and would like to continue if the Board so directs.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that all that you're looking for is a consensus from the Board that we agree with the concept of going to a Joint Operating Agreement.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that was correct. He added that one of the things that all of the people directly impacted by this are looking to the Board of Supervisors to be certain that the Board agrees with the idea to see the leadership role that the Board takes.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop brought forward an item regarding the Police Pension Board. The Actuarial Report had been received. Mr. Bishop encouraged the Supervisors to be thinking in terms of scheduling a meeting to review the

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

investment results and objectives and have the investment advisor, Mellon Bank, come in and advise their recommendations. The Board can then decide whether to make any changes or not.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated Mr. Amic had commented on the Actuarial evaluation in his report and questioned the term, unfunded liability, which is really a misnomer. This was really an overfund or surplus fund and had overfunded the liability rather than underfunded.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the plan is funded far more than the initial liability. There is no unfunded liability.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether a date should be established.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that the date would have to be mutually convenient with Mellon.

**Consensus of the Board was to tentatively meet with Mellon Bank on Thursday, September 30<sup>th</sup> at 7 p.m.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he would contact Mellon Bank to schedule the meeting and respond back to the Board with confirmation.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop requested Mr. Amic to also communicate the meeting date with the other members of the Police Pension Board.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would do so.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick received a request from Lee Brown regarding consideration of his property to add security. He requested a telephone call to confirm this could be done. Chairman Mitrick referred this matter to Mr. Amic.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated Mr. Stern had prepared some information for the Monday morning meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick personally thanked Mr. Noel as she had received a call from a resident who had a concern about upcoming construction. Mr. Noel had done a fine job of getting the dates and communicating with the resident.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether any feedback had been received regarding the library posters.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he had not heard anything following his communicating the wishes of the Board to them. An employee of the library came and picked up the mockup.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested that Mr. Amic follow up with the library.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported on an item from the York County Commissioners Office regarding the Emergency Management Agency- Three Mile Island exercise. A copy was provided to each Board member. She read a portion of the communication: “Springettsbury Township should be commended for the exceptional and professional manner in which they performed these duties.” She continued that they wish to provide a sincere thanks to Sgt. Tim Harvey for his support work as coordinator for the exercise. They indicated that Springettsbury Township Emergency Operation Center attained itself a mark of distinction. Chairman Mitrick thanked all of the people involved indicating a sign of the excellent participation and performance that exists in Springettsbury Township.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that there was a request to have an appointment to the Recycling Committee – a Mr. Phil Ort. She asked Mr. Amic whether there had been any communication with him regarding a letter of interest.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that at the last meeting Chairman Mitrick indicated that Mr. Ort would be contacting him, and if they contacted him to set up a short meeting. No one had contacted him.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that an item of consideration is an automobile for the Zoning Officer. She asked Mr. Amic whether a decision had been made.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that a lease agreement had been secured from Jack Giambalvo. Mr. Amic would like to pursue one additional lease agreement. He addressed the matter of whether this should be a budget item or not. There may be a request for more than one vehicle.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Amic supported that.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether Mr. Amic was asking a question or making a statement.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the Zoning Officer had not yet provided his budget. In verbal conversations there had been mention of a concern for more than one vehicle.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether Mr. Amic was speaking of the budget for next year.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that was correct.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that it seemed there was a need now.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the vehicles available had been utilized. There is not a shortage of vehicles, but these vehicles won't last forever. Police vehicles are not being reconditioned. A need exists to do something with the vehicles that Mr. Stern's department uses.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked why the police cars are not being reconditioned.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there should be at least one or two vehicles for the department. Some reconditioning had been done and some money was saved, but the department should have some newer vehicles. The timing is important, and if it can be worked in between now and the budget time, fine.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that at one of the Work Sessions with the department the Board had indicated that they really wanted the members of the department to get out there in the community.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they are very much out in the community.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick received a call from Chet Shaffer. He had made repeated concern to the Township regarding a property violation that he observed every day. His question was, "We have all these employees of the township that are out throughout the community 8 hours a day. Is it only a few people that are assigned to reporting violations?" Chairman Mitrick stated that the issue had been previously discussed. Numerous people go through the township, but asked who had been requested to look for these violations.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that every day all day long there are dozens of vehicles on the road. It isn't just Mr. Stern's three vehicles. The staff was encouraged to report code violations many times, and if employees see these kinds of things they are instructed to refer them if they are code

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

violations to Mr. Stern, so he can respond. Mr. Amic added that this is a large geographic community, and commended Mr. Stern and his department for doing an excellent job.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that a memo had been circulated some time ago to all the departments regarding this matter. There have been some items reported as a result.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that the memo should be re-stated.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick had received a copy of a proposed field policy from Mr. Bainbridge's office. The Park and Rec Work Sessions indicated concern about the conditions of fields. Children are allowed to play on the fields and they are not in good shape. Mr. Lauer had advised that the fields can't be used repeatedly and expect grass to grow for the ground to be level. A policy may be needed for each field, for example, Old Orchard, which may need to rest for a season. Mrs. Mitrick asked Mr. Amic if someone on staff could work with Mr. Bainbridge and coordinate with Mr. Lauer to determine what the physical needs are for the maintenance on these fields. That is what is needed and she believed that Cindy Osborne understood that we needed a policy for each field.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would address this matter.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost reported that he had no additional items to add to his written report that had not already been discussed.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he, too, had no additional items to add to his written report.

**9. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Ordinance 99-03 – Amending Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requiring evidence of Chapter 94 Inclusion (Adoption)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern reviewed the matter of changing Section 3 in the proposed Ordinance 99-03, and instead of reading "This Ordinance shall be effective immediately" should read, "This Ordinance shall be effective September 23, 1999." The purpose is to allow the process of applications

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

for projects for 1999 to be completed prior to beginning processing projects for 2000.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that this Ordinance had been discussed during the Public Hearing held at 7 p.m. and called for a Motion to Adopt at this time.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE 99-03 AMENDING THE SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE REQUIRING EVIDENCE OF CHAPTER 94 INCLUSION EFFECTIVE DATE SEPTEMBER 23, 1999. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Resolution 99-37 – Recognizing Emergency Services**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic spoke for Resolution 99-37 provided to him by the County Commissioners requesting that we draw this Resolution recognizing the contributions of the men and women of our local emergency organizations in conjunction with the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary on August 21<sup>st</sup>.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the Emergency Services Commission would include the Police Department.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that, as written by the County officials, it would not include the Police Department.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that it contemplates volunteers.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that what Resolution 99-37 does is honor the volunteers.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-37. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that there was a sheet attached to this Resolution asking for attendance at the Open House on Saturday, August 21<sup>st</sup> between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the County was doing something to coordinate that with the volunteer companies, or is this the communication that makes this happen.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he really didn't have an answer for Mr. Schenk's question, but he was suspicious that it did not. He suspected that the Township would be involved in that. He will follow up.

**C. Resolution 99-40 – Endorsing the concept of consolidating three volunteer organizations**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Resolution 99-40 had been provided by the Emergency Services Commission, spoken of earlier by Mr. Bishop. Passage of this Resolution is requested.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick clarified that this Resolution endorses the concept.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that was correct, and that it does not particularly have any legal weight one way or another, but more a sense of the direction.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-40 ENDORSING THE CONCEPT OF CONSOLIDATING THREE VOLUNTEER ORGANIZATIONS. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic brought forward an additional Resolution 99-41 regarding Governor Ridge’s Proclamation of an Emergency Drought.

**STERN** Mr. Stern reported that he had done research regarding the Adoption of a Resolution as a result of Governor Ridge’s Declaration and had provided the Supervisors with a drafted Resolution 99-41. The Resolution indicates that the Board of Supervisors support the Governor’s Proclamation and encourages people to conserve water in accordance with his Proclamation.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned Mr. Stern’s statement that “on the 21<sup>st</sup> the Fire Chief of Springettsbury Township will post a ban on all open burning.” She asked whether open burning is permitted in Springettsbury Township.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that in certain areas open burning is permitted.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what the provisions are for rescinding that ban.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the Fire Chief is responsible for rescinding the ban.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-41 DECLARING A DROUGHT EMERGENCY. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**10. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. Board of Supervisors Bio-Solids Work Session – June 2, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BIO-SOLIDS WORK SESSION JUNE 2, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. BISHOP ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**B. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – June 24, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING JUNE 24, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Board of Supervisors Development Zone Work Session – July 7, 1999**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION ON JULY 7 AS AMENDED. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic had no items for action under Old Business.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Public Education Program – Bio Solids**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on Item A, on which R. K. & K. and Jim Noel had been working. This item is New Business and will be discussed further on the next Agenda.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he had read the information provided to him and requested that R. K. & K. review the proposal in the area of derivation tasks, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4. to discover whether there might be an error.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he was encouraged that the Township moved quickly in this direction, and he hoped this could continue.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that Jim Noel who worked on this deserved the thanks, as well as Bob Halbert, who gave his input. Something should be available in August after the quotes are corrected.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Amic would bring this matter back to the Board of Supervisors at that time.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he would, and added that he had not yet reviewed it himself.

**B. Agreement Springettsbury Township – Commonwealth Fire Company**

**AMIC** Item B. includes the status of the long-standing agreement between Springettsbury Township and the Commonwealth Fire Company. This agreement has been in process for a year or more. This will be brought up at the next meeting for consideration.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that, from what he had reviewed, it seemed that while the concept may be there, a lot of work remains to be done.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested that the agreement would be in their packet for the next meeting.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked Solicitor Yost to review this agreement prior to discussion at the next Regular meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Messrs. Bishop and Gurreri whether the Board should take an opportunity to discuss the proposed Joint Operating Agreement. The Board endorsed that the two Board members participate in this commission and approved a Resolution that the concept be supported.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated agreement and added that he would like to have discussion on it.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri suggested the Board members come to the next meeting.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned the timing too. The Board of Supervisors is not a party to this agreement although it is contemplated that the Board of Supervisors join into it in some fashion or another.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated there is language in it that the Board of Supervisors is going to be affected by in terms of the budgets and how the budgets are

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

put together and how they allow for certain expenditures and not allow for others.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Yost whether he could clarify the issue. If the three organizations make an agreement among themselves the Board cannot really dictate anything other than how they operate. These organizations may decide among themselves how funds are going to be expended but not necessarily dictate how township funds are going to be accounted for or spent.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated it is between the Joint Operating Committee of the Township instead of dealing with three separate entities. In effect the Township will be dealing with one entity and one budget request instead of three budget requests, and hopefully one audit versus three audits. Solicitor Yost indicate that the agreement does not commit the Township to anything other than that concept.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that some of the things that he read confused him regarding the properties and the equipment. He would like more of an explanation.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri responded that Mr. Pasch might be referring to the social events at the fire halls. The equipment is switched back and forth to either fire hall.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that one of the very early intents of the process was to try and get a real working relationship and a confidence between these volunteer agencies and the Township. She added that an attempt was made to establish a policy for expenditures because of our responsibility for Township monies. Chairman Mitrick stated that she does not personally want something in this agreement that would be words from the Board of Supervisors. She would be more encouraged to see something in the agreement of the three entities that indicates a relationship with the Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors. She is concerned about where the policy on expenditures will fit.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that the Township would be able to dictate the policy for expenditures of Township funds no matter what's in this agreement.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that she would feel more comfortable if that fact were acknowledged in the agreement because that has always been a problem.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that with the concept he is not sure that that's a problem any longer. The concept is that the Township has one entity to deal with, rather than three which is the incremental step toward solving that problem. Mr. Bishop's understanding was that the Township is not relinquishing anything.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that the information that had come forward to the Supervisors within the Minutes of the meetings, did not give a sense from those Commission meeting Minutes as to exactly what is occurring.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that most of the action here did not happen in the commission meetings. Most of the real action happened in the sub-committee meetings, for which there were no Minutes. That sub-committee of four consisted of Chief Eshbach, and the Presidents of the three organizations, the two fire companies and the ambulance club. That's where this agreement was hashed out. It was not hashed out in front of the entire commission.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that the subcommittees came up with the agreement.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop continued that Chief Eshbach was there basically as a facilitator and coordinator to keep the process moving. Mr. Bishop stated that the Chief had done a great job and hammered out something with the help of Mr. Yost in which they all seemed to basically agree. This is not really a document that was created by the commission. Mr. Bishop indicated that he and Mr. Gurreri really didn't have anything to do with it. They were facilitating the three organizations getting together and that is the concept that Mr. Bishop hopes the Board would adopt too. The Township involvement has been to make this happen and that's what we've been told along the way that they want. They're hoping that by the Board of Supervisors being involved that some leadership would be provided.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated she understood more clearly where the agreement came from. She added that the three entities still will be working under the name of Springettsbury Township, Mrs. Mitrick added that given that there is some responsibility by those members to the Township she would feel best if she saw it some place in their agreement.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that he wished to clarify that this agreement did not indicate a merger or a consolidation; it's a Joint Operating Agreement. The relationship of all these individual entities to the Township really

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

doesn't directly change. The three organizations will technically still exist. They are just agreeing among themselves to operate together and to present a unified front in decision making. But legally Commonwealth Fire Company will still exist- must still exist – and will have at least one meeting every year with Springettsbury Fire Company and the Ambulance Club. They will all individually still exist as separate entities, just that they are separate entities that have legally agreed to operate together. One of the fundamental reasons behind that is the fact that they can get their low interest state loans and basically each organization is allocated two state loans. If we consolidate or merge, state loans would be lost. This way the entities can still apply for six versus only two.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated his understanding is that the three entities are willing to take this concept back to their membership.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that's what we have to decide at the next meeting. The Ambulance Club doesn't really take it to their membership because they don't have provisions for doing that. They are governed by their Board of Directors.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that he has to defer some of the things he saw here to legal counsel. Our Springettsbury Township Fire Chief is part of this.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost reminded the Board members to keep in mind that the Code of Ordinances creates the Fire Department and acknowledges its entity. Our official emergency service providers specified that they are under the direction of the Fire Chief and none of that changes. That's already in our Code Ordinances.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented upon one item that the Committee will determine based upon the needs of the Township was the allocation of resources. The Township has no input.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the Township currently has no input. Conceptually it would be that this committee would analyze the needs of the township. This does not mean that when Commonwealth gets a new fire truck that Springetts gets a new fire truck or vice versa.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it is based on the needs of the Township.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the Committee is charged with determining what the needs of the township are and our Fire Chief and the Board has every right to communicate what they think the needs are to this committee.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it's not only a right; it's an obligation. If this language is in here there is an obligation to communicate that right.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether, once the agreement is in place, will the Emergency Service Commission still exist.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that there's no reason to abolish it. It might not have as much worth, but it could continue to be an arm of the Board to continue the communication with the committee. This would be a decision to be made after the fact whether the commission would continue to serve a purpose.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that those are the kinds of things he was looking at that created some questions.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated agreement and added that they really don't know. He viewed this as step 1. There will be a number of other steps. Mr. Bishop has no idea what he thinks the role of the Emergency Services Commission would be once this is done.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated what he is concerned about is as a Township, if we have no input into this, is there a liability involved if this Committee does things which are not in keeping with what the services should provide to the Township?
- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded it would not change from what exists at the present time.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that doesn't mean it's correct.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost added that this would give the Township a better opportunity to have input into what the needs of the township are, and see that they are met. I don't think it creates a liability situation. A liability would be no greater than it presently is under this agreement.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the liability may exist now.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that to be correct.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether we are giving this Operating Committee permission to determine what's necessary for the Township, and the Board

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

has no input or veto into it and something goes wrong; do we as a Township have a problem.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that it cannot be said that we have no input into the scope of what they can do, even with this agreement it is severely limited. This Board still makes all determinations about paid employees. This Board still controls significant portions of the budget, and none of that changes. We're not ceding any responsibility whatsoever to this committee.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he has a problem with some of the language and has questions about it.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that they each have to cede some of their authority to the committee, but the Township is not ceding any of their authority.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added except that the committee can allocate funds where they want to allocate it.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that they can do whatever they want with those funds that either they control and raise on their own, or those funds that we allocate to them and don't tell them how to use.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the agreement doesn't say that.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that it does not say that. It doesn't need to say that, because it doesn't give them that power.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he thought that they had a right to allocate whatever funds or revenues, except for those funds or revenues that were from social activities.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that was correct, and added that is what they do now, except to the extent that the Township puts strings on money that comes from the Township.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that the Township does not control the allocation that is made to the Fire Company. The Township does insist that it be accounted for.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he thought that was a part of what the goal was to do.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated agreement with Mr. Pasch.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that he never understood that the issue was to control how that money is spent.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that he thought that there would be a budget that would be submitted by them which would be approved and so forth.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that that is in the agreement. This contemplates that they prepare a budget right along with the budget for every department and submit it in the fall just like every other department. It's one of the things the agreement says.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that there would be a unified budget submitted by the Committee as opposed to three budgets.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that if Mr. Bishop were satisfied with it then he would be too.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that the basic Township control still comes through our Ordinance.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that still doesn't give up the Township's right to have input into it.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated, "Absolutely not."
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether he had a copy of the Joinder Agreement.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that would have answered many of the questions.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that it's a one-page agreement and that the Joint Operating Agreement does state everything that is included in it. It just says that the Board of Supervisors acknowledges that it will deal with the Joint Operating Committee.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested that the Board review Item 508 on page 8 under R. and asked whether it read correctly, "Certified Public Accountants appointed by the Township to audit the Township's financial records"
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that refers to the same CPA firm that the Township already employs.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JULY 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether it meant that an audit would be conducted on the committee.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that it does.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether if that is what it means. She suggested that it read, "Township to audit the Committee's financial records."
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that it should, but what it's saying is that it's going to be the same firm as the one, but it is not spelled out.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that they asked for that, and we elected to put it in.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that it is charged against their allocation.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commended all the participants who have worked diligently on the Joint Operating Agreement, which took 18 months to arrive at this point. A tremendous amount of work had been accomplished, and Chairman Mitrick thanked all those who were involved with this major project.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that many people worked very hard, and John Krout really set the ground work last year as Chair of the Commission and has continued to force the Commission to keep moving forward. Dave Eshbach did unbelievable work with that subcommittee.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reminded the Board of Supervisors that there would be a short Executive Session immediately following the Regular Meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JUNE 24, 1999  
DRAFT**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck, Vice Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
Mike Myers, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Dan Flohr, Acting Fire Chief  
Jim Noel, Wastewater Treatment Plant  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting of the Board of Supervisors to order at 7:35 p.m. Chairman Mitrick called for the presentation of colors.

**SCHENCK** Boy Scout Troop #25 formally presented the American flag and the Springettsbury Township flag as part of their work toward a Communications Merit Badge. Mr. Schenck introduced each scout from the troop for which he serves as an assistant leader. Troop #25 meets at the Yorkshire Methodist Church.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

There were no communications from citizens.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**SCHOBBER** Mike Schober had provided his written report as of June 17<sup>th</sup>. He gave an update on the 537 Plan indicating a meeting had taken place with DEP to

keep the process moving for the pump station. The permitting process is moving ahead for the pump station. Further updates will take place in July and August.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Schober if he was as surprised as he had been relating to the failure rate of on lot systems.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that he had been aware that the failure rate as a result of the water testing was high. He added that new sewer estimates would satisfy DEP.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic publicly thanked Mike Schober and Buchart Horn for the prompt responses to DEP's requests.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober continued with a report on the three projects out for bid, i.e., Harrowgate, Millcreek and the PLC contract. Bids were received for Harrowgate. Only one bid was received for Millcreek, and Mr. Schober suggested a re-bid be advertised. The PLC contract was advertised for bid.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned the reason for the two bidders bidding on two different items for the Harrowgate work.

**YOST** Mr. Yost responded that the work had been split between two bidders, since none of the bidders were interested in bidding on the whole project. As a result the project was split into an excavation phase and a relining phase. Mr. Yost added he was satisfied that this type of bidding was entirely legal.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** John Luciani reported that the Plymouth Road project is continuing. Mr. Luciani indicated that the New Municipal Building project is being bid. A regional study had been undertaken for the Kreutz Creek stormwater review. A study will be undertaken regarding Mill Creek in the next few years. As far as the Codus, there are three different ordinances detailing problem areas which will be submitted to the county. The Pleasant Valley Road extension should be completed about July 4<sup>th</sup>.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there had been any plans made for an official dedication or opening.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that the road could be opened as soon as the construction work was completed.

**YOST** Mr. Yost commented that the road must be legally offered for dedication.

- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that work is continuing on the Academy Road and Ridgewood Road projects.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the access road for the Municipal Building.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani provided assurance that the concern for the driveway and right-turning lane at the farmhouse would not be difficult or costly to complete.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that costs would be needed to make a decision.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that with more park development and additional activities taking place, the resulting additional traffic would require additional access.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that her understanding was that part of the concern with the turning lane related to PennDot requirements.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the access road had to be considered as part of the Municipal Building project.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it could be separate and the costs might be lower.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that very simply it involved moving a fire hydrant which the water company would do and the traffic signal would involve removal and replacement in a different spot.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that having greater access would provide the Police Department with a quicker exit.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked for a consensus of the Board regarding this matter.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic requested that Mr. Luciani discuss the matter with Mr. Lauer to provide costs.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether a crosswalk could be included with a push button.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani will meet with Mr. Lauer and report back to the Board.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

- MYERS** Mike Myers reported for R. K. & K. He provided an updated status report regarding the Diversion Pumping Station and stated that DEP is reviewing their plan. The Corps of Engineers consented to enter into agreement across the flood corridor. The CSX easements and condemnations are in place. Authority is required for permitting to advertise for the diversion pump station.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Grant Application had cleared all the hurdles and is under final review by EPA. A formal approval letter could be received within days. Mr. Amic suggested that the Board entertain a motion to bid the project upon receiving EPA approval. Mr. Amic suggested authorizing bids to go out subsequent to obtaining approval.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost advised that this procedure would provide no legal problem.

**MR. PASCH MOVED TO PROCEED WITH CONTRACT 99-1 AND 99-2 FOR THE DIVERSION PUMP STATION AND BE AUTHORIZED TO BE SUBMITTED FOR BID SUBSEQUENT TO RECEIVING APPROVAL FROM THE EPA. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- YOST** Solicitor Yost recommended he proceed to do the final condemnation work for the right-of-way.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 6/24/99**
- B. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Overview/Mt. Zion Road – Progress Billing #5 - \$1,406**
- C. Murphy & Dittenhafer – Municipal Building – Progress Billing #8 - \$8,379.20**
- D. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Diversion Pumping Station – Progress Billing #10 – \$9,974.18**
- E. Reed Smith Shaw & McClay – Phase II Grant Effort – Progress Billing #2 - \$2,182.22**
- F. C. S. Davidson – East/West Interceptor – Billing #5 - \$1,855.25**
- G. Buchart-Horn, Inc. – Millcreek Interceptor – Progress Billing #3 - \$4,243.95**
- H. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Act 537 – Phase II – Progress Billing #20 - \$413.27**
- I. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Harrowgate/Kingston – Progress Billing #7 - \$3604.83**
- J. Buchart Horn, Inc. – PLC System – Progress Billing #4 - \$3,416.35**
- K. Acer Engineers – Risk Management Plan – Progress Billing #5 - \$1,432**

- L. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Overview/Mt. Zion Road – Progress Billing #6 - \$1,885.30**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick suggested Items A. through L. be considered together for action with one motion.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO PAY ACCOUNTS PAYABLE ITEMS A THROUGH L. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

- A. Two (2) 1995 Chevrolet Police Cruisers (Permission to Advertise for Sale)**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether there was a legal requirement for a minimum bid such as \$100.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there is no minimum bid required.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE FOR SALE TWO (2) 1995 CHEVROLET POLICE CRUISERS. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- B. Millcreek Interceptor – Reject the bid of Springfield Contractors (Permission to Readvertise)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that only one bid had been received from Springfield Contractors.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober recommended that by re-advertising to bid would encourage more contractors to participate in the bid. There will be more incentives provided to bidders.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO REJECT THE SINGLE BID RECEIVED FOR THE MILLCREEK INTERCEPTOR AND AUTHORIZED THE STAFF TO RE-ADVERTISE AND RE-BID. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- C. Harrowgate/Raleigh Sewer Rehabilitation**

1. **Base Bid One – Springfield Contractors - \$224,456.44**
2. **Base Bid Two – AM Liner East – \$67,000**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF BASE BID ONE – SPRINGFIELD CONTRACTORS FOR \$224,456.44. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF BASE BID TWO – SPRINGFIELD CONTRACTORS FOR \$67,000. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. 1999 Material and Resurfacing Project (Recommend Award)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic had provided a comparison sheet of the prices, which had decreased largely due to the efforts of the Public Works Director. Mr. Amic recommended the award of this project. His recommendations were itemized in a memorandum dated June 15, 1999.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AWARD THE 1999 MATERIAL AND RESURFACING PROJECT BIDS AS DETAILED IN THE JUNE 15, 1999 MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED TO THE TOWNSHIP MANAGER. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

- A. **Planning Module – Crestview Mobile Park (Windsor Township) A3-67966-280-3 – 5,000 G.P.D.**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF PLANNING MODULE – CRESTVIEW MOBILE PARK (WINDSOR TOWNSHIP) A3-67966-280-3 – 5,000 G.P.D. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- B. **Planning Module – Craigdan – (York Township) – A3-67971-475-3 – 3150 G.P.D.**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE PLANNING MODULE FOR CRAIGDAN (YORK TOWNSHIP) A3-67971-475-3 – 3150 G.P.D. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- C. **Planning Module – Rite Aid (York Township) A3-67971-484-3 – 200 G.P.D.**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF PLANNING MODULE FOR RITE AID (YORK TOWNSHIP) A3-67971-484-3 FOR ADDITIONAL 200 GPD. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- D. Land Development 97-19 – Burger King – Granting of Extension to (10/1/99)**
- E. Subdivision 98-06 – Burger King – Granting of Extension to (10/1/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that items D. and E. both apply to Land Development and Subdivision planning for Burger King with a request to grant the Township an extension of time to 10/1/99.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO ACCEPT THE EXTENSION OF TIME FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT 97-19 - BURGER KING TO 10/1/99. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO GRANT THE EXTENSION OF SUBDIVISION 98-06 - BURGER KING TO 10/1/99. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- F. Subdivision 99-03 - Messina – Action (7/22/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern spoke on SD 99-03 in Hunting Park Court, where the owners wished to combine 3 lots into one parcel.

**POTTS** Mr. Potts of C. S. Davidson provided some additional information, such as drainage easement and tree removal. The trees are not currently causing any problems on the property. The owner eventually would like to expand his home on the property.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION 99-03 – MESSINA WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:**

- **WAIVER FROM SUBMISSION OF PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **WAIVER FROM SUBMISSION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY.**

**MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- G. Subdivision 99-04 – Epstein – Action (7/22/99)**

**POTTS** Mr. Potts of C. S. Davidson spoke for Epstein, the owner of this property. The purpose for this Subdivision action was to gain access to the rear of the property from Cortleigh Drive.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION 99-04 – EPSTEIN WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:**

- **WAIVER FROM SUBMISSION OF PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **WAIVER FROM SUBMISSION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY**

**MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**H. Subdivision 99-05 – Fleming – Action (7/22/99)**

**LIED** Brent Lied of Webber/Smith Associates, Inc. spoke for the Fleming Subdivision project and indicated that all items detailed by the Township had been satisfied, which included the traffic considerations.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION 99-05 – FLEMING – ACTION (7/22/99) WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:**

- **WAIVER FROM SUBMISSION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **CONDITIONED UPON THE COMPLETION OF ALL SIGNATURES, SEALS AND NOTARIZATIONS**
- **WAIVER FROM SHOWING ALL STREETS WITHIN 400' OF SUBJECT TRACT.**

**MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**I. Land Development – 99-06 – Fleming – Action (6/24/99)**

**LIED** Brent Lied of Webber/Smith Associates, Inc. spoke for the Fleming Land Development project and indicated that all of the issues detailed by the Township, such as stormwater, the traffic and preliminary plan had been addressed.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost commented that his only concern with this action was that a waiver of storm water retention be included to indemnify the Township against flooding.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-06 – FLEMING – ACTION (6/24/99) WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND CONDITIONS:**

- **CONDITIONED ON THE COMPLETION OF ALL SIGNATURES, SEALS, AND NOTARIZATIONS**
- **CONDITIONED ON SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY IN AN AMOUNT APPROVED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER**
- **CONDITIONED ON APPROVAL FROM THE YORK COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

- **WAIVER FROM SHOWING ALL STREETS WITHIN 400' OF SUBJECT TRACT**
- **WAIVER FROM SUBMISSION OF EIS**
- **WAIVER FROM ACCESS DRIVE WIDTH**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT RELATED TO THE MINIMUM ANGLE BETWEEN THE CENTERLINE OF AN ACCESS DRIVE AND THE STREET**
- **WAIVER FROM COMPLETION OF ONSITE STORMWATER DETENTION IMPROVEMENTS TYPICALLY REQUIRED BY SPRINGGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP FOR SUCH A DEVELOPMENT PLAN,**
- **CONDITIONED ON: AN INDEMNIFICATION BETWEEN SPRINGGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP AND FLEMING WHICH WOULD INDEMNIFY SPRINGGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP IN THE EVENT OF STORMWATER DAMAGE AT FLEMING AS A RESULT OF THIS WAIVER**
- **A "FEE IN LIEU OF" IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE OF SPRINGGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A TRAFFIC STUDY**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **CONDITIONED ON RECEIPT OF PENNDOT HIGHWAY OCCUPANCY PERMIT**

**MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**J. Land Development 99-05 - Harley Davidson – Action (6/24/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided background information concerning the Harley Davidson Land Development. A 5-Year Comprehensive Land Development plan was provided for overall growth of the facility. Stormwater management and traffic issues had been successfully addressed. Mike Daschbach and Chuck Husley of Entech had worked on the development. The 5-Year plan provided for detailed construction planning and included items such as Eden Road access, moving the truck entrance and providing parking to the east side, along with a new employee parking lot.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-05 – HARLEY DAVIDSON – 6/24/99 WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND CONDITIONS:**

- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **MODIFICATION TO REQUIRE PROPERTY CORNERS TO BE SET ONLY ALONG EDEN ROAD AND ROUTE 30**
- **CONDITIONED ON COMPLETION OF ALL STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ISSUES NOTED IN JOHN LUCIANI'S LETTER DATED JUNE 15, 1999**

- **CONDITIONED ON SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY IN AN AMOUNT APPROVED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER.**
- **MODIFICATION FROM STORMWATER FACILITY DEPTH REQUIREMENT TO ALLOW 7.25" DEPTH (6" MAXIMUM PERMITTED BY ORDINANCE).**

**MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**K. Planning Module 2201-2251 Industrial Highway – A3-67957-294-3-1750 G.P.D.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided background information regarding Planning Module 22-01-2251 regarding the former Sears building on the Industrial Highway covering 1750 GPD.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF PLANNING MODULE 2201-2251 INDUSTRIAL HIGHWAY IN THE AMOUNT OF 1750 GPD. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**L. Planning Module – Yorktown Heights (York Township) A3-67971-483-3 – 24,413 G.P.D**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided information regarding Planning Module for Yorktown Heights.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF PLANNING MODULE – YORKTOWN HEIGHTS (YORK TOWNSHIP) A3-67971-483-3-24,413 GPD. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether a date had been scheduled for the next Development Zone meeting. A Work Session was suggested to pull together concrete thoughts on the Development Zone work.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated this in his opinion to be the single, most important item to take place in Springettsbury Township in the next 10 years.

**Consensus was to have a Development Zone Work Session scheduled for July 7, 1999 at 7 a.m.**

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Picnic planning is continuing. He is enthusiastic and expects a great response within the Township.
- Mr. Gurreri added that interviews for Wastewater Director with Mr. Amic and for the Fire Chief position had good results. Mr. Gurreri thanked Mr. Amic for his efforts.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck thanked the Police Department for a park incident which showed him first-hand that the department is trained and diligent to handle all the problems encountered in every day activities.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that a neighbor had called him, and Ed Sowers had straightened out the problem.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the Township Building Permit Summary distributed to each of the supervisors included a lot of important information. However, he indicated he would only need a summary sheet.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick received a letter from Connie Smoltzer regarding an appointment of Phil Ort. Mrs. Mitrick requested that he submit a Letter of Interest following which Mr. Amic was asked to schedule a 10-minute interview prior to the next Board of Supervisors' meeting.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that Cindy Osborne of the Park and Rec Department had been receiving requests for field assignments for different sports. A policy for park usage needs to be provided.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reported on the June meeting of the Emergency Services Commission, which meeting was frank and productive. Another meeting will be held the third week in July.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to go back to the Park and Rec Agenda of 6/16 meeting and clarify the park usage.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Mr. Yost had provided a written report. However, he requested authorization to settle the Druck Valley sewer right-of-way matter. There is a \$125 difference.

\$4,000.00 Offer  
\$3,375.00  
-500.00 Attorney Fee  
\$3,875.00  
\$125.00 Difference

**Consensus of the Board was to have Mr. Yost proceed.**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost commented regarding a time schedule for the R.K.&K. property acquisitions and right-of-ways regarding the Diversion Pump Station. He indicated that the first step is to have an appraisal done and make an offer to Dan Wagner of the appraised value and the taking of that property.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic had nothing further to report.

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Ordinance 99-05 – Establishing a No Parking Zone on Industrial Highway**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned why this Ordinance only applies to the North side.

**ESHBACH** Police Chief Eshbach responded that the surrounding areas are already posted.

**MR. PASCH MOVED TO AUTHORIZE PERMISSION TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 99-05 ESTABLISHING A NO PARKING ZONE ON INDUSTRIAL HIGHWAY. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Mr. Amic to advise Mrs. Fry who had brought this matter to the attention of the Board.

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING – MAY 27, 1999**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING OF MAY 27, 1999 AS SUBMITTED. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION – JUNE 9, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION OF JUNE 9, 1999 AS SUBMITTED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. SCHENCK ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

There was no Old Business requiring action.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided the sample mockups of the Township newsletter addressing the focus toward having the Parks and Rec newsletter as an insert in the Township newsletter. He added that the mockup could be bound or split subject to the Board's decision.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck suggested that the Park and Rec format be separate with a future goal to incorporate.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick suggested that someone be consulted about the readability of a larger newsletter.

**STERN** Mr. Stern will work with Mr. Bainbridge and Mr. Lauer to get the newsletter out.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reviewed future meetings scheduled with the Board of Supervisors as follows:

<b>Wednesday, July 7 – 7 a.m.</b>	<b>Work Session - Development Zone</b>
<b>Thursday, July 22 – 7 p.m.</b>	<b>Public Hearing – Ordinance 99-03</b>
<b>Thursday, July 22 – 7:30 p.m.</b>	<b>Regular Board of Supervisors Meeting</b>
<b>Monday, July 26 – 7 p.m.</b>	<b>Professional Park Fund Raisers</b>
<b>Thursday, August 26 – 7:30 p.m.</b>	<b>Regular Board of Supervisors Meeting</b>

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic, Jr.  
Secretary

PWA/ja

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
Neil Sander, Civil Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Mike Myers, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Dan Flohr, Acting Fire Chief  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting of the Board of Supervisors to order at 7:30 p.m. Chairman Mitrick requested Police Chief Dave Eshbach and Patrolman Kenneth Witmer come forward.

**A. Resolution 99-35 Recognition of Patrolman Kenneth Witmer**

**ESHBACH** Police Chief Dave Eshbach relayed Patrolman Kenneth Witmer's many years of valued service to the Department from July 13, 1970 to April 30, 1999 now serving in York County Deputy Sheriff's Department. Patrolman Witmer had served with the Springettsbury Fire Department for 16 years (1964 through 1980) with 10 of those years as District Fire Chief. Patrolman Witmer had received extensive training in traffic safety and accident investigation; he was certified for accident reconstruction and assisted in the creation of the Springettsbury Township Police Department's Standards of Performance established in 1983, still in effect today. Letters of Commendation have been presented to Patrolman Witmer for Burglary Investigations, DUI Enforcement, Car Thefts. He assisted with the training of Springettsbury Township Fire Policemen and provided endless hours of public education to children and others in the Annual Wellness Day program where the Stranger Danger program is still being used today. He coordinated the recruit testing and physical agility testing for Springettsbury and Northern York County Regional

Police Department and assisted as a field training officer for many officers currently employed today. Chief Eshbach stated that Patrolman Witmer was his first full-time partner, and for his valued service he thanked him personally and for the Township. Police Chief Eshbach presented Patrolman Witmer with his duty weapon.

**WITMER** Patrolman Witmer thanked Chief Eshbach for the presentation and for his duty weapon.

**FLOHR** Fire Chief Dan Flohr mentioned Patrolman Witmer's help to the Fire Department for many years. He served as District Chief, and as a member of the Fire Department he helped through many changes within the department. Chief Flohr stated that Patrolman Witmer helped every year in the training of the Fire Police. The Fire Department representatives were present to honor Patrolman Witmer. Chief Flohr, on behalf of the Springettsbury Township Fire Departments and the Fire Police presented a plaque to Patrolman Witmer as a token of appreciation for service and support given. He also presented him with cards and a gift certificate.

**ESHBACH** Police Chief Eshbach requested Mrs. Witmer to come forward.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick, on behalf of all the residents of Springettsbury Township, formally presented Resolution 99-35 – Recognition of Patrolman Kenneth L. Witmer. Chairman Mitrick read the Resolution.

**WITMER** Patrolman Witmer thanked Chairman Mitrick and Springettsbury Township. Mr. Witmer received a standing ovation.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick announced that there would be an Executive Session immediately following the Regular Meeting.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

There were no communications from citizens.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**Act 537 Plan**

**SCHOBER** Mike Schober provided an update regarding the 537 Plan which had been submitted. Mr. Schober reported that DEP is currently reviewing the plan, and some comments had been received from the DEP Planner, for which a response had been provided. There was a need for some written responses to the municipal comments received. It was suggested that a revision be made where

it displayed the septic system failures, as it was not as clear as it should have been. That had been revised and re-submitted. Additionally some language changes had been suggested in the text to make the township more committed to following through with the sewer system extensions and the review of those areas that had on-lot problems. Mr. Schober is working on revising that text, although this should not require any action by the Board unless there would be a change to the implementation schedule, which he did not anticipate.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the changes to the language sounded like a more major action to him, i.e., that they wanted Springettsbury to be more committed.

**SCHOBBER** Mr. Schober clarified that the concern is that the township would try to gloss over the areas in the township that have failing septic systems. There have been very few permits issued for septic repairs creating suspicion that the township is not fully committed.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether this was only with respect to failing systems because there was discussion in the plan about systems that might fail someday.

**SCHOBBER** Mr. Schober indicated no, that this only referred to failing systems.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic interjected that he had spoken to people at DEP at length about the issue of failing septic systems and confirmed that Mr. Schober was correct in what their concern is. Mr. Amic stated this would be a Board decision to determine whether they are going to commit to extending the sanitary facilities particularly in areas that are sparsely populated or as an option, take another direction with on-lot sewage systems to include aiding the citizen to secure grants or loans. Determination toward fiscal responsibility at some point would be necessary as to whether it is good municipal dollars or good private dollars to be spent. Mr. Amic commented that DEP would then accept the language as written and still give the Board the option that in two years or three years to build the Alcott sewer or not built it, for example. DEP was quite satisfied with the Plan and indicated that it was much better than they usually receive. There were fewer exceptions.

**SCHOBBER** Mr. Schober indicated everything that is needed had been provided.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked Mr. Schober whether he wanted him to review the language.

**SCHOBBER** Mr. Schober stated he had copies for Mr. Amic to review.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that no Board action is necessary.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober stated that Board action would be necessary only if the implementation schedule is changed.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that approval of the plan is critical, as there are other things we want to do now which depend upon the Plan.

**Harrowgate/Raleigh Drive Sewer**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober stated that two of the sewer projects are out to bid: Harrowgate/Raleigh Drive Sewer Replacement/Lining and the Mill Creek Repair. Mr. Schober had attended pre-bid meetings for both of those projects. Some concerns were clarified and bidding is to proceed on June 2.

**PLC Project**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober stated that final comments had been received on the PLC Project, which is scheduled on the agenda for later during the meeting for approval for advertising.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**SANDERS** Mr. Neil Sander reported for First Capital Engineering. He stated that the Plymouth Road survey work had been completed and drawings had been provided to HRG, the firm doing the PennDot coordination of the project. First Capital plans to discuss the project further with PennDot in the near future. Regarding the Springettsbury Township Municipal Building, and specifically regarding the right-turn lane out onto Mt. Zion Road, investigation had revealed that this item would require the relocation of a fire hydrant and a traffic signal mast. A decision will need to be made as to the importance versus the cost of having a right-turn lane. Regarding Lynbrook Lane, final payment was submitted for bituminous on the road, and the project is complete. Regarding the Harley Davidson Visitor's Center, expected completion date is within the next few months. Storm water issues will be discussed with Harley.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested that the Board keep moving on all of the items coming before the Board since the summer scheduling of Board Meetings will be in effect during June. Chairman Mitrick asked whether a decision could be made regarding whether First Capital should investigate the traffic signal situation. It was her understanding that Mr. Luciani's plan was to have traffic go straight from the lane on the side of the building out to Mt. Zion, which would allow right-turn traffic only.

**STERN** Mr. Stern reported that the idea mentioned by Chairman Mitrick was not approved by PennDot. The last discussion Mr. Stern had with Mr. Luciani indicated that his plan was to widen the existing entrance in order to have a

left-turn lane. Presently all the traffic backs up in front of the building. Having a turning lane will help to alleviate some of the traffic problems.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that to widen it the other direction would offset the intersection.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that it would be widened on each side in order to be offset.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated it was her understanding that this would be to the north since that was what Mr. Luciani had reported previously. She asked for clarification as to whether there is now consideration toward moving it to the south of the intersection.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that a small portion of it goes to the south and most will go to the north.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that it would still be in the present intersection, but just widened.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that to be correct.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the first idea was to widen this intersection and have a right-turn lane. Mr. Luciani had stated that was impossible. The next option was to send a short road out for right-turn only. She asked whether PennDot had a problem with that.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that PennDot had a problem and that was why they returned to the widening the intersection.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that when he had spoken with Mr. Luciani he had advised that would be an offset intersection across to the mall. Clarification was needed.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that there had been a consensus that the Board was interested in a right-turn lane if it is possible.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch's concern is the increased traffic flow with improvements being made to the park and the attempts made to attract more people. Mr. Pasch is in favor of the right-hand turn which would alleviate a portion of the backup.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that what he felt the Board was saying was that it would consider moving the fire hydrant and the traffic arm.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that was the last option in his opinion.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that option is where the process currently stands.

- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that to be correct, i.e., moving the hydrant and traffic arm is the only way to place the right-turning lane.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that to leave it as it is would not be the solution. She further stated that there are traffic tie-ups now which will get worse as expansion takes place.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked what it would cost to move a fire hydrant and a traffic arm.
- SANDERS** Mr. Sanders indicated it would be several thousand dollars.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated his recollection was about \$10,000.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that was information that is needed in order to make a decision.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck agreed that the cost was needed before the Board could decide.
- SANDERS** Mr. Sanders indicated First Capital would provide that information.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what progress had been made on Pleasant Valley Road.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that construction is continuing. The utility companies have asked to put their utility lines underneath the roadway. Installation of curbs and paving of the roadway are on schedule.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked for the estimated completion date.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic was unsure as to the completion date, but he indicated it would not take long to lay the base and put the bituminous down.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

- HALBERT** Mr. Robert Halbert provided an update status report and called attention to several important items regarding permit approvals and property and right-of-way acquisitions. DEP Part II Permit, which is the construction permit, awaits review and comment upon the design documents until such time as they get the 537 Plan approval. DEP Joint Permit for Stream Crossing was approved. Facilities Planning was also approved, which directly relates to the 537 Plan. The Conrail matter was approved and the document will be received following their merger with Norfolk Southern which is expected during the first week of June. The EPA Grant Application had been received.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated the application had been received and completed, agreements executed and forwarded to EPA. He had a conversation with EPA regarding an expeditious review.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert continued that the Corps of Engineers had reviewed and approved the design. Some comments/clarifications had been sent to R.K.&K. Following their response it would be formally approved. R.K.& K. expected that to be completed during the first week of June. The Codorus Creek crossing had been approved. They are preparing consent agreements. Pa. Department of Transportation access had been approved. A check for \$50.00 had been received. All of the approvals had been predominantly received except for some key ones. One relates to the 537 Plan. DEP's Construction Permit must be obtained before actually awarding construction. Secondly, anything we do we do not want to jeopardize funding. Mr. Amic is waiting for notice from Philadelphia saying that sufficient information is obtained.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated an expeditious review had been promised. Originally he had been advised it would take four to six weeks.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert reported on properties and right-of-way acquisitions and easements required, Yorktowne Paper has forwarded offers to Solicitor Yost's office for review, which may be more than what had been offered to them. CSX Real Property process is progressing, and they are preparing a counter offer for the Township to purchase the right-of-way across their property on the north side of Route 30 where a portion of the force main will be located. The City of York comments were received, for which a response was submitted on the 26<sup>th</sup>. Interpretation of the agreement the Township has with the City of York relative to capacity. R.K.& K. agrees with their suggestion for a meeting to discuss these issues. The date was left for the City to decide.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether he had heard from the City.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that a conference call had been made earlier during the week for the purpose of discussing this item. There are one or two paragraphs which had been contrary to the agreement signed. The City's interpretation of it was different from ours. Mr. Amic stated he would not want this to hold up or create strife and asked the City for a meeting to discuss the matter, and proceed on with the other items. The question of 'what is the capacity permitted under the agreement for every 24 hours' had previously been addressed, and Mr. Amic believed it to be clear and simple in that Springettsbury can flow a certain amount of gallons every 24 hours under certain conditions. York City is concerned about that and is interpreting it somewhat differently.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that there were some other issues where they had to be referred back to the section agreement to allow contractor access to their site.

It would require a contractor to purchase right-of-way and Springettsbury to purchase right-of-way across San Carlos. Mr. Halbert referred to Section 40121 where access had been granted to this contractor under agreement with Springettsbury Township. Mr. Halbert stated that it was an important issue to get everyone's understanding of the provisions and capacity.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he has difficulty understanding why there would be disagreement if, as stated, it is simple and clear.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that there are different individuals involved; however, he desired to speak to this issue in the Executive Session. It is a legal matter.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated agreement but asked whether Mr. Amic believed it could be a "clinker" in this project.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated it was a matter of an attempt to design something in another document that is contrary to a written agreement previously executed. Mr. Yost will provide his opinion. It was very clear what Mr. Yost and Mr. Amic negotiated in behalf of Springettsbury Township with the City of York. Mr. Amic agreed that a meeting should be held.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the meeting would be held as soon as possible.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that to be correct.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated he would be happy to participate if necessary.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether there was an anticipated completion time for the diversion pumping station.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that as soon as R.K. & K. receives word that the 537 Plan has been approved the process moves forward. Issues relating to planning, approval by the local office, as well as the Harrisburg office of DEP indicate some problem regarding schedule changing. The EPA application is an issue. Issues which were felt would not be major problems have become problems.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked how long would it take to build once the approvals were secured.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that the project would take 270 days to build. Every month that it takes longer to bid it will extend the time until it's completed. Mr. Halbert recommended not to do anything to jeopardize the \$3 million possible grant or cause a change in the contract once it had been let as Change Orders are very expensive.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the Board wants to be sure that the grant is not jeopardized.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that to be the main concern because the transaction must be completed in conformance with what EPA wants.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated R. K. & K. is doing everything possible to expedite the project.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 5/27/99**
- B. C. S. Davidson – East/West Interceptor – Billing #4 - \$1,046.55**
- C. Reed Smith Shaw & McClay – Sewage Grant – Progress Billing #1 - \$2,672.06**
- D. Gregory Contractors – Lynbrook Drive – Progress Billing #2 - \$1,700**
- E. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Act 537 Phase II – Progress Billing #19 - \$1,118.53**
- F. Buchart Horn, Inc. – PLC Upgrade – Progress Billing #3 - \$3,360.15**
- G. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Millcreek Interceptor – Progress Billing #2 - \$2,928.03**
- H. Acer Engineers & Consultants – Risk Management – Progress Billing #4 - \$1,432**
- I. Springfield Contractors – East/West Interceptor – Progress Billing #3 -- \$38,051.19**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded to Mr. Pasch's question of a previous meeting related to the electric bills and revealed that the information had been provided to the Board regarding amounts.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the information provided answered Mr. Pasch's question.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that his question had been answered. He stated that there was a slight difference in the kilowatt hours used; however, that was minor compared to the total. Additionally the information revealed significant savings.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop mentioned that this was the result of deregulation. He asked whether the Township was still dealing with GPU.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch responded that it is still GPU, but it is GPU Energy as the supplier.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called for questions regarding Items A through I.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned an item shown in his listing, page 3, General Fund, Warrant #051199 for a lid for a 55 gallon drum @ \$273.00.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he would review the item and report back.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch also questioned an item on page 3, Sewer Fund, Warrant regarding “Creative Solutions Depreciation Update” for \$500.00.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the item referred to computer software for the depreciation program for our computer.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch wondered whether the item was for calculating charges to the other municipalities.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that this is used to calculate the depreciation, which had always been done by hand before.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO PAY ACCOUNTS PAYABLES A. THROUGH I. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

**A. Memory Lane – Pleasant Valley Road Intersection – Authorization to Proceed not to Exceed \$12,000**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that this request made by the Public Works Director authorizes proceeding with the signaling and the partial additional lane and intersection enhancements previously discussed. Some of this work will be performed by the Township; some will be contracted; part of the project is signaling.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch requested clarification as to whether this work applies to the intersection at Memory Lane and Whiteford Road or Pleasant Valley Road and Whiteford Road.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the intersection actually refers to Memory Lane and Whiteford Road.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO AUTHORIZE TO PROCEED AT MEMORY LANE AND WHITEFORD ROAD INTERSECTION, NOT TO EXCEED \$12,000. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. PLC System – Authorization to Complete Bid Documents & Advertise**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Buchart Horn had completed the PLC System specifications. Review was completed the previous week. Mr. Amic requested authorization to B-H to complete the bid documents and advertise.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE BUCHART HORN TO COMPLETE BID DOCUMENTS AND FOR THE ADVERTISEMENT OF THE PLC SYSTEM UPGRADE. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Land Development 99-03 – Concord Road Building “E” – 6/24/99**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided background information regarding Concord Road Associates project. This proposal included a 40,000 sq. ft. building added to the complex, noted as Building E. Sewer capacity had been transferred from another lot. A Planning Module had been previously completed. The Planning Commission comments had been addressed along with several waivers including a condition addressed with an attached letter from Sun Pipeline.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked whether having construction in the flood plain would be viewed as a problem.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated this is not a problem. The building is not in the flood plain.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Paul Francis spoke for the project. He elaborated on the fact that the flood plain had no detailed study performed for it, and as a result it was an estimated flood plain. It is provisioned in the zoning ordinance which allows for accessory structures. Floor elevation must be a foot and a half above the flood plain. Mr. Francis estimated this elevation is approximately four feet above the flood plain. Mr. Francis mentioned the high pressure Sun pipeline. A previous agreement had been written for the four buildings. Sun reviewed it and agreed that it was in conformance. Solicitor Yost had requested this be included in the Planning Committee Minutes.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the agreement had been recorded. He had requested the letter to be referenced in the record.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the stormwater agreement was in place.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that this agreement was in place.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the plan meets all the zoning requirements.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it met all the zoning requirements.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether this is the final development which would occur at this site.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis responded that, in his opinion, it is final because of several environmental and stream crossing concerns for a small piece of property.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-03  
CONCORD ROAD, BUILDING “E” WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND**

**CONDITIONS:**

- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY IN THE AMOUNT APPROVED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE ACCEPTANCE OF A STORMWATER MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT BY SPRINGGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP AND**
- **CONDITIONED UPON THE ATTACHMENT OF THE LETTER FROM SUN PIPELINE CO. DATED APRIL 3, 1999 BE ADDED TO THE PLAN.**

**MR.BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reported on the activities of the Emergency Services Commission. Mr. Bishop indicated that a meeting notice had been issued which gave the impression it was a special meeting; however, it was just a date change. Mr. Bishop summarized that there had been progress made; however, three members were unable to attend the last meeting, which had not been successful. Mr. Bishop is hoping to do some work prior to the next meeting and on June 10<sup>th</sup> the momentum will move forward.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that he and Mr. Amic attended Senator Gib Armstrong's morning breakfast. Mr. Gurreri reported that work is proceeding on the Route 24 project.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that he is very optimistic about Route 24. Rep. Saylor, Rep. Platts, Sen. Mike Waugh and Commissioner Shirley Glass had attended a meeting on the Transportation Coalition. Mr. Amic stated that, in his opinion, the effort will come from this group as far as Route 24 is concerned. This group is addressing transportation problems in York County. Mr. Amic sees this Coalition as a group which understands the transportation situations. Their meetings are very productive. Springgettsbury Township's problems have not been brought to their attention.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Amic what action is needed in order to bring Springgettsbury's problems before the group.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that a request for a meeting will begin the process.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Amic whether this was his plan.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he would be glad to do so.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that historically the Transportation Coalition had been very productive.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch encouraged Mr. Amic that if the Transportation Coalition is the vehicle, it should be pursued quickly.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would gather data and request a meeting.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that a representative from Rep. Saylor's office attended and advised that Sherman Street is on the plan for the next two years.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick received a copy of a program by the Dallastown Community Park, sponsored by the Dallastown Recreation Board and area businesses. Copies were provided to the Board members.
- Chairman Mitrick also reported that Mr. Stern had provided a copy of York Township's newsletter. The newsletter had included some fire safety ideas and storage of gasoline; use of lawn mowers.
- Chairman Mitrick met with Fran Keller of Martin Library. Ms. Keller provided a poster for the Board's response to regarding their public relations effort.
- Consensus was not to have the Supervisor's names on the poster. Otherwise the poster was satisfactory.**
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated the library is waiting for the Board's comments regarding the poster.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he would communicate with either Fran Keller or Bill Shell at Martin Library.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that in the space at the bottom consideration could be given that the library is a three-way effort between Bradley, Martin and Springettsbury.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that a map might be a good idea.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the firm doing Springettsbury's is doing this.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it is the same firm.

- STERN** Mr. Stern referred to a letter and mock ups requested for the newsletter to incorporate Parks and Rec. Pricing was provided which did not include the printing or postage – just the design portion. Separate prices to do the mock up just for Township Recreation and separate price for the combination, i.e., items A. and B with B being the lesser expensive as the existing newsletter was used. \$925 (A) just for Recreation and \$695 (B) for the combined.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that the cost for the mock up (full design) is higher than he expected. He expressed interest in seeing the end product.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that this effort still moves toward saving \$4,000 in postage.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that, in addition to saving \$4,000, the product would produce something that fewer people might read because it would be bulkier.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch agreed that people might not be inclined to read the entire newsletter.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the news information provided was very good.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that perhaps they could be separate and not bound together.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic interjected that a visual aid is needed in order to make a sound judgment.

**Consensus of the Board indicated agreement to proceed with item B, for \$695 for layout and design. Mr. Stern was encouraged to explain to the designer what the Board is projecting and request solutions from the firm.**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch clarified that the Board is only requesting the design stage, not awarding production to the firm.
- STERN** Mr. Stern called the Board’s attention to the fact that the price will be more for future publications.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether, instead of putting old information in from the Rec Board, that it would be better to put the new information in.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that in this instance it is a matter of timing to get the information to the public.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that, with the Rec Board information, people do keep the information and refer to it later.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called attention to the June Meeting Schedule and reviewed the dates:

- June 2, 1999 – 7 p.m. – Work Session on BioSolids
- June 9, 1999 – 7 p.m. – Work Session on Development Zone
- June 24, 1999 – 6:30 p.m. – Executive Session
- June 24, 1999 – 7:30 p.m. – Regular Meeting

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he would be unable to attend the BioSolids meeting. He will review the data with Mr. Halbert.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern whether a date had ever been established for the Historic Preservation Committee ceremony for presentation of the designation of Old East York.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that they had discussed it and wanted to leave it up to the Board.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what the actual request was.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Chairman of the York County Commissioners, Mr. Minnich, has an award for the Historic Preservation Committee for their efforts. Mr. Minnich desired to see this award presented either personally or by the Township Board.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the Board must make a decision and respond.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what the county had to do with this issue.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they had received the document but that they really are not involved.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked why the county received the paper.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it had been sent by the state to them.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that, in her opinion, it would be appropriate for a Board Member to handle the presentation.

**It was a consensus of the Board to make this presentation at the picnic. The presentation will be made by a Board Member.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that on the Park and Rec agenda there was mention of a meeting regarding county property. She asked about the status.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that he had heard directly from the president of the soccer club that the county said there was no interest.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that, as he understood that, Cindy Osborne was to advise the Township which piece of property was under consideration. The Township would then be able to advise her which pieces of property might be available.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that Ms. Osborne had done so several months ago. Mr. Stern indicated he had explained to Ms. Osborne which pieces of property might possibly be useful. He added that there weren't many.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck suggested follow up with Cindy Osborne as to what the next step should be.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested a document be prepared to the County Commissioners and ask them.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he thought the Township should make the request as to whether there is any interest.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic will follow up.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost had no update on his report dated May 20 other than he had received a communication from Mr. Neff of Yorktowne Paper, and he wished to review this matter in the Executive Session.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**A. Wastewater Director**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic brought forward the matter of Wastewater Director and the Fire Chief as well. He commented that agenda item 13A could be included. Wastewater Director interviews were completed two weeks ago. Messrs. Schober, Halbert and Amic served on the Interview Committee. Two candidates had been selected. Fire Chief interviews also were completed. The Interview Committee consisted of Chief Kunkle of Harrisburg Fire Dept., Kevin Nelson, Director of the Harrisburg Area Community College Fire Training School, Mr. Amic and Ms. Betty Speicher. Two potential Fire Chiefs had been selected.

Mr. Amic suggested that the four candidates for the two positions could be interviewed in one day. Mr. Amic was anxious to move forward quickly with the process.

**Consensus of the Board indicated that Saturday, June 5 at 8 a.m. was a good date in order to conduct interviews with the Board for the four potential candidates.**

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Master Park Plan Fundraisers**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic brought forward New Business agenda item 13 A. Two people are under consideration. There was a possibility for a third person.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick suggested that a date be scheduled even though it may be in July in order to move the process forward.

**Consensus of the Board was to hold a meeting on Monday, July 26 at 7 p.m. to review the Master Park Planners.**

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Amendment to Intermunicipal Service Agreement of May 15, 1981**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided information related to the Intermunicipal Service Agreement, which is to satisfy the sister municipality that the connection distance traveling miles are correct in the transportation billing. Mr. Amic recommended approval of this Amendment.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF THE AMENDMENT TO INTERMUNICIPAL SERVICE AGREEMENT DATED MAY 15, 1981. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic brought forward the subject of Resolution 99-36. The distinguished officials at the Environmental Protection Agency notified Mr. Amic that this was an incorrect Resolution; however, it was wording that EPA had provided. Review of the suggested last sentence, "*The appropriate officers of the township hereby authorize to execute all certificates, etc. in connection with the grant are as follows.*" The only word that changed in the Resolution previously passed was that it said, "*in connection with the application.*" EPA is recommending changing the word *application* to *grant*. This document had already been included in the grant package. Mr. Amic suggested that Resolution 99-36 effective May 13, 1999 be rescinded and enact a new one with one word changed.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the same Resolution number would be used, i.e. Resolution 99-36.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that to be correct. Resolution 99-36 passed on 5/13/99 would be rescinded, and Resolution 99-36 would be passed on 5/27/99.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost interjected that the Board would be amending Resolution 99-36 to read as follows: *“The appropriate officers of the township hereby authorize to execute all certificates, etc. in connection with the grant are as follows.”*

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated some concern about the Resolution due to the fact that it had already been submitted to the EPA as Resolution 99-36.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost for his recommendation.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost provided two options, either call it a new Resolution or an Amendment to Resolution 99-36.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO RESCIND RESOLUTION 99-36 AS ADOPTED AT THE MAY 13, 1999 MEETING AND RE-ADOPTED AS AMENDED ON MAY 27, 1999. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. Board of Supervisors Work Session – May 12, 1999**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 12, 1999 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**B. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – May 13, 1999**

**MR GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING MAY 13, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

There was no action required under Old Business.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Master Park Plan Fundraisers**

This item was discussed earlier during the Manager’s Report.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 13, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Mike Myers, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Dan Flohr, Acting Fire Chief  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting of the Board of Supervisors to order at 7:35 p.m.

**A. Swearing in of Police Officers Ogden F. Dickerson III and Rebecca Ann March**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick announced that the meeting would begin with the honor of the swearing in of two new police officers, Ogden F. Dickerson III and Rebecca Ann March. Chairman Mitrick requested Supervisor William Schenck to conduct the swearing in ceremony.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Police Chief Eshbach to introduce the two new officers.

**ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach introduced Ogden F. Dickerson III and Rebecca Ann March.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck administered the oath to Ms. March and Mr. Dickerson and welcomed them to the Springettsbury Police Department.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 13, 1999  
APPROVED**

**ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach presented Officers Dickerson and March with their official police identification.

**The officers were then introduced individually to Chairman Mitrick and each Supervisor.**

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

There were no communications from citizens.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober had previously provided his written report. Mr. Schober provided updated information regarding the contracts for the Harrowgate Sewer, as well as the Millcreek Interceptor, which had been advertised in the newspaper. Bids will be accepted beginning in June. He reported that the PLC contract is being finalized, and a final set of specs had been submitted to the Township for review and final comments in preparation for advertisement.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic publicly thanked Mr. Schober for his participation in the interview process for a potential Wastewater Director.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Schober as well for being a guide on the tour of the Wastewater Treatment Plant. Mrs. Mitrick expressed her appreciation for an insightful and beneficial visit. Mrs. Mitrick also requested that consideration be given to having the Board visit the other departments in the Township simply to become more familiar.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani provided an update on Pleasant Valley Road. The box culvert is in, and construction work is ongoing with an expected completion date in two to three weeks.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the problem with the grade had been resolved.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that meetings had been held with the contractor, and they are working on a solution.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about the stop sign.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 13, 1999  
APPROVED**

- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that the stop condition is to remain on Pleasant Valley Road at this time. Mr. Luciani expressed concern about having to steepen Memory Lane to a 11 or 12% grade.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that Mr. Luciani's response is in conflict with what had been anticipated.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that the goal was to try to get the through street on Pleasant Valley. He again expressed that the crown of the road and its effects are of concern to him and to Charlie Lauer as well.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that one of the issues in favor of putting the stop signs on Pleasant Valley Road was the concern over the straight shot to Mt. Zion if there is not a stop at Memory Lane; the speed that could be generated through there might become a concern.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that in taking a look at the bulk of the traffic and what was being done, a problem would be created because people traveling straight through will have to stop.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck expressed some concern about the solution as well. He asked whether they are really changing the grade or addressing it by a stop sign.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani explained in more detail the elevation/steepening of grades into stop signs. There are concerns that cars would become airborne because of the severe grade on Memory Lane.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated his concern is moving traffic and that this might even be considered a calming situation.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that there is a choice for locating the stop signs in either direction. As a temporary suggestion Mr. Luciani wished to make Pleasant Valley the stop condition. It can be further reviewed.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that there had been a call from a resident concerning the safety in the area of the curve coming south on Memory Lane just north of the farm.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that the initial plan discussed was a four-way stop sign at that intersection, which needed approval from York County. That does not appear to be the proper solution. The initial start can be a two-way stop for further review.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there would be a left-hand lane on Pleasant Valley Road to go up the hill.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that there would be a left-hand lane in both directions.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked where the name would change when the road opens.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the road is presently named Pleasant Valley Road, unless some change is suggested by the Board of Supervisors.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl:**

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert reported regarding the diversion pumping station schedule, as well as an item on bio solids. Mr. Halbert provided an updated status report on permits, approvals and property acquisitions. The DEP review of the Act 537 Plan is in process. Some recent additional comments had been provided to Mr. Schober for response. As soon as that is accomplished, DEP will complete its review process. Conrail has provided verbal approval and a right-of-way lease agreement will be provided within a week. The Corps of Engineers/EPA is reviewing the contract documents for the specifications and drawings. Their final comments have been received, and there was no further need to re-submit the drawings and specs to them. The EPA Grant Funding Application is behind schedule; however, Mr. Risetto had been contacted and is providing guidance.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that Mr. Risetto had sent an attorney from his firm, who worked with Mr. Amic throughout Tuesday on the package. An Agenda item was listed later in the evening covering the Resolution needed for the package. R.K.&K. estimated costs were provided along with other data. A signed certificate by York County Planning was provided to them.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the application was to be submitted, but not approved.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it was his understanding that the application must be approved before bidding.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned then whether the Township is now just in the process of submitting.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the submittal would take place on Friday, May 14, 1999.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch then asked how long it would take for the approval.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 13, 1999  
APPROVED**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it would take about four to six weeks.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether it could be put out for bid before getting the approval.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he had been advised by Mr. Risetto verbally not to bid the contract until the application is approved.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that was his understanding. Mr. Risetto requests delay of advertisement of the project until the application is complete and submitted to EPA, which is completely different than having it approved.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed that this was his understanding. He asked Mr. Halbert for his opinion.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that it was his understanding that when it is a complete package and they have what they need, even though it may not have a formal approval, but they're aware of the contract; aware of the grant and there's an acknowledgment of that the project can move forward. The application is almost a pre-application because it does not have all the final information for the grant until the job is bid and the engineer's estimate is received, as well as the actual construction bid information from all the actual costs; then it's amended and the grant is made on that basis.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that he has heard two opinions that are at odds with each other.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic asked Mr. Halbert for an additional opinion. He asked, based upon the correspondence from the Department of the Army Corps of Engineers and his suggested comments and any other language comments to the specifications, what the earliest day would be to ask the Board to bid the contract.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that the date would be when the \$1 million is available to give to the Township for this project, then the job is bid.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic clarified that if Mr. Halbert were ready two weeks from now, then he needed definitive answers to provide the Board. However, if Mr. Halbert would not be ready for a month then it's a moot point because it would be approved by then.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert reported that Spring Garden Township passed a Resolution regarding the project. The project is in Springettsbury Township, but the owner of Yorktowne Paper is Spring Garden Township. Yorktowne Paper has agreed to a number. They have requested input from a York attorney

to make sure they are protected. That issue will resolve itself once the appropriate language is in the document.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he had not heard from them.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert reported that CSX Realty had been very difficult to deal with, and there is no progress to date. R. K. & K. is telephoning them daily, and Mr. Halbert recommends proceeding with bidding without their final approval. Mr. Halbert reported that they are waiting for the City Solicitor's comments from the York City Sewer Authority and from the City Engineer, Buchart Horn.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that comments were sent to the City but he was unsure why Mr. Halbert had not yet received them.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert reported that other than those issues with CSX being the one of most concern, R. K. & K. would recommend advertising as soon as there is some assurance that the \$1 million is not in jeopardy.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reiterated that if we can get assurance from Mr. Risetto's firm that the application had been filed and Mr. Risetto indicates that now that it's filed it's okay, then we'll be bidding in two weeks, and you'll be prepared at that time.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated that was correct.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that if Mr. Risetto indicates that is not the case, then he would report that back to Mr. Halbert. Mr. Amic added that he had been advised that the professional costs the Township had in the project, which were thought not to be included in the project, whether they are legal, engineering, or design costs are includable in the grant even though they had been expended before approval.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he would feel more comfortable to see what Mr. Risetto says in writing.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated agreement.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic thanked Mr. Halbert for coming in on Saturday morning to help with the interviews. Mr. Halbert had been extremely helpful and responded promptly with his comments. Mr. Amic indicated he would be providing comments on the interviewees.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that a sludge/bio-solids analysis had been done relative to the question of whether Springettsbury would like to be a host facility

for a pelletization facility or have bio-solids in general. A quick, but detailed analysis had been done, not just for the potential of pelletization but also all plant bio-solids current methods and proposed methods and reviewed work that had been done in the past. They made some recommendations May 4 in conferences with Township personnel and then made some revisions. A similar presentation incorporating some of the Township comments can be provided to the Supervisors. It is an important aspect of the business in the difficulty of disposal of wastes.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic noted that he suggested in his report to the Board that they receive the same presentation the staff had.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he would like some time to review the report. He had a number of questions because the report was provided so quickly and the work was provided at no cost. He asked Mr. Halbert what he figures is the margin of error in the provided numbers.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that the numbers came from the planning module. In the planning module it is usually less than 25%. As more definitive information is obtained, the costs are higher. The implication of why no cost is that it benefits R. K. & K. from an understanding of the basic changes that have been made over the past 18 years particularly with regard to how bio-solids are handled. Mr. Halbert felt it was important to understand it if he was to be of any help to respond to comments received from the Board or others.

**Consensus of the Board was to review this item at a Work Session Wednesday, June 2, at 7:00 p.m.**

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert mentioned that R. K. & K. has a new address. The week of May 25, their office will move from New Cumberland and an equal amount of personnel from the Baltimore Office all will move to Springettsbury Township.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 5/13/99
- B. Murphy & Dittenhafer – Architectural Design – Invoice #7 - \$20,742.77
- C. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Overview Mt. Zion Road – Progress Billing #3 - \$434.75
- D. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Overview Mt. Zion Road – Progress Billing #4 - \$1,646

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 13, 1999  
APPROVED**

- E. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl –Design Engineering – Progress Billing #9 - \$3,943.75
- F. Acer Engineering – Risk Management Plan – Progress Billing #3 - \$3,580
- G. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Millcreek Interceptor Repair – Progress Billing #1 - \$228.26
- H. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Harrowgate – Kingston – Progress Billing #6 - \$240.65
- I. Buchart Horn, Inc. – PLC Unit – Progress Billing #2 - \$473.10

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked the Board whether Items A through I could be considered together with one motion.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what was covered in the Columbia Gas billing for the Administration Building.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the item covered three bills: one for the Recreation Building, one for Public Works and one for the Administration Building, which included the Police Department.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that the Recreation Building is about one third less.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the Sewer Fund, just as a matter of information, regarding GPU Energy, whether that is our discounted rate. Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Amic whether this reveals a big difference.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded he would investigate that and respond.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch reiterated that the comparison should be from the same month last year to the same month this year.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE ITEMS A. THROUGH J. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

**A. 1999 4X4 Truck – Motors Fleet - \$46,511 Straight Bid**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented regarding the 4X4 Truck. The low bidder did not include an item, which happened to be the plow. In conference with Solicitor Yost, his opinion was that the original assumption was incorrect.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated correspondence had been received stating that the bidder made a mistake and missed an item in the bid. It was a lump sum requested bid. The specifications clearly included the plow. They had bid a lump sum. There is no exception taken by them or any asked for. Solicitor Yost's opinion was that they are legally obligated to deliver the chassis dump truck and plow for the price bid by them. Should they default, the Township would have the right to exercise rights under the bid bond. There is a \$7,500 bid bond, which would cover the cost of rebidding and any difference in bid that might occur.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented additionally that he recommended this bid be awarded on a straight bid of \$46,511 rather than with a trade in. Mr. Lauer had informed Mr. Amic that he had an offer from another municipality that will far exceed the difference between the straight sale bid quote and the trade in. He suggested that this be a straight sale. The number is less than \$3,000 and is significantly higher than that which had been offered.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the specs on the truck and the plow are straightforward. There is not a possibility of getting less than what we asked for in this truck.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that, if the bid were awarded to these people, they wouldn't be able to shave it.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that the bids are very detailed.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he recommended accepting the bid and awarding the contract.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT THE BOARD ACCEPT THE BID OF \$46,511 FROM MOTORS FLEET FOR THE NEW DUMP TRUCK. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Land Development 99-01 – Associated Wholesalers, Inc.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern explained the purpose of Land Development 99-01 for AWI, Inc. They are proposing a 5,000 sq. ft. addition, referred to as "cubby hole," an area which is in between existing buildings.

**BOGART** Mr. Richard K. Bogart stated that AWI desires to enclose an unbuilt area to add some elbow room for the computer department. There will be no

new employees. All of the requirements of the Township Land Development have been met.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Luciani what improvements he suggested.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated AWI had requested a storm water waiver. Following a meeting at the site, options were discussed and AWI will store the water underground. This was considered a very satisfactory solution.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked about the sprinkler system.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated it is sprinklered now, and this will be expanded.

**BOGART** Mr. Bogart indicated the sprinkler system is a dry system specifically designed for areas where there is a lot of computer equipment.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-01 FOR ASSOCIATED WHOLESALERS WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND CONDITIONS:**

- **WAIVER FROM THE SUBMISSION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAN.**
- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SHOW ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS, SEWERS, WATER MAINS, TELEPHONE AND ELECTRIC LINES, GAS LINES, FIRE HYDRANTS, AND OTHER MAN MADE FEATURES.**
- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A SEWER AND WATER FEASIBILITY STUDY.**
- **MODIFICATION FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SHOW ALL CONTOURS.**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY IN THE AMOUNT SPECIFIED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER.**

**MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Land Development 99-02 – Nello Tire Company**

**STERN** Mr. Stern explained the purpose for Land Development 99-02 for Nello Tire at 1210 Haines Road. This property is currently Gallagher's Auto, developed in late 1995. Mr. Stern introduced Laymon L. Mortorff of Gordon Brown & Associates, who is involved in the project.

Included in this development is an addition for an insulation area of about 2,500 sq. ft. There is an existing building, and proposed two buildings which appear as two for the warehousing of tires. One 3,375 sq. ft.; the other 4,500 sq. ft. These will be separated by a 3-hour fire wall in order to meet building codes for separate buildings. Mr. Stern also commented that this property uses an existing well. Water usage is 150 to 200 gallons a day. There is little interest in creating a water source through York Water Co.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that a storm water issues have been covered.

**MORTORFF** Mr. Mortorff indicated the only outstanding item is the posting of the bonds, which will be done promptly.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned what the Township's interest in the water line might be in terms of future connection.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he did not foresee a future need. The site has a well and surrounding sites are low water users.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked what would happen if the user of this property changes.

**MORTORFF** Mr. Mortorff responded that the user would then have to come back to the Township for a Land Development Plan.

**STERN** Mr. Stern also commented that if a user did not need a Land Development Plan, their engineers would advise them whether the well has enough water in it. If the well could not provide the water then a connection would be required.

**MORTORFF** Mr. Mortorff reported that the people purchasing that lot had inquired as to whether they had to hook up water to the site, and they proceeded with their purchase contingent upon not having to do that.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated surprise that the staff had come forward and is willing to having this pursued without water hookup. She asked where the nearest fire hydrant is located.

**FLOHR** Acting Fire Chief Dan Flohr responded that it was within sufficient distance of the site.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Flohr whether he considered that distance to be any kind of a public safety hazard in any way, shape or form.

**FLOHR** Chief Flohr responded that he did not. He indicated that the fire company, in its front line equipment, carries 1,500 ft. of large diameter hose, which would be adequate. The large diameter hose replaces the water mains. It would be laid from the hydrant to the facility. This would be rural type of fire fighting which is done all the time, for instance in Druck Valley area, so in that instance it isn't a public safety problem.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether burning tires are toxic.

**FLOHR** Chief Flohr responded that anything burning is toxic.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented about an issue of the incineration of tires several years ago being toxic.

**FLOHR** Chief Flohr responded that a tire is of petroleum base so that it does give off some toxins, but everything today seems to be toxic because of regulations.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick expressed concern about the waiver to connect to public water. While the situation can be viewed as an isolated case, there is a string of development in that area, and the distance is within our ordinance.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned the waiver from the requirement to submit a preliminary plan. He commented that with the new sewer availability a lot of plans would be forthcoming. He asked whether there was a set way of determining whether we're going to grant a waiver from requirement for a preliminary plan; whether there is some threshold that is crossed. Would this be something that is definitized or is it a matter of subjectivity with each plan.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that there is some subjectivity but for the most part would deal with preliminary plans for large residential developments. It would be something that the applicant would want to do. That allows them to do certain work prior to actually separating the different lots for sale, and they can begin putting in the infrastructure.

**MORTORFF** Mr. Mortorff added that they normally would ask for a waiver from the preliminary plan if there were no public improvements involved. For instance, if there were no public sewer line or a street or something of that nature, that would require the kind of information that usually you have in a preliminary plan. In that case a waiver would be requested. In this situation, the preliminary plan and the final plan would be the same. There is no design for any public facilities on this plan.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 13, 1999  
APPROVED**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether, aside from what the applicant is asking for, we feel the same way about the approach.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that was correct.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Luciani to comment on what the risks are for granting the waiver for the public water.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that in industrial and commercial applications, ordinances base lot sizes on the availability of sewer and water. In Manchester Township they don't allow industrial and commercial uses without public water and sewer. Typically a variance is needed to put in a septic system or a well. It is for Edris Oil in this case. Unfortunately, the property that's furthest away will have to connect to the line.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenk indicated that the estimate from the Water Co. was written to Wolf Printing, which isn't even this applicant. I'm assuming the estimate was to get the water to that property. What is unknown is what the difference in cost would be to go from Wolf to Nello. If you put those two together if they were really interested in having public water, they would share that cost. What we have here is Nello basically getting off for nothing because Wolf doesn't want to get it to his lot. Mr. Schenck asked what the township's obligation is in the public water issue.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that that, too, was his question, i.e. what are the risks to Springettsbury Township.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded he did not know what risks there are; however, in a highly-developed area, the wells could dry up. They could become easily contaminated.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated it seems as though it's being pushed back, and the last guy down the line is going to need water, and every one else will get it for nothing. Edris is already there with no water and a jiffy john. Mr. Schenck stated he sensed a lack of responsibility here, and it's unclear to know who is asking the waiver of not requiring the public water because the letter is written to Wolf Printing, and yet the Board is dealing with the Nello Tire land development.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that there was not a request for a waiver of water and provided further, more detailed information about the water situation. He had visited the site with Mr. Lauer and looked at the storm water pond. When Mr. Luciani saw the fire hydrant, that tipped him off that there was water on the street. When he returned to the office he looked at the plan for the water line, which was not shown. When he looked for the water location he found the well. Mr. Luciani contacted the York Water Co.

and requested the map. They sent the map; measured the distance, and it was within 1,000 for the ordinance. Ideally public water is the way to go, but costs to the developer have an impact. One of the reasons why costs appear high is because this is located on a state road and anything done on a state road costs nearly doubled.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that when this project was first started, the first thing that was brought up was public water. As the process has gone along, Mr. Stern indicated he had shifted away from that opinion because it is an existing property with an existing well that was approved just four years ago when this property was developed. Mr. Stern stated that if this were a brand new development and there was nothing here and it wasn't approved for a well before, then his opinion might have been different. When these plans came forward, that was one reason why staff had encouraged them to split this into two buildings with three-hour fire wall instead of putting in a sprinkler system.

**MORTORFF** Mr. Mortorff stated that the waiver from public water occurred with the initial development.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether that had been explicitly waived.

**MORTORFF** Mr. Mortorff responded that to be correct. He added that he had been involved in the land development plan for Gallaghers. Because they were a used car lot with just incidental repairs to vehicles, they didn't have water use any greater than what the Nello people do, so we explicitly asked not to have to hook up to water. They had the same problems with costs before which hasn't changed over time. The Township approved the plan with the well.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the cost to the developer for any land development that comes before the Board could be discussed. Mrs. Mitrick concluded that there was a need to look at this issue and determine if we feel public water is necessary.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what the argument would be in favor of having public water provided.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck agreed that, for this applicant, there is probably not a strong argument; there is probably very low usage. Mr. Schenk's concern is over time, who pays.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that making this applicant be the one who pays doesn't really solve anything.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 13, 1999  
APPROVED**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck agreed with that too. It concerned Mr. Schenck that there is another lot waiting to be developed. Mr. Schenck indicated he did not appreciate the comments made where our township line ends. When it comes to public utilities he would hope that if we were close to the York Township line and they had facilities that they would extend our way and that we would work with them.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that when you get into the other townships everything is developed. Since that's not our township that information is not available.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there is any water coming from York Township.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that it ends with a number of houses down the road.

**MORTORFF** Mr. Mortorff added that there is a water line on the Camp Betty Road up to Chambers Road.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that we have a means – a way - if we ever want to force water into the area.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost to explain specifically what that means would be.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded just as we run water other places, we create a water district to tell everybody to connect with a tap-in fee to pay part of the cost and water rental sufficient to amortize the cost of the line over a period of time.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked on what the cost is based.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded it is based on street frontage.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-02  
NELLO TIRE COMPANY WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND  
CONDITIONS:**

- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO CONNECT TO PUBLIC WATER**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY TO THE TOWNSHIP IN THE AMOUNT TO BE DETERMINED BY THE**

**TOWNSHIP ENGINEER.**

**MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. CHAIRMAN MITRICK VOTED NO. MR. GURRERI ABSTAINED AS THE OWNER OF NELLO IS A PERSONAL FRIEND.**

**C. Subdivision 99-06 – Springettsbury Township Diversion Pumping Station**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided explanation for Subdivision 99-06 which covered the Springettsbury Township Diversion Pumping Station with R. K. & K. This will serve the entire line but specifically covers subdivision of .28 acres on the Yorktowne Papers tract of land on which to place the pump station. The current tract of land is in Spring Garden Township, as well as Springettsbury, and Spring Garden requested review as well. Spring Garden had conditionally approved it with several items require before they sign approval.

- Army Corps of Engineers to discuss with them any concerns about existing and future flooding associated with Mill Creek.
- Yorktowne Paper signature and notarization.
- Waiver of several items from their ordinance.
- Springettsbury Township’s signature to be obtained first.

**MYERS** Mr. Myers of R.K.&K. stated that the issue of the Corps of Engineers has been finalized. The COE telephoned R.K.& K. and that has taken care of that one concern. If they have any further need for information they will contact R.K. & K.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that it was necessary to get this subdivision approved because of timing. The plan would be ready to be signed and recorded rather than having to wait for another meeting to have it done.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that in his opinion this is a courtesy to Springettsbury Township. Technically it is a subdivision, but it is a subdivision for a public work. Even if Springettsbury were to file a condemnation act which gives ownership of that portion that is taken, that still wouldn’t give the authority to sign a plan because it must include the area out of which we are subdividing the parcel.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated it is not a legal plan without their signature.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that it cannot be recorded without the Owner or Spring Garden’s signature.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION 99-06  
SPRINGGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost if there was any reason to add a comment to this regarding anything that would cover the fact that the Board is doing this prior to the approval.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated no.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated then that Solicitor Yost was advising the Board to proceed with this action.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that our approval means nothing until Spring Garden signs it.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Request to waive Land Development Walk in Freezer**

**STERN** Mr. Stern gave an explanation to the item for action, which covered an area of 300 sq. ft. at the south end of El Serrano Restaurant. Originally Mr. Caltagirone had come in for a permit to put in a freezer. Land development ordinance requires land development plan unless there is a separate accessory building, which it is not. Mr. Caltagirone has asked for a waiver of a formal land development plan.

**SHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked for a clearer understanding of what is planned – i.e., whether this covers just basically putting walls up.

**CALTAGIRONE**

Mr. Caltagirone stated that his plan includes a walk in freezer and refrigerator/freezer in the same place, which he wished to enclose.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck added that the area would be enclosed in bricks.

**CALTAGIRONE**

Mr. Caltagirone added that there would be a roof.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented that it would be a matching brick building with a rubber roof.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the building will take parking away.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the building would take two parking spaces, which were extra spaces.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 13, 1999  
APPROVED**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Stern whether, if Mr. Caltagirone came in for a permit to do this 300 sq. ft., he would be examining the material specifications.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that his office would examine the material specifications.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated then that they would not be permitted to build something which is not in keeping with the rest of the building.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that to be the case if that would be how it would be approved.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that there is an ordinance that says if it's not an attached building then it can go to 800 sq. ft. What he was looking at was why the Supervisors even have the plan coming before them.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the ordinance requires it.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned why that ordinance exists.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that this discussion had been had many times.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the accessory waiver was added.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated this gives us a little bit more control in terms of the way it looks and that it complies with the existing building.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE REQUEST TO WAIVER LAND DEVELOPMENT FOR WALK IN FREEZER CONDITIONED UPON COMPLIANCE WITH DRAWING PRESENTED DATED 4/12/99 AND COMPLIANCE WITH LETTER SPECIFYING THAT THE BRICK MATCHES THE EXISTING BUILDING DATED 4/23/99. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch reported that he had visited Martin Memorial Library. The Librarian asked for his address and zip code. She asked Mr. Pasch whether he knew about the Library facility at Bradley Academy, sponsored by Springettsbury Township, Bradley Academy and Martin Memorial Library. They provided a brochure. Mr. Pasch was extremely pleased.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that he and Mr. Pasch attended the Local Government Advisory Full Committee Meeting held at Bay City

Restaurant in Hanover on May 5. The speaker was Warden Hogan and was very informative.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Amic for the communication he had with Mr. Dubin regarding the Waste Management concern that he had. Frequently letters of complaint are received, and very seldom do we receive a letter of appreciation. The resident was very pleased with Mr. Amic's response.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reminded the Board if there are any corrections or comments on the draft for the newsletter, Mr. Stern would appreciate those as soon as possible.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that Mr. Stern mentioned to her of a conversation regarding combining the Park and Rec newsletter with the Township newsletter. Mr. Stern had a deadline for that.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that, if the newsletters are to be combined, the next one needs to be mailed out by the end of August. All the material would have to be ready for printing the end of July.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he had heard no arguments against doing it.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded that several years ago when consideration had been given to a township newsletter, several Board members did some research on what would be the best way to design it, what should go into it, and at the time were advised by two sources that are involved in news reporting about its readability. The sources had advised that the bulkier the product, the less it will be read. Mrs. Mitrick believes that there is some truth to that statement, and she is personally in favor of keeping the township newsletter as a separate item. It is in very good form now. The information that is in it is pertinent to township business, and she likes the separate identification of the Park and Rec Board news.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick also reported that in the Park and Rec Minutes of their meeting on March 17 – under their department report there were concerns raised regarding combining the Rec newsletter and the Township newsletter.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that for the last two budgets there had been discussion held when we get to the section containing the amount of money spent on the newsletter. It had been suggested to look at the Rec newsletter, look at our own newsletter for the possible combining of the newsletters for economic purposes. Ms. Bowers had done an extensive amount of work on that to bring forward with intention to combining these, but the

direction was that we were to explore that. No examples had been provided at this time in lieu of definitive direction.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that providing an example would be possible, but difficult to provide. The printer actually assembles it, typesets it. He would have to do a mockup and pay the printer to do it. Mr. Stern added that the Park and Recs Board has to get their newsletter out quickly.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether it would be feasible to have someone take the last issue of the Township newsletter and the last issue of Parks and Rec newsletter and tell us what it would have looked like had they been combined.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that one of the reasons why the issue was brought up was because we felt that the present Park and Rec newsletter should be updated technically. The Park and Rec Board would agree. If they are to be kept separate, we must also understand that was part of the concern in the past.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the readability of the Park and Rec newsletter was difficult.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated he would try to get samples of the last newsletters.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri suggested to take the old Park and Rec newsletter and put it together with the last Township newsletter.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to determine what was meant by the comment in the Park and Rec Minutes.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he did not think the Park and Rec people want to lose the individuality of their newsletter. If it's designed improperly they may lose it. It can be designed in a manner where they are identified.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick continued with an item regarding the Career Firefighters Rules of Conduct. She inquired as to the progress being made.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he had written a letter corresponding with the President of the union and asked to begin negotiations as soon as possible.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether a response had been received.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he had not received a response to date.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 13, 1999  
APPROVED**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported on the Development Zone project. A meeting was held with the Planning Commission. A commitment was made to keep this item on the front of the table. Planning Commission had asked the Board what they would like in that zone, and once the Board has determined that, then meet with them in another Work Session.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he had read the Minutes of that meeting. His discernment is that there are problems that need to be addressed and resolved in order to come up with a Development Zone that will work. One of the things that Mr. Stern mentioned is that some direction is needed as to where we're going, and that's true, but also the Planning Commission should be very much involved in terms of their suggestion. Some of their ideas were different from some of the Board's ideas. Mr. Pasch stated that the Township would not want to miss a potential purchaser.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck did not sense a consensus on either side/opinion of the Planning Commission or the Supervisors.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick agreed with Mr. Pasch and Mr. Kevin Hodge of the York County Economic Development Corporation that time is of the essence for potential businesses. They may turn away and not purchase if the zoning is not in order. The Chairman of the Planning Commission indicated that he wants the Board of Supervisors to determine what it wants and bring it back to them.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed that the Supervisors need to make some decisions one way or another as to the direction the Board wants the whole matter to take. Perhaps it needs to be in writing.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated agreement, but the Planning Commission is established for the very purpose of determining ideas and thoughts that they bring to the Board of Supervisors rather than the other way around.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop's opinion is that the Board already has that, and they are telling the Board.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he did not see any real plan in there.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she requested another Work Session with them for the purpose of doing that and they were not interested. They said that the Fathers of the township should get together, determine what is best.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch said then if we're going to do that then we go ahead with it. There is no need for the Planning Commission.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 13, 1999  
APPROVED**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick recommended that the Board of Supervisors establish a date where it is discussed as a Board and then certainly consult with the Planning Commission once we have a fair idea of what we're looking for in that area.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he felt the Planning Commission had a lot of good comments, and he would like to see the two Boards meet again.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that they don't want to do that; they were asked.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that if we're going to get together and talk about it, let's schedule a Work Session and invite anyone who wants to come.

**Consensus was to hold a Work Session for Wednesday, June 9, at 7:00 p.m. to discuss the Development Zone issue.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to notify the Planning Commission of this meeting.

**STERN** Mr. Stern asked whether Mr. Hodge should be invited.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated it was helpful to have him as well as Randy Beck and Mike Shaffer.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that one thing he had noticed in the Minutes was how it can be controlled with environmental rules. It is important to spell those rules out for a more clear understanding.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop voiced agreement and indicated that there may be a need to incorporate those rules in an ordinance.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost reported, in addition to his written report, two additional items both concerning Pleasant Valley Road extension. Notwithstanding what was published in the newspaper, Springettsbury is legally occupying that property and building a road on it. Secondly, he received a call from the Chairman of the Board of View, who scheduled June 3 as the date for the Viewer's Hearing on the Taking.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that Senator Gibson Armstrong would be at Rutters for a breakfast meeting on Wednesday, May 19<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m. This meeting would be an update on items taking place in Harrisburg. The Board of Supervisors are invited to attend.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Amic to involve Senator Armstrong in the Route 24 corridor.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated he would attend.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she would attend.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reminded the Board that on May 22 interviews would be conducted for the Fire Chief position. Mr. Amic had provided a list of the potential candidates. The list of potential candidates is expected to be significantly reduced by these interviews. Mr. Amic invited anyone from the Board to attend.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic explained that through Reed Smith (previously Holland & Knight) we applied for funding under the TCPA, the TEA 21 for the roadway. We weren't successful in that first round. Now we have discussed this matter for the second round, and Reed Smith has presented another proposal to us. The potential development at the back of the York Mall and the way that they would design it environmentally would be better for our program with sidewalk café's and biking paths and environmental lighting. They indicate that there will be more funding, and it's far more likely that we would receive this funding. Looking at what might be required of us and the cost that might be required to enhance the project to meet the federal guidelines, Mr. Amic was not at all sure that there's a value to this. There is an aesthetic value to it, that if we could build it it would be quite beautiful. However, we would be building a much larger project than we intended and the percentage of what we would be putting in it and receiving would be very high.

**STERN** Mr. Stern added that having spoken with Michelle Wyman who worked on the last one, her ideas are great and would make that little road look beautiful. However, when Mr. Stern had first become involved the cost of this roadway was going to be about \$200,000. The cost for the rail crossing is a constant figure, the rail cost goes up, and it will cost us extra regardless of which of the options are chosen.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned whether the \$200,000 includes the rail crossing.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that was correct and that it was a low cost for the rail crossing. If the rail crossing is \$15,000 more than we thought, it will cost an extra \$50,000 regardless of what process is chosen. The next option was approximately \$500,000 and that was with the T-Grant last time.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic clarified that was the one we had hoped to get the last time but didn't get.

- STERN** That would have left us somewhere around \$150,000 of our money.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what the difference would be in terms of what's in the \$200,000 as opposed to what's in the \$500,000?
- STERN** The reason is that one of the major components of the T-Grant is friendly environmental items – recycled asphalt, solar overhead lighting that is automatic, charges up during the day, turns on at night, brick walkways, a lot of environmental friendly things that cost money. Mr. Stern indicated that the Township would be facing probably a \$800,000 cost because of environmental considerations.
- STERN** Mr. Stern recommended that if the Board wants the road done and is willing to set aside the sidewalk cafes and brick walkways, then move forward with just the bare basics and start getting agreements for contributions from the community. Home Depot, Walmart, Caterpillar if they're interested and just get it done.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic added that there will be help other than this program to build this roadway, as well as corporate help. The Township has budgeted a half million dollars for this project the last few years. It's still sitting in the budget, and we hope to use as little as possible. Mr. Amic recommended combining some of our resources, Mr. Stern's efforts, and efforts with Industrial Development with Caterpillar and the roadway and our re-development with the mall. Mr. Amic believes there's a possibility of funding from several areas, even the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania funding in some way.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch added that when this roadway is gussied up like that there is a continuing maintenance cost.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it would be required and there'll be federal inspections. Unless somebody wants to pursue this, Mr. Amic suggested that the product we might get is going to cost us a lot more than is necessary.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch's recommendation was to proceed with the roadway and trying to get help from the corporate sponsors and whoever is involved. Isn't one of the things that's in there that once this rail track transfers over we're going to have some trouble negotiating with the new rail owner? It's in the budget. If there's any funding available from the state, fine, but Mr. Pasch did not think that kind of money suggested this evening should be spent.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick voiced agreement.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic was uncomfortable with the application. He will notify them that we are not at this time interested in proceeding with this.

**Consensus of the Board indicated agreement with not proceeding with this format at this time.**

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Resolution 99-32 – Police Rule of Conduct of May 13, 1999.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided information regarding the Police Rule of Conduct. This had been reworked and reviewed by the police legal counsel and the bargaining unit has approved it. Mr. Yost had approved it. Adoption was recommended.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 99-32 POLICE RULE OF CONDUCT OF MAY 13, 1999. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Ordinance 99-03 Amendment to Subdivision/Land Development Ordinance**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided information regarding Ordinance 99-03. Zoning Ordinance changes allow people to submit plans this year. At this point they are asking for a Public Hearing. An odd request asks that this be delayed a month or two - reason for making this change is so that we don't get bombarded with plans all at one time next year. There are 14 projects that are on this year's Chapter 94 report. Once that's approved by DEP land developments and subdivisions will be submitted. Mr. Stern stated that he would like to get those 14 plans submitted and in process before opening the door to the next 25 – 30 projects for next year.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Stern had a date for submittal.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he did not know when DEP would approve this, but he would think if this were adopted, sometime late July – early August.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that there would be a public hearing at our July meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick clarified that the Public Hearing would be July 22. Public Hearing will convene at 7 p.m. on July 22 for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 99-03.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO ADVERTISE ORDINANCE 99-03. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- C. Resolution 99-33 Application for Ogden F. Dickerson III to attend Basic Training.**
- D. Resolution 99-34 Application for Rebecca Ann March to attend Basic Training.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated Resolution 99-33 and 99-34 are required to place the two new officers sworn in the academy. The academy requires a formal Resolution to authorize them to go to the academy.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-33. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-34. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- E. Resolution 99-36 Authorizing the submittal of FY 1999 Grant Application.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reviewed this Resolution required by the Environmental Protection Agency to accompany our application for Federal Grant.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-36. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

- A. Board of Supervisors Work Session – April 15, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION APRIL 15, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. SCHENCK ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

- B. Board of Supervisors Public Hearing – April 22, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PUBLIC HEARING APRIL 22, 1999 AS SUBMITTED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- C. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – April 22, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES APRIL 22, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR.  
SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Board of Supervisors/Planning Commission Work Session – April 27, 1999**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that he really appreciated receiving the Minutes quickly having not attended the meeting. It was extremely helpful to him to stay in the loop.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that thanks should be given to Joy Lauchman as she had been requested to provide the Minutes quickly, and she had responded.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 27  
WORK SESSION. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR.  
BISHOP AND MR. PASCH BOTH ABSTAINED AS THEY WERE NOT IN  
ATTENDANCE.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated there was no Old Business requiring action.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Amendment to Intermunicipal Service Agreement of May 15, 1981**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Amendment to Intermunicipal Service Agreement of May 15, 1981 is a long-standing agreement. This was noted for informational purposes. This item will be moved up on the Agenda as further communication from sister municipalities takes place as to whether or not they approve of it. Mr. Amic does not anticipate any problems.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported on the interviews for the Wastewater Director. There are two potential candidates. Both Messrs. Halbert and Schobert provided their thoughts in writing. Mr. Amic will follow up with his comments. The consensus was that while the candidates were excellent, however, perhaps the Township could do better. Further discussion will take place.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned in the Recreation Department Report that “ground breaking for the new building will start in May.”

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked for the date of the report.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated March 17.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 13, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that it had been three weeks and he had not received any word from Mr. Dittenhafer related to specifications to review.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that, since Mr. Pasch had brought up the subject of Parks and Rec., in their Park and Rec Minutes I believe there had been some responsibility clarified for some of the port-a-potties.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that there were some in the specific locations which continue to be permitted.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick also commented with regard to the Minutes that Gail Reed had reported that July 21 was the date for the picnic in the park. Evidently this was a mistake in the minutes as the correct date is July 17.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that a memo had been received from Dan Flohr to Mr. Amic. Mrs. Mitrick asked the Board whether they had a chance to review the memo.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick announced that an Executive Session would be held following the Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors regarding personnel.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Mike Myers, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Dan Flohr, Acting Fire Chief  
Jim Noel, Wastewater Treatment Department  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called a General Meeting of the Board of Supervisors to order at 7:30 p.m. Chairman Mitrick reminded the Board of the Road Tour scheduled on Monday, April 26, 1999 at 4:30 p.m. Chairman Mitrick added that Andrew Stern would accompany the Board on the Road Tour and encouraged the Board to notify Mr. Stern of any locations to be placed on the agenda. Chairman Mitrick also announced a Work Session to be held with the Planning Commission regarding the Development Zone on Tuesday, April 27 at Noon and a Work Session regarding Residential Blight on Wednesday, May 12 at Noon.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick introduced William Schell, Executive Director, Martin Library.

**SHELL** Martin Shell provided an update regarding the electronic library at Bradley Academy. Mr. Schell specifically focused on the efforts to promote the use of the library. Mr. Schell discussed the challenges, the opportunities,

the goals, and the objectives for usage, that being to have at least 2,000 uses a year for township residents. Mr. Schell reported that during the month of March the reporting indicated there were 2,500 uses within the township. Mr. Schell discussed the different types of promotion of the library which include mention and/or inserts in the last three township newsletters. He added that both Martin Library and the Kreutz Creek Library are a part of the service. Brochures are distributed at Borders bookstore and by Welcome Wagon; also to each person who registers or re-registers for a library card at Martin or Kreutz Creek Library. The total membership of both libraries is approximately 6,000 people; 2,000 apply for new membership or re-registration. Newspapers are also used where possible. The Web Page shows a link to Springettsbury Township Library and partnerships with the Township, and additionally has indicated 20,000 visits a month. An additional link shows the partnerships. Businesses are offered the service without charge.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that in the beginning he did not think residents would participate; however, residents are using the library, and he indicated he was pleased with the use.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick read a letter from a resident urging the Board to continue the financial support of the Bradley Academy site. Chairman Mitrick echoed Mr. Pasch's statement in support of the use of the library.

**SHELL** Mr. Schell stated that the relationship the library has had with Bradley Academy and Springettsbury Township is considered an ideal condition. He added that the Pennsylvania Department of Education is looking at this partnership toward the provision of library services as an example to other communities in Pennsylvania.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that three years ago when the concept for this library was being developed, before Bradley became involved, the Supervisors would have liked to have located the library in the township building. At that time it was not possible because of space limitations, etc. Having to look elsewhere the Bradley partnership was developed. The township is in a position with the new building where space would become available. He asked Mr. Schell whether he would consider location in the new Municipal Building.

**SHELL** Mr. Schell responded that he would be happy to enter into discussion about what end the Board might have in mind in terms of the total library service within the township and what financial realities the township is willing to accept. He indicated there would be clear advantages with the partnership in terms of the financial standpoint and from a service standpoint as well. The county libraries are now collaborating and meeting jointly having recently signed a Memorandum of Understanding

whereby collaboration now takes place in business and program management, which has resulted in a very positive impact for a full service library to York County. Mr. Schell indicated that Kreutz Creek library – 25% of which is utilized by Springettsbury Township residents – must be included within the scope of discussions.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick suggested that Springettsbury Township could include a piece of publicity from the library as an insert with the sewer billings or in the next newsletter. Mrs. Mitrick asked Mr. Schell whether he would be able to provide an insert.

**SCHELL** Mr. Schell indicated he would participate in any way to promote the library.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that there are many mailings and much public contact work, and combining the two efforts would provide a better overall promotion.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked when the next sewer billing would take place.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that would be in July and added that it would not be an expensive fee to include something in the envelope. Mr. Amic added that the mailing reaches about 6,500 people.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that would be a good goal for future promotion.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Schell for coming and participating in this discussion.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that what had prompted the invitation to Mr. Schell to come before the Board was the payment of the interest on the trust to Martin Library, and the motion made by the Board a year ago indicated that the Township would participate as a pilot program. Mr. Amic suggested that a motion be made to fund the Martin Library for the calendar year 1999 with the interest on the trust from calendar 1998. The check would be for \$11,098.62.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT THE BOARD AUTHORIZE THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE INTEREST IN THE WILLIAMS LIBRARY TRUST TO MARTIN LIBRARY FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1999. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**FREY** Mrs. Margaret Frey reported a need for a No Parking sign on Industrial Highway between North Hills Road and Memory Lane in the eastbound lane of traffic. She reported a caravan of trucks from Edgecomb Metals parking in that lane of the street blocking part of a lane forcing traffic to

cross over the double line in order to get by. Mrs. Frey had spoken with Edgecomb and was advised that the facility is not equipped to take the trucks as they come in in the morning. As a result the trucks use Industrial Highway as a parking lot. Mrs. Frey reported that on May 8 a potential occurred for three accidents on the highway. Springettsbury Police were called and the truck driver was cited.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would discuss this with Police Chief Eshbach and visit the area. He will report back to the Board and to Mrs. Frey as to what recommendations will be made.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that this might be an area to include on the Road Tour.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**SCHOBBER** Mike Schober reported two additional items supplemental to his written report. Regarding the Act 537 Plan, Meeting Minutes from the last meeting were incorporated into the Plan and sent to DEP in order to begin the approval process. Their review has begun, and they would like to have an original copy of a signed Resolution of Adoption from the Board. Mr. Amic had one prepared for signature. The second item covered the PLC contract. Comments had been received from the Waste Treatment Plant staff to be incorporated with the documents.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Mrs. Mitrick, and Mr. Gurreri will be at the Waste Treatment Plant Wednesday morning at 8:30 a.m. for their tour.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that Mr. Pasch would attend as well.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck, having previously attended a tour of the Waste Treatment Plant, indicated that the session was very informative.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that, in her absence from the last meeting, there had been additional complaints regarding the odors. Mrs. Mitrick visited the area herself, and ascertained the problem to be valid and needing to be addressed.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. John Luciani provided an update on changing the stop signs on Pleasant Valley Road so that Pleasant Valley Road would be a through street. At the last meeting the Board had authorized a review of a dangerous intersection on Mt. Rose Avenue with a look at a longer turning

lane on Plymouth Road. Mr. DeRose of Heritage Hills was contacted and he indicated they recently had aerial mapping done over the area. They will provide the aerial mapping from their consultant. Tom Austin, of the Transportation Resource Group, and John Luciani had reviewed this. Mr. Luciani also spoke with the owner of the beer distributor who provided information showing that motorists cut through her parking lot. Mr. Luciani informed her that PennDot would require the applicant to narrow down the driveway to make it a permitted driveway. The downside is that the driveway gets narrowed; the upside is that she gains more parking and the driveway would become much more controlled. She seemed to be in favor of making it a safer driveway indicating her cooperation. Consideration was given to possibly having to move a utility pole on the corner, which may be avoided by putting a curb line in.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick brought forward an item regarding traffic control. She had received a call about the intersection of Eastern Boulevard and East Market Street. The resident had asked the township to consider eliminating left-hand turns onto Market Street.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that making a left into Eastern Boulevard off of Market Street in that same area going west is also difficult and should be reviewed.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated he would look at that as well.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that Mr. Miller, the farmer, had telephoned him to remind him that the township had not done anything to correct the drainage problem on Ridgewood Road. The water comes down the hill flows across the road into his field.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that they had reviewed that last year. At the time he met with the residents and they were to look into two things – to get the county involved claiming run off from Rocky Ridge and at the same time engage an engineer to review it.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated they never came back to the township as far as what their intentions were.

**YOST** Mr. Yost indicated he thought it had been addressed and was apologetic to Mr. Miller when he called.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that Mr. Luciani (without becoming their engineer) had made a number of suggestions toward the eastern part of the plan. There was a natural watercourse and suggested that on the upper part of the lot that they move the water some way to the east which would catch

the natural watercourses. Along the roadway there is a large abutment on the north side of the road.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that there are five or six homeowners involved.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that at one of the Work Sessions the Board had asked Mr. Amic to contact Mr. Luciani about a possible overview of an exit on Route 30.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he had spoken with Mr. Luciani about that.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that they had discussed doing some concept plans. Mr. Luciani added that PennDot may have some concept plans, which they were investigating. He will report to the Board.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**HALBERT** Mr. Robert Halbert provided s status report regarding the on going permits, approvals, property and right-of-way acquisitions. RK&K discussed the acquisition and right-of-ways with CSX very recently and sent a follow up letter urging them to complete their review as soon as possible. Mr. Halbert indicated that if the approval process continues to move forward and remains on schedule, he anticipates at the May 13 meeting requesting permission to advertise the project the following day on May 14<sup>th</sup>. RK&K has been discussing internally ways to accelerate getting the job done within the 270 day time frame. Mr. Halbert discussed several options for the bidding process. He indicated anticipating requesting permission on the 13<sup>th</sup> and expect the ad date to go out the 14<sup>th</sup> with bids received a month later.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that he had spoken with Mr. Risetto. There is about a six to eight week time period following the filing of the application for the million dollars received last year before the approval. There are stipulations in Federal codes and regulations that if the bid is awarded, not bid, but awarded, and we do not have approval for the grant by the EPA the grant will not be awarded, and so it's critical. Mr. Risetto assured Mr. Amic that he would be in contact with Mr. Halbert.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated that one of the items on this approval is the Corps of Engineers. What EPA has done is contract with the Corps of Engineers for Region 3 to review our documents for compliance with EPA regulations so they are all bid appropriately; the contracts do not have sole sourcing, etc.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Mr. Halbert was probably aware of all this. This Board contracted with Mr. Risetto two weeks ago, and part of his contract is to see that the grant applications and Federal procedures are followed.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated that he understood and that what he proposed is allowable under Federal guidelines.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that upon going into Phase II he is very optimistic. He added that concerning Phase II our Congressman has made a great effort in lobbying and our Federal Senators are in support.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert also reported that there is another item in the contract covering a certain period of time from the time the bid is received until the award, and that allows you 120 days if you need that much time.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that was not Commonwealth law and stated he believed it was 60 days.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he would have to review that.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the bidding procedure under the code says there are 60 days to award the bid.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch re-stated then that what Mr. Amic was saying is that the timing on the award on this contract of this is very critical. However, awarding this contract does not affect Phase II of our bid for a grant.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that to be correct.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that it would affect the million dollars earmarked in the current budget.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether Mr. Halbert is aware that some of the indications he is getting about the ability to get people to work in the construction business in the York area are difficult. Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Halbert whether he thinks the 270 days is going to be a reasonable term for the contractors.
- HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated he was sure that it is.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic requested Mr. Halbert provide a one-page memorandum about his plan for alternate bidding. The Board could then review it for their response.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that regardless of the fact that the Board had been pushing this project every step of the way to move it forward, 30 days off the end of the contract doesn't seem like a big deal to him.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that for general information purposes two of the engineering reports faxed in after 3 p.m. on the Friday were not included in our packet. The Board was just able to receive those tonight, which makes it difficult for the Board. If possible, fax in reports on Thursday by 5 p.m.

**Item 10 B. Resolution 99-30 Condemnation Resolution – Diversion Pump Station Site and Parallel Interceptor**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that, since a Resolution is on the Agenda that has been added this evening related to engineering, she moved Item 10B Resolution 99-30 to this place on the agenda. She asked Solicitor Yost to explain.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost explained that this Resolution had a two-fold purposes. Rights of Way are being negotiated along with an amicable acquisition of the pump station site by deed. Mr. Yost stated that the property could be acquired amicably without the filing of a condemnation action. The transfer tax can be avoided if in the deed it is stated that the deed is being taken in lieu of condemnation. When the deed is recorded we can provide the Recorder of Deeds with a copy of a Resolution that demonstrates that it was in fact in lieu of condemnation. Secondly, because the project is on a fairly fast track eminent domain action may be necessary to get on that site or any of the rights of way that are needed. Provided this has been accomplished, then the Township is prepared to move forward.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the transfer tax issue is a benefit to the Township only, not a benefit to the seller.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that it would not be of benefit to the seller. If the seller were to have to pay transfer tax he would want that much more for consideration for the transfer.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that, to people who we are successfully and amicably negotiating with, it seems like a rather big stick. Mr. Bishop indicated concern with how it might be perceived by people who are honorably doing business with the township.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that was a good point, but all the people being dealt with, in this particular project, are sophisticated enough to know that we don't have to threaten eminent domain; they are well aware that we have the right. They are all corporations of some size.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the one that jumps out at him is Jack Giambalvo where we say we have already received a signed right-of-way from him.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that the only reason their name is on there is because they need to re-sign it. Actually we do have Associated Wholesalers right of way.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT RESOLUTION 99-30 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic brought forward Resolution 99-31 required by DEP in conjunction with our Act 537 Plan previously approved. However, DEP does not accept motions by boards and requires a Resolution in order to proceed. Mr. Amic indicated one change would take place in the third paragraph of his drafted Resolution 99-31, “..... implementation of an infiltration of inflow reduction program” words would be eliminated. Mr. Amic recommended approval with the Resolution with that one change.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that this would replace the Board’s previously approved motion with Resolution 99-31.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that to be correct in that it is simply a format change.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT RESOLUTION 99-31 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED WITH THE ONE CHANGE ELIMINATING THE WORDING IMPLEMENTATION OF AN INFILTRATION OF INFLOW REDUCTION PROGRAM. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that after review of Change Orders, Items C and D for Springfield Contractors, staff had informed Mr. Amic that a potential problem existed with Change Order #3 and that staff needed more time for review and to meet with the engineer. Mr. Amic stated he would not ask for approval for Item D in the amount of \$4,859.35, and E, which is an accumulation became \$82,791.35 for consideration by the Board.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned whether Item D will be placed on a future agenda following review.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated the item would be placed on a future agenda following review and a meeting with the engineer by Mr. Crooks as well.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick clarified that Mr. Amic was asking for Item A, B, C, a change in E, and F as it is.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that to be correct.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF ACCOUNTS PAYABLE A, B, C, E, AND F, WITH THE CHANGE ON E, SPRINGFIELD CONTRACTORS FROM \$87,650.70 TO \$82,791.35. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

**A. Rehabilitation of Wilshire Drive Sewer – Permission to Draw Specifications and Bid.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Wastewater staff recommended permission to draw specifications and bid a rehabilitation project on Wilshire Drive. Mr. Amic had provided information regarding this project in his Manager's Report previously provided to the Board.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether this was a very old system.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks responded that the system was approximately 30 years old.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the system was put in when the homes were built, or whether it had been added.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks responded that the system was installed at the same time as the homes..

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the old system would be dug up and replaced.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated that was correct. He referred to a memorandum mentioning that some of the areas were 20 ft. deep – too deep to be completed with Township staff. It would have to be a contracted job. It compared to work done on Mt. Zion Road or Orchard Road and will take approximately a week to complete. The damage was discovered during some investigative work, which revealed some badly damaged pipe.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that Mr. Amic's comment that the pipe is in danger of collapse, and if that would happen it would present a greater problem.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated this was a low flow line. It does not go up the Locust Grove Road. It would stop sewage to about eight homes.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there was any indication of the estimated expense for the project.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks estimated this project to cost in the range of \$40,000 to \$50,000.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked what the Old Orchard project cost.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated that cost had been about \$38,000.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked what that included.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks responded that shallow and shorter but on a state road that required more control; also it required some pumping to do the work.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there is sufficient information at this point to advertise this project for bid, i. e., what has to go into the specifications.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated that there is sufficient information available.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether he believed this to be ready to process the project.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he had reviewed the project specifically because of the 22 ft. and recommended doing it.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch showed concern that the safety requirements for the contractors such as OSHA, and all of the standards would be met.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed and stated that the contractors have to meet State OSHA regulations specifications, which must be part of the specs.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated that he had drafted the specs, and that is part of the specifications and it will follow all OSHA regulations.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR PERMISSION TO DRAW UP SPECS AND BIDS FOR REHABILITATION OF WILSHIRE DRIVE SEWER. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Murphy & Dittenhafer – Municipal Center – Complete Specifications, Bid Documents, and Advertise**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that item B was based upon the Work Session and the Board placed on the Agenda for Murphy and Dittenhafer, the Architectural firm to complete the specifications and bid documents and advertise for the construction of the Municipal Center.

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether that Work Session was held on April 8.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that to be correct.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri referred to the Drafted Minutes of the April 8 Work Session on page 2 under “*Moving to the farmhouse*” about doing the second floor of the farmhouse. Mr. Gurreri indicated displeasure over the farmhouse discussions even back to November when it was discussed that it was cost prohibitive to do the second floor and a decision was made just to do only the first floor. During attendance at the April 8<sup>th</sup> meeting he had been surprised to see that the second floor was under consideration even though it had not appeared in any of the Minutes. Mr. Gurreri continued that on March 25<sup>th</sup> discussion took place about the architectural fees. Mr. Gurreri was concerned that it was double the cost for the farmhouse of what they should charge. At that time nothing was mentioned about the second floor. Mr. Gurreri indicated displeasure that as a member of this Board everyone should be involved with these decisions.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick agreed with Mr. Gurreri that when discussions took place regarding the farmhouse very early in the process that there was discussion of simply air conditioning the first floor, and it was mentioned by the engineer at a recent meeting about the cost effectiveness of possibly taking the duct work to the second floor.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that nothing was mentioned in any of the Minutes except for April 8<sup>th</sup> and that he had attended all the meetings.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether the farmhouse portion would hold up Item B.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated it would not hold up Item B, but that it depended upon the Board’s intentions. If the Board never intended that to happen, then I think the motion can be to permit Murphy and Dittenhafer to complete specifications and bid documents and advertise for the Municipal Center and the first floor renovation of the farmhouse.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that it was his understanding that the farmhouse was not going to be bid, but that someone from the community would take it over as a project.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the farmhouse could certainly be excluded if the Board desired. The motion would then state that Murphy & Dittenhafer is to complete specifications and bid documents and advertise for the Municipal Building and renovation of the present building. That would

only permit them to do that at this point. The options are the Board's options.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that that particular option is one which he had opposed every step along the way, because it is ridiculous to spend millions of dollars on a building and then have an eyesore sitting in front of it that we haven't done anything with.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that his suggestion would be to exclude the farmhouse and that way proceed on the rest if it's still a concern of the Board.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that the only thing he recalled was that the farmhouse bid would be a separate item in the bid, but it was all part of the bid package. Mr. Schenck could see no reason to deviate from that.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that it was not a part of the bid package. We decided we were not going to bid that
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated he did not remember ever making that decision.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated it had been discussed and very clearly he is against doing anything with that house. Mr. Gurreri asked how it happens that the item is included and he was not aware of it.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated it's not a decision that had been made. The intent was to now make that decision.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated he wasn't sure that the second floor is an issue, because that was a surprise to him too that the renovations to the second floor were in there. Mr. Schenck did not question Mr. Gurreri's surprise at its inclusion. However, his recollection all along was that from day one that the decision of the Board or the direction of the Board was to include the farmhouse as part of the bid package; it was a separate item and can be rejected as that part of the bid.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the last time the farmhouse had been discussed it had been taken out and the Board indicated it was not going to bid; we would try to get some local firm.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that it did not sound familiar to him.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that he would not to do it with the house included, so the house was taken out. Mr. Gurreri stated he would not vote if the house is in there and would vote no.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that he recalls a discussion about doing just the first floor. He recalled that it was to be bid as a separate part of the bid proposal.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that having a bid has nothing to do with.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the farmhouse be bid separate from the building.
- SCHENCK** It's part of the overall package but it is a separate item.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri clarified then that if a vote was taken on it tonight, the Board would be voting on the house separately for bidding.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that was not correct.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he would then vote against it. He does not think any money should be put in the house.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that what was proposed here was that Murphy & Dittenhafer be authorized to prepare the specs for the bidding and there are three elements: the new building, the existing building and the farmhouse.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that the Board would then be voting on all three of them together.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop clarified that the architect prepare specifications to get it bid, and then it gets bid by the contractors as three separate items which we can accept or reject.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck clarified that it could be all of the items, none of the items or some of the items.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri re-stated that he had a problem with the second floor and would not approve it.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck mentioned that there was a general consensus here not to put a lot of money into it.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri responded that the Board had already approved \$8,000 for architectural fees to do the farmhouse drawing on the 25<sup>th</sup>.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that that was not just for the second floor; that was for the facing and everything in there. The architectural work is not just for the second floor; it's for the upgrading on the outside, the facing work or whatever is necessary to have it fit in with the whole complex, and the second floor is included in that.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri restated again that the Board did not agree to do the second floor. He asked then why the second floor appears in there, and he does not know about it as a supervisor.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated his understanding of exactly how that happened was that the architect, when they were looking at how to do this and when they designed the ducts and everything, it became clear to them that while they were doing it that they might as well extend the ducts an extra 4 ft. or so to provide the HVAC for the second floor. No other work that I'm aware of is being done to the second floor other than providing HVAC up there. It's a nominal thing.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he was not aware of anything being done except to extend the duct work.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that at the last Work Session it was indicated that by air conditioning the second floor it could then possibly be used as office space.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that they weren't proposing doing any other work and that it was already configured for office space.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT THE BOARD AUTHORIZE MURPHY & DITTENHAFFER TO COMPLETE SPECIFICATIONS, BID DOCUMENTS AND ADVERTISE FOR BID FOR THE NEW MUNICIPAL BUILDING, RENOVATION TO THE EXISTING BUILDING AS THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND RENOVATIONS TO THE FARMHOUSE. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI VOTED NO.**

**C. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Bids for Harrowgate/Kingston/Raleigh Sewer Rehabilitation**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on Item C. He had provided the history file for the Board. Mr. Amic recommended the project.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether 54 mgd is based on 122,000 gpd. It was measured at 85gpm at a particular point in time.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks responded that the measurement was done at about 2 a.m. when there would be no flow into that line other than infiltration.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch wondered whether there had been a downpour at the time.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated it was a week after the last rainfall.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that it was a fairly dry time at 2 a.m.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated that there is more to the project than just the I & I. There are some areas of this line including a manhole that are in danger of collapse; also downstream an additional manhole is in very bad shape. There is some physical damage to the line in addition to the small leaks.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Crooks how old the line is.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks responded the age is about 25 to 30 years old. This runs from Harrowgate Road down to Kingston to the cut near the park and is in a rocky wooded area. It includes clay pipe with joints every 2 ft. It is susceptible to damage from roots, ground shifting, erosion, etc. The proposed method, except for the damaged pipe, would be method of lining – either a cure-in-place lining or something called hold and form where plastic pipe is inserted inside of the existing pipe and with steam pressure is blown up so the final result is a nice new PVC pipe inside the old pipeline, which is not as susceptible to shifting and root damage, etc.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether the roots, which already have damaged the older pipe, would not damage the new pipe.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated that there is much cleaning and preparation done prior to placement of the liner. The beauty is that not much excavation work is necessary. Work is done from manhole to manhole.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated concern as to where this becomes cost effective just to dig it up and replace it with good, modern materials and good joints to the laterals as opposed to the liners, etc. Nothing is being done to the connections and the old clay pipes were just broken and a pipe stuck in.
- CROOKS** Mr. Crooks responded that in inspection every lateral that is seen that looks like it has any damage at all it is in the contract to replace it before lining. In many cases the house level is cast iron, which can be seen from the main line. At that point digging would be done and a Y put in the pipe, a plastic lining to make a good, modern connection but then still line through there. An auger will reinstitute that opening from inside for that lateral. A lot of it depends on terrain. If there is terrain where equipment can get in and dig, that is the most cost effective way to do it. Because of the ruggedness of this worksite, woods, rocky, stream in close proximity it is very difficult.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether total cost is reviewed over time as part of the evaluation.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that the liner that goes in is the same material as the pipe would be if it would be replaced today. It comes down to the integrity of the host pipe. In this case there's nothing wrong with those pipes structurally. There are cracks and roots, but it has not collapsed. The new PVC liner will last as long as PVC pipe.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks stated that what usually is done in the specifications if there are no other circumstances, an open spec is written to allow the contractors to decide whether to dig and replace, to line, to repair, etc.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE BIDS FOR HARROWGATE/KINGSTON/RALEIGH SEWER REHABILITATION, BUCHART HORN, INC. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Land Development 99-01 – Associated Wholesalers, Inc. – Granting Extension to 5/14/99**

**STERN** Mr. Stern explained that Land Development 99-01 is a time extension granted by Associated Wholesalers, Inc.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT THE BOARD ACCEPT THE TIME EXTENSION FROM ASSOCIATED WHOLESALERS TO MAY 14, 1999. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Land Development 99-02 – Nello Tire Company – Granting Extension to 5/14/99.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern explained that Land Development 99-02 is a time extension granted by Nello Tire Co. until May 14, 1999.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO ACCEPT THE GRANT OF EXTENSION OF TIME FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT 99-02 FROM NELLO TIRE CO. TO MAY 14, 1999. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI ABSTAINED AS THE OWNER IS A PERSONAL FRIEND.**

**C. Sketch Plan 99-01 – Request to Waive Storm Water and Traffic Requirements (6/24/99).**

**STERN** Mr. Stern explained that this item is a Sketch Plan 99-01 from Fleming Foods. Mr. Stern provided a brief overview. The purpose of a Sketch Plan is to obtain approval of two waivers, one for storm water management and one for traffic study. There is actually a third one which will occur in the preliminary plan which is common. They would like the

Board's conceptual consent to the idea before they move forward with the formal Land Development submittal which will require more detail. Traffic changes cover adding additional parking areas, variance at Route 30 and Sherman Street. A new pull off area will be added, a staging lane. It is believed that the requested changes will improve traffic conditions. Mr. Luciani and Mr. Stern do not believe that a full traffic study is warranted for these changes. Storm water management – the area is not impervious and is not being proposed to be impervious. Mr. Luciani provided an overview as to why storm water management is not necessary. Storm water management is important. Fleming's site covers 25 acres. The drainage area for their complex drains to a single 30" reinforced concrete pipe. Fleming had investigated all the alternatives to storm water management. There is a built in basin which is controlled by the depth of the water at Mill Creek. Mr. Luciani stated that a "fee in lieu of" will be applied.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the "fee in lieu of" would be about \$10,000, about \$.15 per sq. ft. Mr. Stern introduced Brent Lied, P.E. with Webber/Smith and Barry Gay of Fleming.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether the Board would later be responsible for damages on their property because such a waiver were approved.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that this action is being requested by Fleming.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani asked the Fleming representatives to show the Board where the water flows.

**LIED** Mr. Lied showed a drawing of the existing facility showing the parking areas and access drive, out buildings, etc. Mr. Lied showed the current flood plain. He pointed out that the facility is a dock height working facility. Discussion reviewed the elevation of the facility and the ability of the water for runoff.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost whether he could foresee any disadvantage.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost recommended that a Waiver Agreement with Fleming to indemnify the Township against any liability or, having failed to provide storm water management after the liability issue arose; obviously if their employees don't move their cars they're going to be flooded in a storm event.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reviewed the request with Mr. Stern, i.e., a "nod of approval."

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that Fleming would like a conditioned waiver at least for Stormwater Management and Traffic. Management will not proceed with the Land Development Plan without the Sketch Plan approval.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked what Mr. Stern meant when he said “conditioned waiver.”

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that would be a waiver conditioned that the Land Development Plan that is submitted is basically the same as what had been presented. The “nod of approval” is because this is only a Sketch Plan.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked for clarification whether the only reason for doing this is just because of the truck traffic to get them off the highway and onto the property.

**LIED** Mr. Lied indicated that to be correct, but the key item was the addition of the staging lane. They are working with PennDot to try to resolve the issue of the staging along the lane. That alone is one step. The other step is to widen the entrance way making the traffic through there more efficient adding two inbound lanes as opposed to what is now one inbound, centralizing the employee parking so there is a security aspect to get all the employees segregated from the truck traffic and get that area isolated. Overall it makes the facility more operationally efficient.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the throughput would be increasing and more goods could be handled.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that with this improvement this will provide for trucking some 30 feet away from the homes along Sherman Street who complain about the diesel fumes, and idling engines, etc.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked how close it would be to the intersection.

**LIED** Mr. Lied responded that it was very close, and that was one of the discussions held with PennDot. The plan is presently before PennDot for review, and PennDot officials had visited the site. It will be a one-way in and no exiting.

**GAY** Mr. Gay pointed out that trucks that are entering the facility – about 90% of them come every two weeks.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani commented that PennDot had brought up the proximity of the driveway.

**LIED** Mr. Lied indicated that some of the areas do not conform with the standard PennDot drive, and that had been discussed.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether this would be confusing to the motorists going south on Sherman. Coming across 30 there's a double lane there now which is a little confusing when people are trying to weave themselves in to get to the single lane before you get to the bridge.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that the one that had been brought up was a truck parked here and a vehicle on the inside, there is a double left, and they were concerned about the pinch move.
- GAY** Mr. Gay commented that letters had been sent, and reiterated that 90% of the truckers were repeat drivers who come in every week, so they would know; letters were sent to the vendors indicating to stay in the outside lane.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that if a trucker came to the location and missed the turn there would be no way he could get in from the opposite direction.
- GAY** Mr. Gay responded that if they missed the entrance, they will be permitted to go in at the next entrance.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani asked whether this will be confusing.
- LIED** Mr. Lied did not think it added confusion but stated that there is some confusion that exists in that there are two lanes that taper into one. That confusion occurs in the section where the existing driveway is. One thing they had done to try to address that is widen the radius in an attempt to allow a truck to stay in this side and swing in rather than having them do any type of wide swinging to the other lane. They are working continually with PennDot to try to come up with other improvements as well.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked why they were requesting the waiver from requiring any stormwater management improvements as opposed to a waiver from requiring stormwater management plan. Mr. Bishop wondered whether there was a real difference. What is usually done is to waive a plan; however, Fleming is going a step beyond that.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that a minor plan was done, and the reason why this was worded this way was due to the stormwater ordinance.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani added that this only provides a conveyance to this point. They're not building a physical basin that can be evaluated with a response to say yes, they've attended to runoff from this site.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop continued to clarify that the Board would basically approve that they're not going to do anything about stormwater on this site.

- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that it had been pointed out at the Planning Commission that there will be some stormwater management conveyance facilities.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that there will be pipes taking the water to the low point of the site; however, the impact is not significant on Mill Creek.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated he understands the concepts but that he was concerned about wording a motion that makes some sense.
- LIED** Mr. Lied stated that the term management is one of the most important items. The waiver relates to providing on-site storm water management, for on-site retention.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether Fleming intended to do a storm water management plan that would comply to the normal procedures.
- LIED** Mr. Lied responded that in the plan set that will be submitted, there will be a storm water plan that will address conveyance. It will not provide on site retention.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that, in fact, they are submitting storm water detention.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated it would not meet the Ordinance.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that to be correct.
- LIED** Mr. Lied indicated that the “fee in lieu of” is an agreeable solution to Fleming and is probably the best way in order to fund studies or other improvements that would be beneficial.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Solicitor Yost for his recommendation.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost requested that the waiver be conditioned and documented in the agreement whereby Fleming would also agree to indemnify the Township. Mr. Yost indicated he would be happy to draft something.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE SKETCH PLAN 99-01 FLEMING FOODS WITH A WAIVER FROM REQUIRING ON-SITE STORM WATER DETENTION TYPICALLY REQUIRED BY SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP FOR SUCH A PLAN.**

- **CONDITIONED UPON THE APPLICANT AND THE TOWNSHIP EXECUTING AN AGREEMENT INDEMNIFYING THE TOWNSHIP FOR**

**LIABILITY FOR ANY INJURY TO PERSONS OR PROPERTY AS THE  
RESULT OF ANY FLOODING WHICH OCCURS AS A RESULT OF NOT  
HAVING REQUIRED ANY DETENTION FACILITIES,**

- **WAIVER FROM SUBMITTING A TRAFFIC STUDY AND,**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN.**

**MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that he, Mr. Pasch and Mr. Amic attended the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors meeting held in Hershey April 11 through 14. There were 4,500 people in attendance. Over 100 Resolutions were voted upon. Lt. Gov. Mark Schweikert, U. S. Senator Rick Santorum, Mark Cowers, and Captain Scott O'Grady were speakers.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch also commented about the convention. He indicated he would forward several items to Mr. Amic, one regarding Route 24. Some of the people Mr. Pasch spoke with indicated the State has a lot of money and is looking for jobs. Mr. Pasch recommended pushing for Route 24. Also in terms of a sewage system, particularly focusing on the failing on-lot systems we have, one of the groups indicated that they can do repairs on on-lot systems which for less than \$10,000 to bring them up to necessary specs and can put in a new system for around \$12,000. The trade off between us looking at these failing systems costing \$30 - \$40,000 to do and this is a large difference. He will provide this information to Mr. Amic.

Mr. Pasch commented on the new devices being used in New Jersey to prevent automobiles from hitting deer. These devices are mirrors which reflect your headlights back into the woods 300 to 400 ft. before you get to where the deer might be. The results indicate that the incident rate of accidents with deer dropped by 70 to 80% in stretches where this was installed. Mr. Pasch recommends that Springettsbury take a look at this as well.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that there will be a Full Committee Meeting of the Local Government Advisory Committee May 5 at Bay City Restaurant in Hanover at 6:30 p.m. The speaker will be Warden Hogan of York County Prison.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that the York County Planning Commission is having a function on May 17 in celebration of 40 Years of Planning for the Future.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he planned to attend the York County Planning function.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that the township did receive notification from St. Joe's that they are going to have their 8<sup>th</sup> Annual Parish Carnival June 22 through 26. In their letter St. Joe's indicated that they would be complying with the stipulations agreed to in November of 1992.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick had forwarded to Mr. Stern and on to the Historic Preservation Committee that a telephone call had been received from Beverly Harman in Springettsbury Township, who is very interested in becoming active in the pursuit of Historic Register District recognition for Pleasureville.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that a telephone call had been received from Mr. Mundis on Long Point Drive regarding a concern he had with a neighbor. Mr. Stern had addressed that concern.

#### **8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost had provided a written report to the Board. In addition, he advised that the Environmental Hearing Board had dismissed the Livingston appeal. At this time all litigation with the Livingston family had been stopped. The contractor is going through the property now.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch confirmed that some of the brush had been taken down. Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Yost whether the damages are settled.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that the damages are not settled. He prepared a Petition to appoint viewers to assess the damages and get it done.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost added to his report that during the last meeting he had been asked whether a member of the Board of Supervisors could serve as members of the Sewer Authority. The answer was no. The Municipal Authorities Act is silent on the subject, but a Pa. Supreme Court decision quoted that it is against public policy for members of a governing body of a municipality to sit as members of a municipal authority.

#### **9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that he will have a third meeting with the 3<sup>rd</sup> fund raiser candidate. He expected to provide a report prior to the next Regular

Meeting. At that time the Board can schedule discussions. Mr. Amic indicated he is pleased with the professionalism in their approach to fund raising.

In addition, the resumes for Wastewater Director had been forwarded to him. He has selected five out of 18 resumes for interviews. There were 29 resumes for Fire Chief received and he had selected 9 or 10 for interview. Mr. Amic requested the Board's permission to proceed on the Wastewater Director followed by the Fire Chief interviews. Mr. Amic indicated he wished to have Messrs. Schober and Halbert and Mrs. Speicher on the interview team.

On the Fire Chief he had not decided on the interview team, but interviews could be held at the convenience of the Board. There will be two interviews with each of the groups followed by an employment offer. There are two very strong wastewater candidates and a number of Fire Chiefs who are actually serving as Fire Chiefs now. In the group of nine or 10 are three of our own career fire fighters. All of the internal people will be given an interview.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that if there are nine or 10 candidates, he would prefer that Mr. Amic short list those candidates. He would participate in the second interview. He would also like to know who the interview team on both sides would be and what the process would be.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic re-stated that Mr. Schober, Mr. Halbert and Mrs. Speicher are the internal team for the Wastewater Director. He still needs the Fire Chief team.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Amic if there is a deadline for the Fire Chief.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated there is a June 1 deadline unless it's extended.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch recommended getting an extension.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop suggested Mr. Amic proceed on the first round of Wastewater Director interviews. Mr. Bishop also encouraged Mr. Amic to act quickly on the Fire Chief position as well.

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Ordinance 99-02 Amending Article 17 "Signs" of Zoning Ordinance**

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that this had been discussed earlier and unless there were questions he recommended adopting the Ordinance.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT ORDINANCE 99-02 AMENDING ARTICLE 17 “SIGNS” OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. MR. BISHOP VOTED NO.**

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. Board of Supervisors Work Session – March 30, 1999**

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION FOR MARCH 30, 1999 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Board of Supervisors Work Session – April 8, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION APRIL 8, 1999. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. CHAIRMAN MITRICK ABSTAINED AS SHE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 8, 1999 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. CHAIRMAN MITRICK ABSTAINED AS SHE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic pointed out to the Board that some of the items shown under Old Business could be removed. Items F, G. will be removed based on correspondence between him, York Township and Solicitor Yost. Also the Ordinance under Item J was passed on Signs. Mr. Dunn and Mr. Amic will be meeting on Items A and B. There were no other items needing action.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested topics that the Board might want to include in the upcoming newsletter be given to Dori Bowders. A time line will be advised in the near future.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop mentioned that money is continually being spent on sewer rehabilitation projects, and it had been about two years since sewer rates were raised. At the time that the rates were raised the only reason any flack was received was because the rates were not kept incrementally where they belonged. At that time from the general analysis Springettsbury rates were significantly below other townships. Mr.

Bishop urged consideration for what and when the Board might want to do something in this regard.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed with Mr. Bishop's suggestion, and suggested that the rates should be considered some time prior to the budget

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated this should be done significantly before the budget process begins and preferably be kept completely separate. He would prefer to have the sewer done during the summer.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that a report was received from Cindy Osborne from Park and Rec. Unfortunately, the report had been received too late, but Mrs. Mitrick requested that the Board review the report and indicated it would be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri brought forward the subject of volunteers. Mr. Gurreri indicated some animosity with some of the volunteers which needed to be discussed.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked to what Mr. Gurreri was referring.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that there had been some problems with volunteers in the past.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether this was something that the Board did.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked for clarification.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that he was told that volunteers overstepped their boundaries; they have no authority. He added that there seemed to be animosity.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked who the animosity is from.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri responded that he does get it from the Board. If there is a problem it should be discussed because volunteers are very important, and they should be welcomed. If there is a problem with a group that does something then it should be isolated to that group.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that if the Board is asking people to be volunteers and they are being stepped on in some way or discouraging them then it should be addressed. Mr. Pasch asked whether there was something that could be pinpointed that could be identified in order to change.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the Board sensed there were issues with the Park and Rec Board so we met with them and resolved any issues. Mr. Schenck stated he appreciated all the volunteer boards.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she worked with the Historic Preservation and they feel tremendous cooperation with the Board. Chairman Mitrick stated that perhaps Mr. Gurreri is experiencing something the Board needs to know about.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Committee had done a lot of work and couldn't get it together because they couldn't get a hold of Mr. Bainbridge. Mr. Gurreri felt it the Committee was hammered by the Board personally. Mr. Gurreri stated that the Committee did a lot of work, and didn't feel as though the Board appreciated it. Mr. Gurreri stated he would not volunteer again.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated he was sorry Mr. Gurreri felt that way and stated that he was very appreciative of everything he had done.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that he had volunteered and put a committee together and then his name appeared in the paper and you, as a volunteer look like a bad guy. You're told you have no authority to do anything. Yet the Board approved it and gave their blessing but no authority. It is very frustrating being a volunteer and being told that, or being turned down and say \$5,000 is too much money. It's not a lot of money to do what we're doing.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he was sorry if he gave Mr. Gurreri that impression but it's the way he operates. He has a right to operate and ask for details. If Mr. Gurreri felt animosity from Mr. Pasch, he stated he was sorry. Mr. Pasch indicated he was sorry he had dissuaded the \$5,000 because it ended up at \$6,000. As a member of the Board Mr. Pasch felt he had a right and an obligation to ask for information.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether anyone had seen the newspaper article.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the Board has nothing to do with the newspaper and added that the Board can't be responsible for what they write.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that by what Mr. Gurreri had discussed, the Board needed to be more sensitive to, not only what we say, but also how we say it when we're dealing with other people and particularly the volunteers. Chairman Mitrick stated that she was sure that there wasn't a single member on this Board that meant any statement in an offensive manner, but cautioned the Board members to be sensitive to that.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 22, 1999  
APPROVED**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that as a volunteer you're giving your time. The Supervisors need to keep that in mind.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 8, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Bill Schenck, Acting Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Dan Flohr, Acting Fire Chief  
Jim Noel, Wastewater Treatment Department  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**I. CALL TO ORDER:**

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Bill Schenck called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. Mr. Schenck stated that Chairman Lori Mitrick would not be in attendance and added that there would be an Executive Session regarding a legal matter following the Regular Meeting.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**MEHRING** Lynn Mehring of 1433 Memory Lane Extended asked whether anything had been discussed or whether any decision made regarding extending Memory Lane onto Whiteford Road.

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck asked whether she was referring to the connection at the end of Whiteford Road to Memory Lane Extended, not Pleasant Valley Road.

**MEHRING** Ms. Mehring indicated that to be correct.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 8, 1999  
APPROVED**

- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that at the present time it is scheduled to stay open.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that was correct; however, when work was started, there was a concern because it is a dangerous intersection. Originally there was a plan to do something with that intersection, but nothing is scheduled at this time. There may be something done in the future because there are some engineering considerations to address.
- MEHRING** Ms. Mehring stated that there are reasons why she wouldn't want it totally blocked off. She asked whether the Township would notify the residents.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated he would like to hear her reasons. He stated he was not aware of any particular problems.
- MEHRING** Ms. Mehring stated that if the street would be blocked off, it would be like a cul-de-sac. There are apartments there, and she believed it would wind up with cars parked on that road, kids playing on the street. She expressed concern that from her property they would back out onto that road. It cannot be controlled as a cul-de-sac.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether she lived across the street from the apartments.
- MEHRING** Ms. Mehring indicated that to be correct.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop clarified that Ms. Mehring was stating that she would be backing out of her driveway into the street.
- MEHRING** Ms. Mehring indicated that to be correct.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck commented that Ms. Mehring made an interesting statement about the cul-de-sac because allowances would have to be made for a turning lane.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that it could not be eliminated as an area for trucks to turn around.
- MEHRING** Ms. Mehring added that a right-hand turn only could be utilized versus cutting it off totally. She stated that might hurt some valuable commercial property to cut it off totally.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that the original plan two years ago showed that block closed off. Mr. Schenck added that while the Board could not speak for the future, there are no current plans to close it off.

**MEHRING** Ms. Mehring asked whether the residents would be notified before the Township made any changes.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there would be no question about that. She would be notified. He added that she should feel free to check with his office, and leave her name and number. If something comes up regarding this road, his office would contact her.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**SCHOBER** Mike Schober provided information, in addition to his written report, he reported that a meeting was held Wednesday morning with a representative of R. K. & K. to coordinate the diversion pump station with the new PLC system. That meeting was very productive.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that, upon approval of the March 25, 1999 minutes this evening, they would need to be affixed as part of the 537 Plan. Mr. Amic stated that if the minutes are approved, authorization will be in place to file the Plan.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** John Luciani provided two additions to his written report. With regard to Academy Road, he spoke to Ms. Flury who is the recipient of some of the water on that road. He discussed changes being planned, and she is awaiting those changes. Mr. Luciani added that for the gentleman who came in and complained about his driveway being too steep and needs to make it more approachable; there's really not much that can be done. Mr. Luciani indicated that the situation will be monitored to make sure the swale isn't filled in and the water diverted. Some drawings are being prepared to try to resolve that situation.

Mr. Luciani continued his report on Pleasant Valley Road, Messrs. Stern, Lauer and Luciani met to get prepared to get construction underway. Some of the utility conflicts are resolved. They are still working with David Moon to make sure that as you drive across Pleasant Valley Road, currently Memory Lane Extended is crowned so you would go up one side of the road and down the other. They are trying to make that transition work a lot better so there would be a good through movement. The issue today is something that should be reviewed at some other time. The proposals have a two-way stop. A new stop sign will be placed on Memory Lane and through movement will be on Pleasant Valley. A brief traffic and engineering study is being prepared so that if people violate

stop signs, there is documentation to enforce it. Stop signs will be placed on Memory Lane at Pleasant Valley Road.

**MEHRING** Ms. Mehring stated concern that traffic would race through that road.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that the through movement needs to be the higher volume road. We want people to use Pleasant Valley Road and minimize the use of Memory Lane.

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck clarified that there are engineering standards throughout the County where the State directs which direction of travel gets the stop sign. In that situation Pleasant Valley will not have the stop sign.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani also commented with another reason. He stated that as motorists go down Memory Lane and turn right and get onto Whiteford Road, that's not a very safe movement. The Township wants to discourage that. We do want people to use Pleasant Valley Road and come out to the signal. We're hoping the people will continue to use Pleasant Valley and we will monitor what happens on Memory Lane and that's when we're probably going to make an adjustment further down the road as to what will happen there.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that with the changes to be made, there should be a big reduction in the traffic on Memory Lane Extended.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani added that motorists would be encouraged to use Pleasant Valley Road.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert provided an updated status report highlighting a few items from his written report. He stated that, with regard to property acquisition, they are aggressively pursuing Conrail and anticipate resubmittal the week of the April 12<sup>th</sup> addressing all their comments. He considered this to be on track.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether any of their comments were critical that couldn't be answered, or whether it was all just routine.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert indicated it is considered to be routine.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert reported on EPA Grant Funding. Comments had been received from them and R.K.& K. had responded. They anticipate approval and any other comments by April 12, 1999. With regard to Yorktowne Paper where the pump station will be located, their appraisal

report which Mr. Halbert understood to be in a preliminary understanding stage and while it had not yet been formally received, all the information necessary to formulate an offer had been provided. Having secured that, Land Development Plans can be finalized. R.K.& K. is aggressively pursuing all other items and do not see anything at this time to hinder the schedule. Mr. Halbert would like to start thinking about advertisement dates and receive bid dates and order to proceed dates. It is their intention to advertise for bidding May 10, receiving bids June 8. That will provide sufficient time to research the apparent low bidders, do bid evaluation, get all the paperwork completed and being prepared to make a recommendation for award at the June meeting. Notice to Proceed would occur on or about July 1, the original schedule date. Mr. Halbert stated that unless something dramatically impacts something they are doing, that schedule is their intended plan.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 4/8/99**
- B. Murphy & Dittenhafer – Architectural Design – Invoice #6 - \$30,381.70**

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that since there are only two payables on the agenda, they could be handled separately, or if there were no questions, they could be handled together.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL TO PAY ACCOUNTS PAYABLE A. AND B. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS AND QUOTES:**

- A. Sale of 1985 GMC 4x4 Truck**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated the staff asked for permission to advertise the sale of a 1985 GMC Truck. In the Minutes of the last Regular Meeting, it was authorized to purchase a new truck. This covers the sale of the truck to be replaced. The new truck will be purchased through the Commonwealth Piggyback Program. The sale of the 1985 GMC truck will be sold through sealed bid process.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned the age of the truck and whether there is a limit where the bidding process could be eliminated.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that by securing bids, we may get beyond what may be expected to get from the truck.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the break-off amount negating sealed bids is \$1,000.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether we provide other municipalities a chance at it without bidding.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic clarified that, if the staff finds another municipality which wants it, the truck will not have to be placed for bid, which is an exception in the new code.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS ON THE 1985 GMC 4x4 TRUCK. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. 1999 Road Building Program – Permission to Prepare Specifications and Bid.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the staff would like to secure permission to bid for material. This covers the Specifications to Bid for material.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the material includes the application of some of the material. During the Road Tour on the 26<sup>th</sup> some of these items will be seen even though this is a bid item.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR PERMISSION TO PREPARE SPECIFICATIONS AND BID THE 1999 ROAD BUILDING PROGRAM. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Plymouth Road Turning Lane – Permission to Have Civil Engineer Secure Highway Occupancy Permit**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that this item appears on the agenda yearly. The last few years the Board rejected this bid process simply because we were hoping the Commonwealth would grant construction of a traffic signal in this area. There had been no permission. During budget discussions it was reviewed whether this item should stay in the Capital Budget. Mr. Lauer recommended that it be placed on the agenda authorizing Mr. Luciani to secure a Highway Occupancy Permit. The warrants went out there for the traffic signal across from the hotel. If this road would be widened a lane, the Township would have to have Mr. Luciani get a permit to proceed with the estimated cost of \$25,000 to widen that intersection.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani added that on Wednesday in the Developer's Staff Meeting, Heritage Hills Hotel came in with plans to expand the hotel again and make some modifications to the miniature golf section.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked what size of expansion was discussed.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 8, 1999  
APPROVED**

- STERN** Mr. Stern responded it will be large.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic asked whether Mr. Stern was suggesting they may get better warrants later.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that there was discussion regarding adjacent intersections at Cape Horn and Prospect/Mt. Rose.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he was not aware of this.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated he had just become aware of it. The Township had suggested to them that they coordinate what they're doing with what the County is doing along that stretch of road.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated it sounds like it might be best to just wait again.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he agreed.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that the street light goes on the next street down. Mr. Schenck questioned whether this would involve acquiring some right of way.
- LUCIANI** John Luciani indicated that Charlie Lauer mentioned the turning lane to him about a year ago.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that a signal wasn't supposed to go there.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that what was being requested was a Highway Occupancy Permit. Mr. Schenck asked if the permit is obtained and is not used, whether there is a lot of expense to that.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated the first step is to go out and survey it. As he understood it, if one car wants to make a left turn on Mt. Rose with 17 other cars behind him who want to turn right those motorists can't do anything. They've got to wait.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that they drive through the parking lot.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated he thought the intent was to try to extend that lane so that those vehicles could either take a right or a left.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that would not change if a light was added at the hotel.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 8, 1999  
APPROVED**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that previously they had been concerned with the whole area.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he understood that, but he was unsure whether those concerns are valid today. It's a dangerous intersection, and there is a need to alleviate some of the problem.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated it is definitely needed.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated it really is dangerous with people going through that parking lot. He did not understand how doing it puts us in a hole later.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that he was not saying it would put us in a hole but that the County engineers are looking at that whole corridor. The work which may be improved may or may not be a part of that project, and Springettsbury may or may not have to pay for it.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani reported that Heritage said the issues were lack of sewage capacity.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Heritage can not expand in our Township any further.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that 99% of the proposed new development is in Springettsbury Township.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that they will submit plans when the Township will allow them to submit plans and won't start construction for at least a year.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked how much money would be wasted if an Occupancy Permit is obtained and not used.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that the amount would be between \$2,000 and \$5,000.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the Occupancy Permit does not expire.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated they are good for one year from date of issue; the drawings can be re-submitted and then it would be re-issued. As part of the survey work, we would also want some protection on the Plymouth roadway to try to widen that.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that from the drawings he had seen the Longstown Study is not going to do anything to that intersection.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that no one else had discussed doing anything to that intersection. If anything is to be done it will be at the Prospect

intersection. Mr. Bishop stated he would like to see the matter move forward and at least get the highway Occupancy Permit.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch agreed. It's not going to expire and it's on Plymouth Road where we're going to do it rather than Prospect. Most of the future effort is going to be on Prospect Road. For what's involved he would recommend moving ahead. If others become involved when they come in for their application, it will be a part of their deal.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEERS TO SECURE A HIGHWAY OCCUPANCY PERMIT FOR THE PLYMOUTH ROAD TURNING LANE. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Planning Module – Locust Grove Road (Windsor Township)  
A3-67966-273-3-1750 GPD**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated this Planning Module had been prepared by the staff covering Locust Grove Road in Windsor Township for 1750 gallons per day. Staff recommended that this be approved.

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck clarified that the project is named Locust Grove but is located on Nina Drive in Windsor Township, not Locust Grove Road.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE PLANNING MODULE – LOCUST GROVE A3-67966-273-3-1750 GPD. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Residential Blight & Property Maintenance Report**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that this item appeared on the agenda at Chairman Mitrick's request.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that his understanding of the purpose of that was to force the Board into deciding when it would be discussed in order to move forward.

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck asked whether that would suggest a Work Session.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that the staff had put a lot of work into this item, and the matters should be addressed in order to move forward.

**Consensus of the Board Members present was to hold a Work Session for discussion of Residential Blight and Property Maintenance Report prepared by the Township staff on Wednesday, May 12, 1999 at Noon.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that some of these items would be reviewed during the Road Tour.

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported on progress regarding the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. He had previously provided paperwork from the committee regarding a letter and information sent to different service clubs. A schedule for the Community Picnic is being provided. The Committee of seven people met with Mr. Bainbridge on Tuesday, April 6. Mr. Gurreri stated that the Committee will solicit local businesses for prizes for some of the functions. Mr. Gurreri asked Gail Reed, Chairman of the Community Picnic Committee to provide a report for the Board.

**REED** Ms. Reed reported that a working session had been held toward putting the Community Picnic together. The picnic is planned for July 17<sup>th</sup> with a rain date of July 18<sup>th</sup>, 1999. In the future the Committee would like to see this picnic become an annual event to bring the Township, Community and families together. This year the event will be to celebrate the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of York County, but also celebrate in the spirit of family, community and Springettsbury Township. Ms. Reed provided an extensive report covering entertainment, kids games, group games, adult games, arts and crafts activities and an evening program winding up the day with a popular band concert. She provided an overview with regard to traffic and crowd control, parking. The committee will work closely with Public Works Director, Mr. Lauer, Mr. Amic and Mr. Bainbridge to set up the different areas for the games. Mr. Amic will contact the volunteer fire companies to see if they would run a Bingo event. Some additional activities are: a community volleyball tournament, clown show/balloon characters, face painting, a magician, storytellers, and cloggers presentation. The evening program would include a Presentation of Colors by a local Boy Scout troop; Springetts Moment presented by the children involved in Parks & Rec program, something of historical value and a big band, ending with lowering of the flag and taps about 10:30 p.m.

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck suggested that, on another occasion, Boscov's provided their tent for a Township event. Mr. Schenck also suggested that this effort will require some serious promotion.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that ads will have to be placed in the newspaper.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 8, 1999  
APPROVED**

- REED** Ms. Reed stated promotion will be placed in the Parks and Rec newsletter; NEFRA Communications and the Community Courier East York edition. Also because this is a part of York County's 250<sup>th</sup> celebration, advertisement will appear in their 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary announcements.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the first week in July sewer bills will be sent and could include a notice to come to the celebration.
- REED** Ms. Reed indicated any type of piggyback promotion would be appreciated.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested contacting all the schools in Springettsbury to have them involved in this community event. Mr. Pasch also suggested contacting WSBA which announces community events. Mr. Pasch thought it was a good idea to have an annual affair and would have good community interest.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the Community Courier does any free ads.
- REED** Ms. Reed will discuss this with her representative.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether Mr. Gurreri or the committee needed anything further from the Supervisors at this time.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he needs a budget. Mr. Gurreri reviewed the matter of the bus tour showing the history of the township which would cost \$850.00. The Township would have to advance \$500.00 for the bus. Approximately \$20.00 a ticket would be charged to participants. Tom Schaefer would handle this and would be able to fill the bus. A walking tour would also be available. Mr. Gurreri expressed concern for advancing money for the bus because if no one takes advantage of the bus tour, the Township may be liable for the cost. Mr. Gurreri asked for a budget of \$6,000. He does not anticipate using that amount. The bills will come into the Township through Mr. Amic and Mr. Bishop. Utilizing service clubs will lower costs as the service club would handle its own function.
- REED** Ms. Reed stated that if Boscov's provided their large tent, there would be no need for the smaller tents noted in the budget. If no service clubs come forward then there is a need for budget money to cover other sources.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked for clarification of the requested budget.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that the amount of \$5,170 had been suggested, and Mr. Gurreri wished to round that figure to \$6,000.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 8, 1999  
APPROVED**

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he had a problem with the bus trip as it would be spending Township money for something that benefits a limited group. He stated he would like to be absolutely certain that the bus trip would pay for itself.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that on other bus trip endeavors when they don't have enough participation, they are cancelled.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that most bus companies will give adequate lead time and can be cancelled up to a few weeks before with either a small or no penalty.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop re-stated that he wished to be absolutely clear that it would be run that way so that there's no reason for that amount to be budgeted.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that no monies would be spent unnecessarily.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he had no problem with a budget, even for the bus trip, as long as the understanding is that it is a self-funding venture.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated the problem he had with the bus trip is that it is not really in with the picnic, and he has to keep following that. He needs to obtain a proposal and nail down the times.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that the bus trip needs to fund itself. If there are not enough participants, then the bus trip needs to be cancelled. For the picnic, in all fairness, a decision needed to be made.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated favor for the budget. He had requested details, which he had received, and he had no problem with moving ahead.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that advertising the picnic may become expensive.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that, if you have a budget figure, you live within the budget. There is a lot of good, solid thinking going into this by the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Committee.
- REED** Ms. Reed suggested the Board give a budget for the picnic and then an opportunity to go back, make a marketing plan, and present the Board with the marketing plan to promote the event. (Two different budgets: picnic only and advertising).
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck indicated he would prefer to set one budget. He stated that Mr. Gurreri asked for a budget of \$6,000, which would include promotion.

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated the \$6,000 would be acceptable.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck asked for a motion to bring this to a question and a vote as to whether the Board should budget \$6,000 for the community picnic.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned exactly what the Board would be doing, i.e., not really budgeting.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that the Board would be authorizing expenditure.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated the monies would come out of the existing budget.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated it would come out of surplus monies in the budget.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that the motion would be to authorize the expenditure of \$6,000 for the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary community festivities.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF \$6,000 FOR THE 250<sup>TH</sup> ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION IN SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri called the Supervisors attention to the York County Planning Commission celebration of 40 years – Planning for the Future of York County to be held May 17<sup>th</sup>, York Expo Center.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reminded the Board of their invitation Thursday evening, April 15, 1999 to attend the Emergency Services Commission meeting at Commonwealth Fire Hall at 7 p.m.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated he planned to attend.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he, too, planned to attend.

**8. SOLICITOR’S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that he had nothing further to add to his report. He had an item to discuss in the Executive Session.

**A. Sample By-Laws Emergency Service Organizations**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that with regard to the Sample By-Laws for the Emergency Service Organizations, he had prepared a draft of a “Joint

Operating Agreement” which is more important than updating the bylaws at this point. Copies will be provided for the meeting next week.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that, if a joint operating agreement were in place rather than changing the by-laws, that would also eliminate a lot of the problems with their being independent organizations.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that to be correct. The concept is to keep the independent organizations, which can be very important in some respects. The two fire companies will get twice as much money from the state loan program than if they were a single organization. If a joint operating agreement is in place, the same thing can be accomplished as if they were really consolidated entities. This agreement was something Solicitor Yost had never seen done

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated the reason for this item being on the agenda was to be sure that the Board was familiar with the concept of Solicitor Yost expending time at the taxpayer’s dollar to accomplish this. Approval had been received from the Board to proceed in a general way and in this way it had been reaffirmed. Mr. Yost continues to be involved and providing significant services to help make this happen. The individual organizations do not have that kind of resource, and the last time this was attempted two or three years ago, the legal hurdles were what really derailed the whole thing. Getting Mr. Yost involved early in the process has been extremely helpful.

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that statements are made during these meetings and no one else says anything. The Board should all make a consensus again that it agrees with what Mr. Bishop just said, and are authorizing Solicitor Yost to do this work and know that the Township will be paying for his services.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that the work is 99% done.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop requested Solicitor Yost to be present at the meeting on April 15<sup>th</sup>.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he could be present. He added that Chief Eshbach had been a great help.

**Sludge Ordinances**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Solicitor Yost whether Springettsbury would run into the same problems as were experienced with Hellam concerning the sludge ordinances.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 8, 1999  
APPROVED**

- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that he needed Tim Chronister and Jim Noel's final comments on those ordinances and will make a presentation to the Board with or without a recommendation to proceed. Mr. Yost does not believe there is any further negotiating room.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether negotiations are with staff or elected officials.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that they did have some elected officials sit in on the negotiating session where it was determined what the Township would like to see in the Ordinance; they did not agree. The bottom line is that they left the meeting not in an antagonistic way, but there will be no agreement. They're going to do what they're going to do. They'll take our comments under consideration.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel stated that both townships have adopted the ordinance.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that what is needed is Wastewater's final comments as to what effect they have adopted has on Springettsbury; whether or not it is worthwhile challenging.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that his reason for bringing the matter up is that he sees it as comparable with the Hellam sludge ordinance. Nobody wants it in their backyard. Springettsbury will be facing that more and more. This is just the beginning and he voiced concern that a way of getting rid of sludge in a different manner must be addressed.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop expressed concern that in dealing with this as a legal issue an opportunity may be missed to make the case for why it should be done in the first place. The Township is not really doing a good job of explaining to people what it is we're trying to do and what the impact really is. Because the state says it's safe, we rely on that information.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he expressed concern about the problem continuing. He spoke with Mr. Halbert and provided the Susquehanna report for his review. In addition, position papers are also available from 1988-89 for review.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch reiterated that it is a problem to be faced which will bring more and more opposition.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that all of the scientific data he had read supports and encourages the use of these bio-solids for agricultural purposes, but it is difficult to sell.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he would not want this in his backyard. The farmers want it but not the people who live in the communities.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that a lot of the people in the community just don't understand. With the right information, people could be convinced, and not much had been done to convince people.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that one of the foremost experts on the issue is a Professor at Penn State who has done studies for DEP and EPA. Mr. Yost was unsure whether those reports could be made available to the Township.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked how the Township could mount some kind of public education program for both elected officials and the public. It is going to be the cheapest way, and even if a fair amount of money would be spent with a consultant to try to educate people, it would be cost effective in the long run.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck asked whether that challenge is one which the Board wishes to put to the Wastewater staff, i.e., to come up with a plan whether that plan is simply to decide that it's something a consultant needs to look at for us, or what.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop would like to hear a response as to whether it would be something that could be done.
- NOEL** Mr. Noel stated that included with the Act 537 Plan was a sludge study that was put together by the Wastewater staff. Wastewater Treatment did not look at all of the options; however, reams of material is available for public relations and how to present bio-solids in a meaningful way. With the study it was shown that the current method of disposal is one of the most cost effective ways to do so. They did not look at returns. The Board is correct in that focus is needed on the long-range issue of bio-solid disposal issues in the Township. Mr. Noel was unsure whether the Wastewater staff alone could do that in the fashion that needs to be done. Much ground work had been laid in the study done by E&A Consultants in the late 1980's and some of the work that Wastewater Treatment had done in the last 1-1/2 years would provide a sound foundation to move this project along. If that's what the Wastewater staff is commissioned to do, there is enough groundwork already done and they would not be starting from ground zero.
- SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that it sounds like a plan could be developed as to how to do this public education, not do it, but just develop the plan what steps need to be taken, what resources can be used, etc. Something of that nature could be brought back to the Board for action. That plan could include the use of consultants, but the Board would have

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 8, 1999  
APPROVED**

something with which to start. Mr. Schenck asked whether that was something the Board would request of the Wastewater staff.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel commented that the entire issue is an emotionally-charged issue. When people are asked to listen to the merits or pitfalls, it is usually in their backyard. Representative Saylor, along with other big players in the field from DEP, York County Solid Waste Authority, etc. had an Open House in Red Lion Area. About 20 people showed up and only two were in opposition. The other 18 were just curious. When meetings are held in East Hopewell Township, it's standing room only.

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that the work must be done long before those meetings for on-going education.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated the necessity for the Township to be prepared with whatever resources needed when the Township starts addressing it.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the meeting at Hopewell Township, the Chairman of Hopewell Board was present. His contention is that Springettsbury will accept Stewartstown Borough's sludge because they don't have any industry, but they will not accept Springettsbury Township's sludge because of the industry present that puts all these bad things in the sludge. The fact that Stewartstown Borough hauls their sludge here to be re-processed was not acknowledged.

**NOEL** Mr. Noel stated that there would always be a percentage of people who are polarized in their thinking about the matter. The attention needs to be focused on the 80% of the public who is open and listening.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked Mr. Schober for his opinion.

**SCHOBBER** Mr. Schober pointed out that there are video tapes and teachers guides and curriculum in the schools geared toward 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> graders, but there are some for high schoolers. They'll be taking that information home. Mr. Schober will get together with Mr. Noel for discussion on what's available. There are some tools available.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that there are lots of resources available but no plan in place to get the information communicated in order to do some good promotion. He suggested a "Rapid Response Team" effort.

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated that the options are to 1) direct the staff to develop a plan or 2) find consultants to develop a plan or 3) contact the state association.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**APRIL 8, 1999  
APPROVED**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested that the Board authorize the Township Manager to begin investigation with the Wastewater Treatment staff and Township consultants to come up with their recommendations for advancement.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he will develop an outline of a pro-active public education program on bio-solids.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that, on the issue of sludge, once he had reviewed the drafts of the ordinances, he will provide his opinion. He requested Mr. Noel and Mr. Chronister's shared thinking with him.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic brought forward an item previously discussed regarding Martin Library. Mr. Schell, Executive Director, will attend the next Board meeting and will be placed on the agenda.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that resumes for Wastewater Director and Fire Chief are being received until next Friday, April 16, 1999. Mr. Amic will review the resumes for Wastewater Director and make suggestions to the Board. More resumes are still coming in for Fire Chief and at the next Board meeting these will be discussed in more detail.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that he received notification that both of the Federal Senators and also our Congressman have supported in writing Springettsbury's efforts for Federal funding for our Wastewater System Pump Station and Access System in the amount of \$3 million. They are all three sending information to the proper House Committee. Legal representation in Washington is excited about this.

**A. Sexual Harassment Policy**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic continued with the agenda item of Sexual Harassment Policy. Mr. Yost had pointed out that some court cases had changed relating to Sexual Harassment Policies. Solicitor Yost sketched out a Sexual Harassment Policy for Springettsbury Township. This policy had been reviewed by Ms. Speicher and Mr. Amic. Mr. Amic recommended approval of this as a Township Policy.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there is a means for enforcement of the policy by the Township.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that, based on the passage of this policy, Ms. Speicher will begin to have the necessary meetings to explain the procedure to the directors and supervisors as to what their responsibilities are and also to explain to the employees in a series of meetings what this means.

**MR. PASCH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE POLICY AS PREPARED BY LEGAL COUNSEL ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

- A. Resolution 99-29 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania/Springettsbury Township**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated Resolution 99-29 covered North Sherman in front of the Sanitary Plant

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-29. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- B. Agreement – Donald Garrett/Springettsbury Township - \$2,410**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated Item B. covered damages incurred during a sewer line rehab on Erlen Drive and settlement negotiated by the Township.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that a final signed document of agreement had been received from Donald Garrett. Mr. Amic recommended closing this matter in the amount of \$2,410.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE ACTING CHAIRMAN TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT WITH DONALD GARRETT. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

- A. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – March 25, 1999**

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 25, 1999 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. SCHENCK ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

- A. Waiver of Land Development – Rocky Ridge Park**  
**B. Waiver of Building Permit Fee – Rocky Ridge – Two Pavilions**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that with regard to the tabled items concerning Land Development and the Waiver of Building Permit Fee at Rocky Ridge, Commissioner Minnich advised Mr. Amic he wished to resolve the

problem jointly. He will direct Mr. Dunn of the Planning Commission to contact Mr. Amic to determine what resources in the County and the Township might work together to help solve the problem.

**O. Police Department Rules of Conduct**

**AMIC** Additionally, Mr. Amic reported that the Police Department Rules of Conduct are completed and will appear on the agenda for the next Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he had visited Rocky Ridge and noticed a road across from Rocky Ridge that came down through to Williams Road, sort of a path that appeared to be a road. A County Commissioner owns that property, but not up to the road.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reiterated that Jack Dunn will be working with Springettsbury to try to come up with a solution.

**Sewer Authority Membership**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether members of the Board of Supervisors can be a member of the Sewer Authority.

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated technically they can.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he knew of no prohibition.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that during a problem-solving discussion there was a problem in having a Sewer Authority where we can't get people to serve, perhaps we could reconstitute the Board of Supervisors as a Sewer Authority or a sub-group of us.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated there would be no problem in that the Sewer Authority does not go out of existence because you do not have any members on it. At such time as it might be appropriate to resurrect it, then members could be appointed.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that in boroughs one member is permitted to serve on the sewer authority. It may be different on a township level.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost will look into this.

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated the suggestion to be a good one which would keep the Sewer Authority active.

**Sanitary Facility**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked the Board to think about coming to the Sanitary Facility and have our engineers and consultants take us through the present PLC system to learn how the PLC works, how it affects the plant and how the PLC will work in relation to the pump station PLC. It will have its own communication system and how these two systems interrelate would be part of this system.

**HINKLE** Mr. Hinkle stated that any dates would be satisfactory for him. He will make himself available. Mr. Hinkle added that this is of significant importance to those at the Treatment Plant that everyone be on board with what is proposed to upgrade the system. It is the backbone of the Treatment Plant facility.

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck stated he and Mr. Bishop will be available for this meeting at 7:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 14, 1999. The remaining Supervisors will schedule dates at their convenience within the next few weeks.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

There was no new business brought forward for discussion.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**SCHENCK** Acting Chairman Schenck adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MARCH 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Bill Schenck

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Dan Flohr, Acting Fire Chief  
Jim Noel, Wastewater Treatment Department  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK**

Chairman Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Chairman Mitrick announced that an Executive Session would be held immediately following the regular meeting regarding legal and personnel matters. Chairman Mitrick also stated that Mr. Schenck would not be present.

Chairman Mitrick opened the agenda with recognition of Patrolman Charles W. Zane.

**ESHBACH**

Police Chief Eshbach provided an introduction of recently-retired Patrolman Charles W. Zane and background on Officer Zane's career. Officer Zane served Springettsbury Township's Police Department from April 30, 1983 until February 12, 1999. Prior to that he worked for the Township in the Public Works Department until being called into active service in the U. S. Army from January 2, 1970 until February 2, 1972 having been honorably discharged. Chief Eshbach stated that Officer Zane was his first

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MARCH 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

partner and thanked Officer Zane for all his efforts in his personal behalf and in behalf of the Police Department. Chief Eshbach thanked Officer Zane for his two years of service in Vietnam and for the next 25-1/2 years as a member of the Springettsbury Township Police Department.

**MITRICK**

Chairman Mitrick asked Mrs. Zane to come forward for presentation of Resolution 99-28, "Recognition of Patrolman Charles W. Zane."

**ESHBACH**

Chief Eshbach then presented Officer Zane's service pistol to him to be retired along with Officer Zane.

**ZANE**

Officer Zane thanked Springettsbury Township Supervisors, Chief Eshbach and his fellow Officers on behalf of his wife and family.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**FISHER**

Mrs. Harold Fisher, (Rita Fisher), Two Apple Hill Lane, York, PA 17402 spoke in behalf of herself and neighborhood asking for assistance and help. Mrs. Fisher, an original owner of an Apple Hill property, has lived in her home for 37 years. She stated her property is for sale; however, because of one property in the neighborhood which has become a "skid row" property with existing debris such as a refrigerator, garbage, etc. she has had no real estate activity regarding her property. She had been advised by the Police Department that it is a civil situation; the Township had been involved resulting in a chain being placed around the refrigerator, but no major correction has taken place. Mrs. Fisher asked for the Supervisors advice and guidance.

**STERN**

Andrew Stern responded that Mr. Simmons had visited the property in February, 1999. A Citation had been issued; Officer Witmer fined the property owner, which resulted in the chain around the refrigerator satisfying the state law. There are some violations regarding outstanding property maintenance issues that Mr. Simmons is working on, however, there has been no face-to-face contact with the individual. The process is taking place.

**FISHER**

Mrs. Fisher provided details from a covenant agreement drawn by the original Apple Hill residents. Mrs. Fisher asked whether the details in the covenant provided any legal help.

**YOST**

Solicitor Yost stated that the restrictions are valid; however, they are a private matter. The Township cannot enforce the restrictions.

Only the property owners in that subdivision can enforce those restrictions.

**SENFT** Mr. Ronald Senft of 765 Witmer Road, York, PA stated he lived in York City for 12 years. He stated that even in the City he had never seen 25 empty beer cases sitting against any house for weeks at a time. The Waste Management people cannot pick up the recycling bins because they are so full. Mr. Senft indicated the Zoning Officer could confirm this. Mr. Senft stated this situation is worse than city neglect.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that there are Ordinances that can be enforced; however, the Township could not enforce their covenant restrictions. The Property Maintenance Code restrictions can be enforced to get some relief.

**FISHER** Mrs. Fisher stated that whatever can be done would be satisfactory. She had attempted a contact with this person in an agreeable manner, which resulted in no response. Other efforts from the Police Department and the Township have been ignored. Legally for the property owners to take legal action would be ignored as well.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the Township Ordinances would be exercised to the fullest extent. There are time factors involved which are frustrating. Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to send someone to review the situation.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked when Mrs. Fisher had contacted the Township.

**FISHER** Mrs. Fisher responded that her first contact was with Mr. Simmons about three week's prior.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he was simply interested in the time frame as far as Township response and indicated action will be taken through the Township processes. Mr. Amic requested that Mrs. Fisher leave her telephone number with Mrs. Bowers to provide communication from the Township to her.

**FISHER** Mrs. Fisher thanked the Township for any help they could provide.

### **3. ENGINEERING REPORT**

#### **A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MARCH 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Mike Schober indicated his written report had been previously provided to the Board. The review of tapping fees was submitted which indicated few changes regarding assets.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic advised that the B-H study had been received. Mr. Amic is reviewing the study and will provide the information to the Board at the April 8 meeting.

1. **Act 537 Phase I**
2. **Act 537 Phase II**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that there were residents present who wished to comment on the 537 Plan, and she requested Mr. Schober respond to their questions.

**CARTER** Mrs. Ann Carter, 421 Mundis Mill Road, York, PA asked Mr. Schober what will happen with the Waste Treatment Plant, whether a study is on-going to correct the horrendous odor, and when this would be implemented.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that the matter has been reviewed. Part of the Capital Improvement Plan, which had been budgeted by the Township includes major odor projects during 2000 and 2001 that total \$760,000. Equipment will be added to capture the air, treat it prior to discharge. A plan is also in place to reduce the sludge handling. A comprehensive approach is in place to reduce the odors in a two to three-year time frame.

**SNYDER** Mr. Jeff Snyder, 2715 Deininger Road, York, PA indicated he owns a farm on Mundis Mill Road. Several weeks prior he met with Mr. Schober and Mr. Noel to discuss the odor problems existing in the valley. Mr. Snyder, a former Chairman of the Sewer Authority, was aware that sewage is accepted from other municipalities where they would not tolerate this odor. The situation devalues their properties. Mr. Snyder suggested that the other municipalities sending sewage to Springettsbury should help to pay for the correction to this problem. Mr. Snyder hoped that the correction would take place as quickly as possible.

**ANDERSON** Mr. Rob Anderson, 2762 Druck Valley Road, York, PA asked whether this odor just became a problem in the past few months. From his observation the last two months the odor problem is getting much worse.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that he had heard the same comment. Mr. Schober asked Jim Noel to respond. He indicated weather

conditions do affect how the odor is disbursed in the valley.  
Operationally he was unaware of anything different.

**CARTER** Mrs. Carter stated that she and her husband purchased the Snyder farm in the late 1970's. Over the years since the 1980's she noticed that the odors are so bad that windows cannot be opened and air conditioners can't be utilized.

**NOEL** Mr. Jim Noel commented that predominantly the odors in question are associated with the composting operation, which is a seasonal operation typically starting in mid-December and continuing to the end of March or until the weather allows an alternative method for sludge disposal.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the money that is budgeted in the Capital Improvement Budget is designed to correct part of the composting problem, or whether it is for some other types of corrections.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that the money is actually used for both. The actual equipment being installed will be for other processes. The plan is to eliminate the need for composting altogether and utilize ag-utilization for disposal.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned whether this is a realistic goal.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that the farm land is available. More equipment is needed; more storage capability on site.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether there is any way to examine the time frame to see whether it could be pushed forward without complicating other factors.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober indicated he would be glad to look into the schedule for this completion.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Act 537 Phase I, and Act 537, Phase II, both of which had been previously provided to the Supervisors had been reviewed. Mr. Amic was impressed with B-H's work as well as supplements by other design engineers. The proper public comment period had taken place, and Mr. Amic recommended that the two plans be officially approved and forwarded to the Department of Environmental Protection.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT ACT 537 PHASE I PLAN BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT ACT 537 PHASE II PLAN BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic publicly thanked the Wastewater Treatment people who had worked very hard on the plan.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked them as well.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani had previously provided his report to the Board. His report covered Land Development Plan issues. Focus was toward stormwater review concentrated on Route 30. Burger King made some revisions and met with Mr. Stern regarding architectural matters. From a Public Works standpoint on Academy Road there were some concerns from residents. Messrs. Amic and Lauer met in the field, did some survey work and have a solution to mitigate the concern.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked whether Mr. Luciani plans to provide a sketch.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani will provide his plan.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated the residents are waiting for him to get back to them.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that prior to conclusion of the meeting, plans will be made to have a final work session on the Municipal Building.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that he wished to add a few minor items to his report dated the 19<sup>th</sup>. The Status Report is completed with the final design and contract documents for the pump station and the interceptor. There is a component of importance, which is to convince others it is completed and ready for construction. There are tools in place for modification and acquiring permits, approvals, right-of-ways, acquisitions in the form of a status report, check list, schedule and action program for both monitoring and managing all of the approvals needed to go to bid. The report was provided and explained for the Board's understanding. R. K. & K.'s objective is to obtain all approvals by the end of April/first week of May to be on schedule for advertising for bidding. The

most important focus will be upon Conrail, COE-Baltimore Section; CSX Real Property. Mr. Halbert indicated a pretty good position with Conrail; however, they will continue to be aggressive. COE-Baltimore Section is under review with not much feedback. CSX property acquisition can be difficult, but they will keep focused on it. The remaining approvals and acquisitions are straight forwarded.

**PASCH**

Mr. Pasch asked whether all of these acquisitions have to be completed before proceeding with going out for bid.

**HALBERT**

Mr. Halbert responded that there is nothing prohibiting advertising a project for bid. If it were a pipeline project, acquisition of the right-of-ways would be important. If it were a pumping station site, all the geotechnical information is available. As this relates to the railroad, without their approval they could come up with a last-minute required approval, and they would incorporate into the contract, which would require an addendum during the bidding. Mr. Halbert will gather as many acquisitions as possible, make an assessment and recommend bidding.

**PASCH**

Mr. Pasch asked whether Mr. Halbert is comfortable with everything that's needed to be done in order to get it out on schedule.

**HALBERT**

Mr. Halbert indicated he has a pretty high comfort level.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 3/25/99**
- B. Murphy & Dittenhafer – Architectural Design – Invoice #5 - \$22,750.39**
- C. Acer Engineers Progress Billing #2 – Risk Management Plan - \$626.50**
- D. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Design Engineering – Progress Billing #8 - \$53,017**
- E. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Progress Billing #17 – Act 537 Phase II – \$413.29**
- F. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Millcreek Interceptor Repair – Progress #1 - \$188.58**
- G. Buchart Horn, Inc. – PLC Upgrade – Progress #2 - \$4,671.15**
- H. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Harrowgate Road/Raleigh Drive – Progress #5 - \$400.90**
- I. Holland & Knight – Legal Consulting – Progress Billing #9 - \$14,536.71**
- J. Holland & Knight – DOT TCSP Grant - \$7,731.25**
- K. Springfield Contractors – Phase I – East/West Interceptor – Progress #1 - \$44,276.37**
- L. Springfield Contractors – Phase 1 – East/West Interceptor – Change Order #1 - \$8,620.00**

**M. C. S. Davidson – East/West Interceptor – Billing #2 - \$3,226.72**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he had provided information to the Supervisors concerning Items A through M.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL TO PAY ACCOUNTS PAYABLE AS DETAILED ON THE MARCH 25, 1999 AGENDA, ITEMS A. THROUGH M. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that with regard to the Change Order on the East/West Interceptor, Phase I for \$1,239.00, he received notification that that Change Order had been rescinded, and the Township had no further obligation to that item.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic also commented that another item mentioned in that Change Order #1 for Springfield Contractors, a charge that he questioned in his memorandum, was a one-time charge.

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

**A. Polydyne, Inc. – (Polymer Annual Bid) - \$1.39 per pound**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Item A related to a bid received for the Polymer Annual Bid. The low bid received was from Polydyne, Inc. at \$1.39 per pound. Award was recommended by Mr. Amic and staff.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether payments made in the payable listing to a different contractor cover last year's contract.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was correct.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AWARD THE POLYMER ANNUAL BID TO POLYDYNE, INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1.39 PER POUND. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Safeco, Inc. – Quote or \$1,284.06 for Atmospheric Tester**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Wastewater staff requested purchase of an atmospheric tester from Safeco for \$1,284.06, which was the low quote received. Mr. Amic recommended this purchase be made.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE QUOTE FROM SAFECO, INC. FOR \$1,284.06 FOR AN ATMOSPHERIC TESTER. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Purchase of 4X4 Pickup – Commonwealth Purchasing – Not to Exceed \$18,000**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Wastewater staff requested permission to purchase a pickup truck to replace the now unreliable 1985 model with 120,000 miles of service. The staff had examined the Commonwealth Piggyback Program, and it is believed this truck can be purchased through this Piggyback Program. Permission was requested from the Board to purchase this pickup under Commonwealth purchasing with a not-to-exceed price of \$18,000.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how long will it take to get the truck utilizing the Commonwealth program.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he was unsure of the time frame.

**CROOKS** Mr. Crooks responded that a telephone investigation with the Commonwealth indicated that delivery would be in about three to four weeks.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR APPROVAL TO PURCHASE A 4x4 PICKUP IN THE COMMONWEALTH PURCHASING PROGRAM NOT TO EXCEED \$18,000. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the 4X4 pickup truck was listed in the 1999 Capital Improvements Budget.

**D. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Engineering – Harrowgate Sewer Rehabilitation - \$5,400**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that a quote had been taken from Buchart Horn in the amount of \$5,400 to provide services related to the rehabilitation of the Harrowgate sewer. The services are bidding, construction, assistance and inspection. The Wastewater staff and Mr. Amic reviewed this item and recommended that the quote be authorized.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO ACCEPT THE QUOTE ON HARROWGATE SEWER REHABILITATION BY BUCHART-HORN ENGINEERING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,400. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Subdivision 98-07 Anderson, Snyder, Druck Valley Road**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided information with regard to SD 98-07 for Robert Anderson and Jeff Snyder. The plan was listed under Mr. Anderson's

name; however, a piece of the property will be transferred to Helen Snyder's property, which abuts Deininger Road. This would not be a new lot. There are some waivers for consideration, such as a waiver from correcting a problem with bearings, waiver from requirement to submit a preliminary plan and waiver from submitting an environmental impact study (this was supported as it was not a new lot). All Planning Commission comments with the exception of the three on the second page had been addressed.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that the bulk of the Township's comments have been addressed. Mr. Luciani explained the need for the waivers.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether Mr. Luciani visualized any problem in granting a waiver.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated there would be no problem.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION 98-07  
ANDERSON/SNYDER, DRUCK VALLEY ROAD (6/1/99) WITH THE  
FOLLOWING WAIVERS:**

- **WAIVER FOR CORRECTING THE PROBLEM WITH BEARINGS, DISTANCES, AND CLOSURE TOLERANCE FOR HELEN SNYDER'S PROPERTY PER JOHN LUCIANI'S LETTER DATED MARCH 2, 1999.**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENTS TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- **WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Subdivision 99-02 Myers, Kalreda Road (4/22/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided background information with regard to SD 99-02. Mr. Myers wishes to sell off Lot 4A, however, the existing house violates setbacks. They wish to take off a section identified as Lot 4B from Lot 4A and attach it to Lot 3, thereby meeting the zoning requirements for the lot. The only item that needed to be addressed is a waiver from the requirement to submit a Preliminary Plan.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that technically they could sell the lot; however, any building would be a non-conforming building.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost asked how they have used the two lots in the past. If they have been used as an entity then they may be a defacto combination so that they couldn't sell them off without meeting the requirements.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MARCH 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that the action would fix whatever problem needed fixed.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that a new building lot was not being created.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that Lehman Mortorff was present representing the client.

**MORTORFF** Mr. Mortorff stated that Lot 3 has already been conveyed; the sliver was to be attached onto that to make that a building lot.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned Mr. Luciani regarding statements in his memo.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated that numbering had been in question, but he was now satisfied with the numbering.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION 99-02 WITH THE WAIVER FROM REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Waiver of Land Development – Rocky Ridge Park – Request County Commissioners**

**D. Waiver of Building Permit Fee to York County for Two Pavilions – Request York County Commissioners**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided background information regarding a waiver request from the York County Parks to waive Land Development for two proposed park pavilions that each would be about 2,000 sq. ft. which can hold up to 200 persons. The location is Rocky Ridge Park. Mr. Stern stated several concerns about this project. A meeting had been held with Police Chief and the Director of County Parks, Tom Brant and Mike Fobes. With the exception of the traffic issue all other issues have been resolved or agreed that resolution would be forthcoming. The traffic problem was Mr. Stern's biggest concern. While the pavilions could accommodate 200 people, history shows that the pavilions only draw 150 or less. With two pavilions, 400 people, about 120 cars could be coming and going at the same time which would create a tremendous traffic problem. PennDot had provided their plan, which Mr. Stern provided to the Board.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Stern whether the Township requested the State to do a traffic light study. It was Mr. Pasch's understanding the State would do nothing until the Township came up with an agreement on the financing of the light if it were approved.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MARCH 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that PennDot refused to do the study unless the Township committed to make the improvements that they recommended in the study.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that it was more than just the light improvements. This type of project would include roadways and possible property acquisitions to widen roadways, etc.

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented that in the present condition of that area, without property acquisitions, the visibility is the major issue.

**ESHBACH** Police Chief Eshbach provided in-depth information with regard to a study regarding the Mt. Zion corridor from Pleasant Valley Road to Sherman Street. Before a study could be done to review the possibility of a traffic light, a commitment from the Township would be necessary. This commitment would involve agreement with whatever PennDot recommended and following through with funds to cover the costs. The Township would have little input or control of the situation. This could encompass property acquisition toward widening the roadway. PennDot requires this Township commitment even though it's a state road.

Chief Eshbach discussed the possibility of an alternate traffic solution making Deininger Road one way going into the park. Egress would be to turn left on Spangler Circle and go down through the intersection and out Pose's Place, which intersection isn't that much better although the visibility is a little bit better than it is up on top of the hill. Chief Eshbach recommended the study of an alternative solution to find ingress and egress traffic out of the County Park, since there is only one way now.

Chief Eshbach continued that the Township can review the new PennDot study, which revealed that PennDot did not recommend any traffic lights in June of 1998. PennDot granted the Township a waiver at that time indicating that if we would agree to do anything, i.e., make a commitment to PennDot to do what they recommended, they would at least study the light situation. To date the Township had not made that commitment.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated his concern for the safety of the intersection. Either intersection which had been discussed could be dangerous. With the planned development to the north, traffic is going to be increased dramatically. Mr. Pasch would like to see the Township join with the County to gather clout with PennDot for improvements as some serious traffic problems need to be considered.

Chief Eshbach stated that he believed the County would participate with the Township in this regard.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MARCH 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri questioned where the access roads are located.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach indicated there are none.
- FOBES** Mr. Fobes suggested Woodland Drive, Berringer, Park Valley.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach stated it touches on Ridgewood Road.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the Park touched some of the roadways mentioned, but no internal park roads.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick added that at those points at which the existing roadways are touched, there are slope problems to get to them.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach stated that it would be a major undertaking to get out of there in any one of those places.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that this particular waiver is a difficult one as the Board has an interest toward promotion of parks. As Chief Eshbach stated, the Board had already attempted to identify and face major problems along Mt. Zion and that's where this request would impact. She asked for the desire of the Board.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that there was no question in his mind that Mt. Zion Road everywhere in the Township is the worst road. Mr. Bishop would have difficulty approving any significant increase in traffic, especially at that intersection. Mr. Bishop favored getting some better commitment from the County of what kind of support they would provide toward providing some help to solve this problem.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated his agreement with Mr. Bishop. He would rather see definitive action regarding working together. Mr. Pasch stated he favors activities in the park but has concern for the safety of residents in that intersection.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Solicitor Yost's guidance on handling Items C and D.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost recommended either tabling the matter or to reject the waiver, which would provide the County an option of filing a Land Development Plan at which time the traffic issue could be addressed and act on the plan accordingly.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether some action could be taken with the County Commissioners to indicate that they would work with us in a defined plan as to how to get something done on that highway.

- FOBES** Mr. Fobes responded that the Commissioners could be approached.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that waiver requests are under no time constraints.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that at that time the Commissioners can either come back for reconsideration of the waiver or for consideration of a Land Development Plan. If the Board denies the waiver request, they could always come back with another waiver request or a Land Development Plan.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch was in favor of tabling it and having some indication as to how the County will respond to it.
- FOBES** Mr. Fobes questioned whether, as far as the Land Development Plan is concerned, even if the County goes through with that and the entrance problem cannot be addressed, the answer still would be same.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that would be correct, i.e., if that's not addressed the problem is still the same.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE BOARD TABLE THE WAIVER OF LAND DEVELOPMENT REQUEST FROM THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND THE WAIVER OF THE BUILDING PERMIT FEE TO YORK COUNTY FOR TWO PAVILIONS FROM THE YORK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to communicate with the County Commissioners and advise the Board's frustration that it cannot go forward with this, but make the Board's concerns very clear.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated it might be a good idea to send relevant copies of the Minutes.

## **7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS**

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he received a letter from Al Mers, representing Walmart. Mr. Pasch indicated he had been pleased to receive this letter, the first letter indicating Walmart is addressing the questions which had previously been brought forward.
- STERN** Mr. Stern provided a brief update regarding Walmart. They did obtain permits and Richard Poole will do the work. One of the conditions of the permit was that they not construct the garden center until they provide new plans to meet the satisfaction of the Board.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MARCH 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated one of the comments from Mr. Merz letter was about outside storage.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that at some point discussion would need to be held to determine what to do during the summer of 1999 given the fact that the area is under construction. Mr. Stern sought guidance from the Board.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that if the Board addresses Walmart, it must address the others as well.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that this summer can not be any different from last summer.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that one issue on outside storage is that we need to watch Lowe's along the creek.
- STERN** Mr. Stern indicated that Inspector Greg Henry is to go there every day to keep an eye on it.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Mr. Simmons took him to review the Farmers Market, which he viewed as disgraceful with debris, paper, skids. Mr. Simmons had notified Farmers Market that this was not acceptable.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop provided information regarding the Emergency Services Commission. The Commission has made tremendous strides in working toward a consolidation concerning various volunteer organizations. Chief Eshbach had provided great effort in this matter. The Commission asked Mr. Bishop to communicate to the Board of Supervisors that they are at the point where some direct communication between the Commission and the Board would be helpful. The Commission specifically requested the Board of Supervisors attend the next Emergency Services Commission meeting, Thursday, April 15. Two items are on the agenda for particular attention to bring the Board up to date on what is going on, i.e., the specific direction in which things are going and to discuss some of the communications issues that the Commission believes are key to its success. The Commission solicited the Board as to whether they would visit and provide feedback from the Commission and some of its members.

**Consensus of the Board indicated they would be able to attend the meeting of the Emergency Services Commission on Thursday, April 15.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Dori Bowders to notify Mr. Schenck about the Emergency Services Commission date to get it on his calendar.

**BOWDERS** Ms. Bowders indicated she would do so.

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that Joan Bitzer of Dreamwrights telephoned her that they are looking for suggestions for a new location.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that he had been contacted with regard to the Dreamwrights need, a unique kind of space (2500 sq. ft.) for a unique cost. He had given Ms. Bitzer some suggestions of people to contact such as Mr. Kinsley.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that notification had been received that the East Mount Zion Superfund site construction is now complete. On that note she expressed gratitude to the residents in that area who were inconvenienced by construction.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Amic whether the Township is satisfied with what had been done.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he was very satisfied with that was accomplished.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick provided an update to the Park and Rec Work Session that had been held. The Board had requested that at their convenience they would provide the Board with a report on the park usage for the team sports involved in the Township. What was felt was that a more appropriate decision could then be made on their questions.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that she read in the newspapers that the Board had approved portable toilets in the neighborhood parks. Chairman Mitrick stated that the Board had asked for a report on the cost and a report from the Park and Rec Board as to where they would like them placed.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic confirmed that there had been no vote by the Board to approve any purchase. The Board attempted to cooperate and asked Mr. Amic to obtain a cost, which Mr. Lauer provided. The cost was passed along to the Recreation Commission to tell us where they desired to place them and how many and provide that information to the Board.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested the Board to review calendars, as Mr. Dittenhafer had requested a final work session on the blueprints for the Administration Building before going out to bid. He suggested Tuesday, March 30, at Noon.
- LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated he would be traveling that day with a scheduled arrival time around 10 a.m. He indicated Mr. Hilson, who had also been working on the Administration Building project, could attend in his absence.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick confirmed a time change for the meeting at 1:30 p.m. on March 30.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that he attended a meeting of the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. He has obtained a baby blue Cadillac Eldorado convertible for the Board to ride in the parade. Further to the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary, there is no plan for a picnic on July 3 or 4; another date will be chosen.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that she had been provided information by Tom Shaffer, and there are no further questions.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that the Glades area was determined ineligible for the National Register.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether the senatorial districts have been changed.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there had been discussion about changing the districts but that he had not been notified that this had actually taken place. Mr. Amic stated he is still communicating with Senator Armstrong.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that the re-districting is futuristic and takes a great deal of time.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that completion of the new census is necessary prior to any re-districting.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that a letter had been received from Mt. Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church in appreciation for Chief Eshbach's presentation.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that a copy of a letter of appreciation had been received from Small Steps for Doc Wolfe's presentation to the children.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost reported that there is a matter of potential litigation to be discussed during the Executive Session.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that in the process of writing checks last week, the Director of Martin Library telephoned and reminded him that Springettsbury had not yet paid our \$11,098.62 check related to the commitment for the electronic library. This is the interest earned on their

fund. Mr. Amic further stated that the Board never approved this program beyond a one-year pilot program. Mr. Amic sought the permission of the Board prior to extending this support to the library. The motion had been a one-year pilot program with reconsideration of an additional period.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that when he reviewed the check, he questioned sending it due to the fact that the Board's desire was to support the program for a one-year pilot program with no further criteria.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that a lot of his objections to supporting the library in the beginning had to do with whether Springettsbury Township residents would use it, but from the reports the residents are using the facility.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated agreement with Mr. Pasch, but he was not convinced that Martin Library people are doing as much as they could to promote it to get more use.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that, for a check for \$11,000. They should certainly be willing to make a visit to a Board meeting.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he thought they would come to a meeting.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop added that ideas had been previously discussed for a library within the township buildings in the future. That possibility should be communicated and their feedback solicited. This communication would also indicate that the Township's \$11,000 support would not be sent every year.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that apparently the library staff believe the support is "a given" as indicated by the statement, "they didn't get our check."

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he would invite the head library person to visit the Board on April 8<sup>th</sup>.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated it would be helpful to Mr. Shell if he would be made aware of the concerns regarding the publicity. Mrs. Mitrick agreed with Mr. Pasch in that the Township residents are using the facility.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that there had been previous discussion concerning a need for more promotional activity.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she had not received her Springettsbury Township newsletter. She had not seen the library insert.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MARCH 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

- BOWDERS** Dori Bowders stated that she had followed up and apparently Chairman Mitrick had simply been missed by her postal carrier.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that he had received a request from Peg Cousler for permission from the Board to give York Suburban School District a listing of the names and addresses of all the businesses in the township for their Dollars for Scholars program. She is not going to provide them with her entire mercantile information, just the names and addresses of the businesses.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he had received a telephone call from Ms. Cousler and had indicated her request should be responded to by the Board. Mr. Yost had investigated the issue, and because of the new Tax Reform Act, the Taxpayer Bill of Rights which included a confidentiality clause which indicated that any information obtained from any report, return or article is confidential and cannot be disclosed by the municipality. Mr. Yost assumed that Ms. Cousler's list is made up independently from the returns. Spring Garden Township had elected not to provide the information. Solicitor Yost recommended the Township not provide this list.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the school district is a taxing authority, but their taxing authority is solely to resident property owners as opposed to businesses. School districts do not derive any benefit from mercantile business privilege tax.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed with Mr. Yost not to provide the list.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that if the township would do this for Dollars for Scholars, there is a chance the Township would be inundated with similar requests.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed with Mr. Yost not to provide the list. Further he would like to see the Township have a written policy on the issue.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch agreed with Mr. Bishop that if a policy were in force the staff would know how to respond.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he would be glad to write a draft for approval.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he agreed with not providing information from tax roles.
- General consensus of the Board was not to provide a list of businesses to Peg Cousler for the Dollars for Scholars program.**
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would notify Ms. Cousler of the Board's decision.

**A. March 4, 1999 Proposal of Reed Smith Shaw & McClay**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic continued with his report regarding the proposal of Reed Smith Shaw & McClay. Mr. Amic indicated that Chris Risetto is now in partnership with Reed Smith. They have made their proposal to represent the township in the Year 2000 Federal Funding in the township's attempt to receive \$3 million Federal Funding for the Pump Station and Interceptor project. Mr. Risetto asked for \$50,000 to perform the service. Phase I was estimated at \$87,000, and \$1 million was received. Final cost of that was \$58,244. No further billing will be received so it was \$27,256 under Mr. Risetto's estimate. About \$50,000 will be tied up in Phase II.

Mr. Amic continued that York City Authority advised they are not paying any monies toward Phase II. If the amount were \$60,000 then the other eight municipalities would be responsible for approximately \$30,000. Mr. Amic stated the other municipalities have no opposition to this.

Mr. Amic stated his confidence in Chris Risetto personally. Mr. Amic recommended approval.

**YOST** Mr. Yost indicated he had no problem with proceeding as Mr. Amic recommended.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned Mr. Amic with the fact that, the township was already awarded a significant sum of money, how does Chris Risetto think Springettsbury will be received on the second attempt.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he and Mr. Stern met personnel involved who asked whether the Township would keep coming back if an award was made. Mr. Amic indicated there is a very good chance an award will be made to Springettsbury. He personally believes there is a better chance simply because they have been through the process.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic whether the fact that York City Sewer is no longer a player would have a negative impact.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he did not think so because it is recognized and sold as a regional project.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that a statement had been made that they wanted to see projects that didn't get full funded last year get their Planning Fund this year.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated it was imperative to move forward on this project. Further she stated that it is encouraging that the sister municipalities are included.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic requested permission to execute the agreement between Reed Smith Shawn and McClay sent by Chris Rissetto dated March 4, 1999.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE TOWNSHIP MANAGER, PAUL AMIC, BE AUTHORIZED TO SIGN THE AGREEMENT WITH REED SMITH SHAW AND MCCLAY REGARDING THE APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL FUNDING FOR THE REGIONAL APPLICATION FOR SEWER UPGRADE. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that a meeting will be held in Pittsburgh Tuesday, April 6, and the Board of Supervisors are invited to the corporate headquarters of Reed Smith Shaw and McClay.

**B. Wasteload Management Report (Chapter 94)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided the Wasteload Management Report prepared by the staff. Mr. Amic publicly thanked Mr. Hinkle for his efforts in preparing the Management Report. Mr. Amic thanked Mr. Stern, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Sauers and Mr. Noel as well. Mr. Amic indicated this report needed to be filed on March 31<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Amic requested permission to file the report.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE BOARD AUTHORIZE PAUL AMIC PERMISSION TO FILE THE WASTELOAD MANAGEMENT REPORT. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated to Mr. Hinkle that numerous times Mr. Amic has expressed his gratitude for what he had done.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the Susquehanna Valley Organics toward the elimination of odors. Elimination of odor problems and trying to find places to put the sludge when finished is an area of more and more concern for the application of sludge. Mr. Pasch stated this to be an important item to pursue.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated it was a good project for Springettsbury. Mr. Yost had advised Mr. Amic that there are other companies to investigate who do this type of work.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that this item should be on a high priority list.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned an item in regard to a Change Order for the East/West Interceptor where it had to be changed because the as-built drawings do not agree with what was finally done. Mr. Pasch suggested that the Change Order seemed expensive, but when bids are solicited, a price should be stated for the possibility of various additional depths.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the amount the Township receives is \$16,030 plus \$2,890. It's more than \$16,030. Mr. Amic indicated Mr. Pasch's comments were well taken.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he had participated in a discussion, which indicated there is no such thing as an as-built drawing. The trade now provides "record drawings."

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Amendment to Intermunicipal Service Agreement – Operational Audit**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic recommended the Board approve the Amendment.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO INTERMUNICIPAL SERVICE AGREEMENT – OPERATIONAL AUDIT. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Agreement - #1 – Architectural Services – Murphy & Dittenhafer - \$8,000**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated this Agreement related to interior and external renovations to the existing farm house.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked what the estimated renovation costs were.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated the estimated renovation costs were \$65,000.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that was about 13% and asked what firms normally charge.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated about 6-7%.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that would have been \$8,000 towards tearing the farmhouse down.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated an earlier discussion regarding the possible hope of getting a community project surrounding this building. It would be important to have this basic information.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that, whether it's 7% or 13%, it depends on the size of the contract. A smaller contract with an architectural firm will cost more than the 7%. Mr. Pasch indicated he has no problem with it. The decision had previously been made, and information is necessary to do it.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated the motion should be authorizing the Township Manager to execute Amendment #1 to the Architectural Agreement.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE TOWNSHIP MANAGER BE AUTHORIZED TO SIGN THE AMENDMENT #1 FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES WITH MURPHY AND DITTENHAFFER IN THE AMOUNT OF \$8,000. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI VOTED NO.**

**C. Agreement – Manchester/Springettsbury Township – Sewage Transfer**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated this agreement between Manchester Township and Springettsbury Township covered the transfer for 50,000 gallons per day of sewage capacity from its allocation to Springettsbury's allocation for a period of 12 months not to exceed 18 months. Information had been previously provided to the Board.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned how soon following its approval could some action be on-going with regard to the 50,000 gallons.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he would have to provide a letter to DEP which will then issue an application.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch would like to see this expedited.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned whether there is a systematic way of distributing the allocation.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that Mr. Stern and Mr. Sowers have reviewed the listing of people requesting capacity and placed it in their report. Much effort had been spent to provide equity.

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided information with regard to the approach used to offer this sewage capacity in a fair and equitable manner.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned that with the distribution whether the entire 50,000 gallons had been utilized.

**STERN** Mr. Stern replied that all the gallonage had been distributed. There are five miscellaneous lots in the accounting.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic recommended authorization to the Chairman to execute the Agreement.

**MR. PASCH MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPRINGETTSBURY AND MANCHESTER TOWNSHIPS FOR THE TRANSFER OF 50,000 GALLONS PER DAY OF**

**SEWAGE CAPACITY FROM MANCHESTER TO SPRINGGETTSBURY  
TOWNSHIP. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY  
CARRIED.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch thanked Mr. Amic for his good work in this effort.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that, while he does not know any of the Supervisors of Manchester Township personally, they were very gracious to him. Mr. Amic suggested that if an occasion arises for Springettsbury officials to thank them to please acknowledge and thank them. He planned to correspond and thank them as well.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to write Manchester Township officials in behalf of the Board.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic suggested that items D. and E. were items to which Mr. Stern would speak and requested permission to proceed with Items F. and G. on the agenda.

**F. Drug and Alcohol Policy – Fire Fighters Local 2377**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided background information regarding item E. The Drug and Alcohol Policy had been previously reviewed by the International Fire Fighters attorney and Springettsbury’s attorney, Ralph Colflesh. Mr. Amic recommended permission to adopt the policy.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned a few items in terms of what has to be done. He asked whether all procedures are in place in order to do what has to be done.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that not all items are in place, and he and Mrs. Speicher need to meet and put a number of procedures into place.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE CHAIRPERSON TO EXECUTE  
THE DRUG AND ALCOHOL POLICY FIREFIGHTERS LOCAL 2377. MR.  
PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic personally thanked Chief Flohr for his efforts in bringing this policy to a conclusion.

**G. Resolution 99-22 – Closing of Capital Improvements Advisory Committee**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that, during the last meeting of the Board, he was directed to draft a Resolution to eliminate the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee. He provided a draft, Resolution 99-22, states the reasons.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 99-22 CLOSING THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested that Mr. Amic notify the two standing members of the elimination of the committee.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic will notify them and thank them for their service.

**D. Ordinance 99-02 Amending Article 17 of the Zoning Ordinance “Signs”**

**STERN** Mr. Stern discussed the V-shaped signs discussed previously by the Board. This involved clarification of a technical error in the Ordinance. This clarification would eliminate any possible confusion in what the paragraph means. Mr. Stern provided a drawing of explanation. The Planning Commission had previously reviewed this and recommended it. The Business Association reviewed it and recommended it. Mr. Stern requested a Public Hearing and advertise it for adoption.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick established a date for the Public Hearing which will be held at 7 p.m. prior to the April 22, 1999 Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

**E. Ordinance 99-03 Amending Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance**

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated the item E. related to the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The Ordinance would be changed from stating that an applicant must be in this year’s report to stating the applicant must be in this year’s or next year’s. Mr. Stern requested permission to send this to the Planning Commission.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO REFER ORDINANCE 99-03 AMENDING SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. Board of Supervisors Work Session – February 23, 1999**

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION ON FEBRUARY 23, 1999 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – February 25, 1999**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 25 MINUTES AS AMENDED. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Board of Supervisors Work Session – February 26, 1999**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 26 WORK SESSION MINUTES AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated there was no Old Business requiring action by the Board at this time.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned agenda Item A. as to the number of members appointed to the Sewer Authority.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the Sewer Authority meets at least annually. Item A. refers to filling a vacancy on the Sewer Authority.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether this Authority could be a 3-member Authority.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the Articles of Incorporation would need to be amended.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that this was not an annual appointment

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reminded Mr. Amic about contacting a professional fundraiser and asked the status.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that he had made contact with three fundraisers. They had asked for Springettsbury's Master Plan and our Citizen Survey. They will review those and then meet with him. Following that they will meet with the Board to determine what is required.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Ordinance 99-04 Adding Development Zone to Springettsbury Township Zoning Ordinance.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic placed the above item on the Agenda in order that the matter is kept in focus for action.

**STERN** Mr. Stern additionally stated that item J. under Old Business is an additional matter to be kept in focus for action.

- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what is requested at this time regarding adding a development zone to Springettsbury Township Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Pasch indicated this matter to be a critical item requiring more work.
- STERN** Mr. Stern recommended first to decide what the zone would be and then decide where it would be.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the Township has exceptions in the Zoning Ordinance, and if the exceptions are not listed, then an item is okay. Mr. Pasch continued that the Board wanted to be sure that what is stated in the exceptions is what the Board desires.
- STERN** Mr. Stern provided an example such as a Co-Gen plant, which could not be in a particular zone because of the pollution requirement. Consideration must be given to other requirements such as heat, glare, and explosives.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that as long as everything is in the Ordinance that is required he has no problem with it. He questioned why there is a limitation as to 1,000 lbs. of explosives.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the 1,000 lbs. is a standard number in other Ordinances.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that 1,000 lbs. seemed to be a lot of explosives.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that there are some legitimate products which have explosives in them in small quantities, such as a life raft.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that there are materials classified as explosives that are not necessarily dynamite, such as chlorine.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Stern what his plan of action would be for this item, such as the Board's review and then meeting with the Planning Commission.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the Planning Commission had not yet had the opportunity to review the information provided to the Board. However, the Planning Commission invited the Board to any of their meetings they would like to attend.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch recalled an item in the Minutes that the Board had intended to meet with the Planning Commission. He would be in favor of this.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MARCH 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the review of the Architectural Drawings will not take a long time. She asked whether it would be possible to review what Mr. Stern had provided to the Board, review any questions and follow up with a meeting with the Planning Commission. Two issues could be covered in one Work Session.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he would prefer not to rush through the final review of the Architectural Drawings. Time permitting he would not have a problem reviewing the matter.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 13. The Board could attend that meeting.

**Consensus of the Board indicated that this would not be possible as two Board members could not be present. Wednesday, April 21 and Tuesday, April 27 at Noon are available dates offered to meet with the Planning Commission.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern will confirm the dates with the Board members.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the April 5 date for the Road Tour needed to be changed.

**Monday, April 26, at 4:30 p.m. was established for the Road Tour.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch would like to include any blighted areas pointed out by Mr. Stern.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated Mr. Stern's presence was requested on the Road Tour.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Dori Bowders to be sure to provide Mr. Schenck with all of the dates established for Board Members.

**BOWDERS** Mrs. Bowders indicated she would do so.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reviewed the following established dates:

**Planning Commission/Development Zone – Wed., 4/21 @ Noon or  
Tues., 4/27 @ Noon  
Road Tour – Monday, April 26 at 4:30 p.m.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated also the meeting established for:

**Architectural Drawings – Tuesday, March 30 at noon.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern asked the Board if there was anything further required from him regarding the blighted areas and requested their input.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**MARCH 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 10:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Bill Schenck  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Mike Myers, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Mike Kyle, Director of Wastewater Treatment  
Jim Noel, Wastewater Treatment Department  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. Chairman Mitrick stated that the Board of Supervisors held an Executive Session on February 16 regarding personnel and also announced that there would be an Executive Session following the Regular Meeting regarding personnel and other matters.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reminded the Board of Supervisors of a Work Session scheduled for Friday, February 26, 1999 at Noon.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**FIX** Mrs. Jean Fix, 2050 Deininger Road, York, PA stated that she had seen an article in the newspaper that the Board would vote on March 25 regarding the sewer line. Mrs. Fix is familiar with the lower portion of Deininger Road from Mt. Zion to Ridgewood. Mrs. Fix urged the Supervisors to carefully consider this matter as it will impose \$30,000 per property to have the sewer line installed. There are only seven properties to tie in on

a one-mile strip. This amount is a great burden, and Mrs. Fix urged the Supervisors to find another way, such as on-site sewage, for these properties.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick agreed that the \$30,000 amount is a large sum. She called on Mr. Amic to brief the Board on his discussions with Mrs. Fix.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that he had met with Mrs. Fix and another gentlemen. In the 537 Plan this particular length of the project is scheduled between the years 2005 and 2010. There is no immediate concern. The Board had pushed the schedules back for the collector lines. There are environmental concerns of failing systems. There are other options, which may indicate different approaches to be taken. He indicated Mrs. Fix to be correct in the cost is approximately \$28,000 per home. Additionally, the State of Pennsylvania has a low interest loan program for residents affected by projects of this nature.

**FIX** Mrs. Fix stated her thanks for the opportunity of getting this on record.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic continued that a number of Mrs. Fix's neighbors are concerned. Some of whom were ill and unable to be present at this meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick thanked Mrs. Fix for coming.

**BEAVER** Mr. Tim Beaver, Springettsbury Business Association, stated his presence was to discuss the Sign Ordinance during the public comment period; however, he noticed it was shown as an agenda item. He elected to wait until that time for discussion.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober reported on two items in addition to his written report previously submitted. One is the issue of the upgrade to the Wastewater Treatment Plant Computer Control System. Mr. Schober will meet with Jim Noel to provide draft documents for review. This item is moving along and by the March meeting he should be in a position to provide a recommendation for bids. Secondly he had prepared and submitted a cost estimate to upgrade the utility water system. He will meet with Mr. Amic and Mr. Noel on Tuesday for review.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

**LUCIANI** Mr. John Luciani stated he had nothing major to report. However, he and Mr. Lauer met with Harley Davidson this week to discuss improvements to Eden Road and Land Development Plans. They will be coming to the Township with a sketch plan.

Secondly, Mr. Amic and Mr. Lauer met on Academy Road to resolve the driveway problem. They are working on the solution.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked if the residents were there during the visit.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated both were present.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**MYERS** Mr. Mike Myers reported for R.K.& K. There were a few items to add to their February 19<sup>th</sup> report. The property acquisition process continues. Letters had been submitted and property plats to Jack Giambalvo, Associated Wholesalers, CSX Railroad, and York City Sewer Authority. Work continues with Yorktowne Paper for the pumping station site, and Mr. Yost is getting appraisals. As soon as the appraisals are received, that letter will be sent as well.

Mr. Myers provided an update regarding Conrail and reported that Charlie Myers, the lone Conrail employee previously mentioned, is no longer working there. The good news is that he (Charlie Myers) had been able to get the permit package to the consultant, Frederick R. Harris. R.K.&K. has made contact with them, and they are reviewing it.

Mr. Myers stated they are on schedule for their submittal next week with both the documents for the parallel interceptor and the development work on the pump station.

Mr. Myers indicated that he and Mr. Halbert are developing some incentives for early completion.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 2/25/99;**
- B. Acer Engineers Progress Billing #1 – Risk Management Plan - \$984.50;**
- C. Buchart Horn, Inc. Progress Billing #16 – Act 537 Phase II - \$11,505.53;**
- D. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Overview/Mt. Zion Road – Progress Billing #2 - \$2,276;**

- E. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Design Engineering – Progress Billing #7 - \$45,790.97;**
  - F. C. S. Davidson – East West Interceptor – Progress Billing #1 - \$1,900**
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick instructed that the payables will be handled as a group as the Supervisors have had an opportunity for reviewing A through F. Mrs. Mitrick asked whether there were any questions on the list.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned an item in the general fund, warrant #021699, for prescriptions amounting to \$70,000. Mr. Pasch asked how there could be such a large expenditure.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded to Mr. Pasch’s question and provided information regarding this \$70,000 item. During the latter half of 1997 and the first half of 1998 the pharmacy involved began to do some sloppy billing. This included double billings and the omission of the co-pay for pharmaceuticals. Mrs. Speicher caught these errors and notified them. They were extremely slow in responding to her request; however, through Mrs. Speicher’s efforts there was about \$5,000 saved. There is no additional interest or penalty. Following the correction of these errors, the bill should be paid.
- Mr. Amic had discussed this matter with Stambaugh Ness, and they advised that these charges belonged in another year; however, they did not see any problem with this.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether these charges are against this year’s budget, which would eat up almost the whole budget.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that this will be re-stated as a past year item for budget presentation purposes.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned the handling of prescriptions as well. She asked Mrs. Speicher if there was a way to give a comparative for the expenses that a group of employees had annually required when they were going to whichever pharmacy they wanted and then they were directed to Walmart. Mrs. Mitrick stated that on the payables prescriptions filled at other places show the expense to be so much higher. Mrs. Mitrick questioned how beneficial it is for the Township that we have steered this toward Walmart.
- SPEICHER** Betty Speicher responded that it is the Teamster group, which goes to Walmart. Prior to the Township having an agreement with Walmart, they did not have a prescription plan.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that that may have been an oversight for the Supervisors when they were going through negotiations in the recent past, and Mr. Amic was going to look into that regarding prescriptions.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated a contract amendment may be possible for that because it doesn't damage the bargaining unit any.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri questioned the sewer fund on page 6, York Township meter. GPU Energy is expensive compared to the other ones, and he asked whether that is a normal figure for a month.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the figure is normal for a monthly charge.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE REGULAR PAYABLES SHOWN IN THE PAYABLE LISTING OF 2/25/99 FROM A. THROUGH F. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

**A. Quote to Demolish Wastewater Barn – Under One Roof - \$2,900**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented with regard to demolishing the barn at the Wastewater Treatment Plant. Buchart-Horn has done a study relating to rebuilding or demolishing this barn. Demolishing the barn was offered for bids and the low bid received was \$2,900. Under One Roof has a market for the material in the barn.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether Under One Roof had adequate insurance to cover their work.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the bid specifications contained the insurance requirements. Also included in the specifications were items that were below ground to be removed.

**NOEL** Mr. Jim Noel agreed with Mr. Amic's statement about the insurance requirements. He stated that Mr. Sowers and Mr. Kyle both had reviewed all bids received and made a recommendation based on the review of all bids.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that, "Section 30 in Specification Bonds of Insurance calls for minimum combined single limit for both personal injury and property damage in \$1,000,000 each occurrence." Mr. Amic stated it also calls for performance bonds. Mr. Amic recommended acceptance.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost commented that a ‘certificate of insurance’ won’t be available until they are awarded a contract. It is a condition of award that they provide the ‘certificate of insurance.’

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO ACCEPT THE QUOTE AND AUTHORIZE THE REMOVAL OF THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY BARN TO UNDER ONE ROOF IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,900. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that the Historic Preservation did get all the documentation that they wanted.

**B. Three and one half (3-1/2) Ton Dump Truck – Permission to Draw Specifications and Advertise Replacement**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated the Public Works Director requests that specifications be drawn to replace a 1988 one ton dump truck with a new 3-1/2 ton truck. Cost for replacement is estimated at \$55,000 which amount is included in the capital improvements fund and is a liquid fuels item. Mr. Amic recommends this request to proceed with specifications and advertising for bid.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE PERMISSION TO DRAW SPECS AND ADVERTISE FOR A 3-1/2 TON TRUCK. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Defective Antenna and “T” Line – Permission to Draw Specifications and Quote**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated the Public Works Director is asking for permission to replace the antenna and two-way power line that provides service for Public Works, Wastewater, Fire, and Police. This matter was a “not to exceed cost” of \$2,500. Mr. Amic requested permission to quote and accept the quote of not more than \$2,500. This was also a liquid fuels item included in the 1999 capital improvement budget.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck clarified that the intent would be, if the quotes were within what was moved, Mr. Amic would go ahead and make the purchase.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that to be correct.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT THE BOARD AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO DRAW SPECIFICATIONS AND SOLICIT QUOTES FOR THE TWO-WAY RADIO SYSTEM ANTENNA AND LINE. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Quote Software Systems, Inc. – Phase II – Financial Upgrade Not to Exceed \$39,805.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that this item covers the purchase of the 4GL Unix software for the present system. Mr. Amic apologized to the Board for not inviting them to the demonstration/seminar regarding this equipment. Mr. Amic further stated that the software system being proposed is a compatible system and will be compatible with the systems being placed elsewhere within the Township. Mr. Amic stated that, if the Board wished to look at other vendors for software, that could be accomplished; however, time is of the essence and costs would most likely be higher.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what Mr. Amic's level of comfort is with the recommended software package, i.e., whether the package will do what the Township requires.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided several examples of what the package will do indicating it will do all that and more. He indicated he has a strong comfort level and recommended its purchase. A large portion of the cost of this will provide training for the in-house MIS person, which will eliminate billing for service people to maintain our system.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that about \$21,000 of the \$39,000 cost is their labor. Mr. Schenck cautioned that this project be managed carefully in order to eliminate any additional charges, such as re-engineering services.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he intended to manage the project in the same manner as any other engineering projects and will stay on top of this.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether this software system is the same integrator as always.

**SPEICHER** Mrs. Speicher responded that the name of the software is MUNIS software; the company which developed MUNIS software is the Computer Center. They are changing their name to MUNIS. Software Systems is the distributor. Mrs. Speicher commented that there will be no need to re-invent the wheel. All the present files can be converted as a migration with this system.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the migration will cost \$10,200.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT THE BOARD AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE OF THE MUNIS FINANCIAL SOFTWARE SYSTEM AND SERVICES AS**

**QUOTED BY SOFTWARE SYSTEMS, NOT TO EXCEED \$39,805. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick altered the agenda at this point, inasmuch as Mr. Amic was not feeling well, in order that he could finish his reporting to the Board.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic informed the Board that he attended the Longstown Interceptor meeting with the York County Planning Commission. York, Windsor and Springettsbury Townships are all concerned about this matter. Engineering studies have been completed projecting the townships in the next 10-20 years. Mr. Amic will report fully at a later date, but indicated that the concerns about the traffic problems in Springettsbury Township will get dramatically worse. Within 10 years nearly every intersection on Mt. Rose Avenue will be designated an "F" intersection. The growth in Windsor Township will put an additional 20,000 automobiles per day at the major intersections. Mr. Amic will provide comments as to the engineering studies. Another meeting will be held in 30 days.

Mr. Amic also attended the Regional GIS meeting which included all the municipalities surrounding the City of York to discuss the Regional GIS system. The expense of the first two phases went from \$82,000 to \$94,000. Phase I and Phase II items will be provided in Mr. Amic's next report. Total cost of the project could be \$1 million. Some municipalities have committed to Phase I, which is photography, and for Springettsbury it means about \$14,000. Phase II will be more expensive. Phase III will be extremely high. Mr. Amic has requested all the directors in Springettsbury Township provide their needs, which he is reviewing. Some municipalities have budgeted some money toward the project. Mr. Amic is in the process of reviewing the cost benefit to Springettsbury.

Mr. Amic also commented that with regard to the consulting attorneys he will discuss that in a private session.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the county was involved in the GIS meeting.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the County Planning Commission, from the tone of the letter that was passed from Mr. Dunn, was not exceedingly encouraging. The County Planning Commission was not involved at all. Mr. Amic is in the process of quantifying the things they can provide and how it relates to what this system provides.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned why two agencies should have the same system to serve the same area. Mr. Schenck is not opposed to going into the system, but would encourage only one, instead of a duplication of effort.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he is concerned about duplication and the speed with which it is moving.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that the county needs to contract with the city.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed but thought Mr. Amic was on the right track when he reviewed the cost benefit.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated this will take some work and thought on his part. The York City Sanitary Authority is not front ending this project. Mr. Amic will review what benefit Springettsbury will receive from its contributions.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented on the matter relating to the upcoming traffic problems that are expected. She stated that with anticipation of the traffic situation, Springettsbury needs to get the flags up to our Representative and Senator and advise them of our concern, particularly since Springettsbury will be sitting in the center of the traffic flow.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that at each meeting when developers come in, one of the main concerns is what to do with the traffic. Springettsbury is logistically located in a by-pass. The sister communities continue to develop, and we get the traffic as it moves.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri pointed out that Stan Saylor is having a meeting on March 5<sup>th</sup>. A representative of the Board should attend and advise him what our problems are.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he intended to go to that meeting. He encouraged the Board to advise Stan Saylor about this matter. Senator Armstrong and Todd Platts know about it.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that Mr. Amic could be excused for the evening at this time.

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Planning Module – North Hills Elementary – A3-6957-292-3-632 GPD**

**STERN** Mr. Stern commented on the Planning Module for North Hills Elementary School for 632 gallons per day. Approval was received from DEP for the

change in the Chapter 94 report for this transfer. Mr. Stern recommended approval.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE PLANNING MODULE A3-6957-292-3-632 GPD. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Subdivision 98-07 Anderson/Snyder – Granting Extension to (6/1/99).**

**STERN** Mr. Stern recommended item B as stated.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED THAT THE BOARD ACCEPT THE GRANT OF AN EXTENSION OF SUBDIVISION 98-07 ANDERSON/SNYDER TO 6/1/99. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Land Development 97-19 Burger King/Two Ton, Inc. – Granting Extension to (6/28/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern presented LD 97-19 requesting granting an extension of time to June 28, 1999. Mr. Stern pointed out that Burger King has a new civil engineer.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACCEPT THE GRANTING OF EXTENSION FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT FOR BURGER KING TWO TON, INC. TO 6/28/99. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI VOTED NO.**

**D. Subdivision 98-05 Burger King/YGL – Granting Extension to (6/28/99)**

**STERN** Mr. Stern presented SD 98-05 which encompasses a small plot of land.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether this land would be used as an access.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated no; it is a small space at the rear of the property.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT THE BOARD ACCEPT THE EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SUBDIVISION 98-05 TO JUNE 28, 1999 TO BURGER KING/TWO TON, INC. AND YGL PARTNERS. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI VOTED NO.**

**E. Subdivision 99-01 North Hills Elementary School.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern explained that during the Land Development process, it was determined that there are multiple parcels at North Hills Elementary School. The property lines go through the building. A Subdivision is being completed to combine these parcels into one parcel to eliminate property line problems. The Planning Commission recommends approval with waivers and conditions. A waiver from submitting a preliminary plan; and waiver from requirement to submit a sewer and water feasibility study.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked if there were any concerns.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that initially when this was reviewed by the Planning Commission, bonding for any required improvements would remain until the Land Development Plan attached to the financial portion be completed. No field work was completed regarding this subdivision. The property has not been surveyed. Mr. Luciani assumed that corners would be set to define the 17 acres, and at that point it had been requested that they be released from setting the corners. Mr. Luciani pointed that out for consideration before it would be rolled into the Land Development Plan.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that he had addressed that in his February 17 memo.

**YOST** Mr. Yost stated that he had no problem with waiver. Yes, it would be nice if the corners were marked, but he did not see this as a significant problem. The other matter which they requested a waiver is of any necessity to file a bond with the township, and Mr. Yost had no problem with that.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that the waiver does go with the Land Development.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated yes.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that the waiver of setting corners is required at either point and he assumed they would be setting them in the Land Development. However, the school indicated that they did not want to set the corners and justify the expense of surveying the tract, etc.

**RUTH** Attorney Tim Ruth spoke for the Central York School District. The situation was that the school was not convinced that there was a reverse subdivision plan required. However, they felt there was not a serious problem to comply. The deeds into the tracts, of which there are three, have been in existence in their current situation for over 30 years. There are no improvements or subdivisions on any tract. They are simply confirming the three deeds comprise the entire tract which is owned by the

school district as one parcel, which is confirming the facts as they have existed and the facts as they will exist in the future. There was no need to go out and mark the corners of where the property is; the property has been in that configuration for 30 years. There has been some change as the result of the widening of Route 30 in terms of the condemnation at that point, but the plan in existence was done in 1989. The marking of corners of the tract would have required substantial expense in having it re-surveyed. The feeling was that there was no real purpose served in that except further expenditure of tax payers funds. There was no harm done and no violation of the sense of the subdivision and land development ordinance in requesting a waiver from having the corners marked.

**YOST** Mr. Yost added that no one is aware of any boundary disputes.

**RUTH** Attorney Ruth stated that there have been no issues. No adjoining owner had raised any issue to the school. One area where there could be an issue relates to the home that is surrounded on three sides by the property, but none exists at this time.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani appreciated the concern for compliances; however, when roadwork is done, there is a need to define where the roads to the properties are. The adjoining homes are surrounded by school district property. As a contractor, there is a need to know where the corners are prior to starting work.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Luciani whether that becomes Springettsbury's problem or the school district's problem.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that it is a matter between the school district and the adjoining property owner.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost agreed. Monumentation from the Township's point of view does nothing more than resolve conflict between adjoining property owners.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that building setbacks and landscaping are always set off of property lines.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION 99-01 FOR NORTH HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:**

- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN; AND;**

- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A SEWER AND WATER FEASIBILITY STUDY.**

**MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**F. Land Development 98-05 North Hills Elementary School**

**STERN** Mr. Stern reported that this item provided for two additions covering approximately 13,000 sq. ft. for classrooms on the west side of the building. A temporary classroom trailer had been previously approved. A second small addition toward the front of the building includes the kitchen area, the parking lot and the house surrounding the parking lot mentioned in Item E; it also included some reworking of the parking lot, bus lane and fire lane areas. The trailer will be removed when the addition is completed. Planning Commission recommended approval of this Land Development including waivers and conditions provided in Mr. Stern's 2/17/99 memo. Mr. Stern indicated their engineer, Tom Harbert, was present.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Luciani to explain the detention pond issue.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that the coverages used were accurately represented; storm water calculations are accurate. Mr. Luciani favorably recommended this waiver.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned why a waiver is needed.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that in the initial review, the engineer requested a waiver of that condition. Mr. Luciani indicated he was comfortable with granting the waiver.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated, for clarification, that a waiver is a requirement to actually do the stormwater study to be sure the existing pond is adequate.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani stated that their engineer had done an actual stormwater study.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck requested further clarification of the plan as presented for a complete understanding.

**HARBERT** Mr. Harbert provided clarification of the lines shown on the drawing and stated the reasons for them. He additionally stated that some corners will be set prior to work being done. Contact will be made with the property owner next to the parking lot to be clear about the work in progress.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked where the flow of traffic for the parked autos would be.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded as to where the bus loading is done and added that a traffic person is on duty.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she read that the Fire Chief had reviewed this plan.

**HARBERT** Mr. Harbert indicated the Fire Chief had no problems.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked about landscaping plans.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated this plan had been discussed.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF LAND DEVELOPMENT 98-05 FOR NORTH HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS AND CONDITIONS:**

- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN;**
- **WAIVER FROM SUBMISSION OF FINANCIAL SECURITY TO THE TOWNSHIP;**
- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO SET PROPERTY CORNER MARKERS;**
- **WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO RE-ANALYZE THE DETENTION POND; AND CONDITIONED ON THE APPROVAL OF THE DETAILED LIGHTING PLAN PRIOR TO INSTALLATION OF ANY NEW LIGHTS.**

**MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND.**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned DEP approval for the sewer module.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated there is DEP approval for the transfer of capacity and the change to Chapter 94. DEP cannot approve the planning module until after the Board approves it.

**MR. STERN ADDED THE FOLLOWING CONDITION TO HIS MOTION:**

- **CONDITIONED UPON THE APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING MODULE BY DEP.**

**MOTION CARRIED. MR. PASCH ABSTAINED AS HE WAS TEMPORARILY OUT OF THE ROOM.**

**G. Request for Waiver from Completing Land Development – York Mall/THF Realty**

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that this item requested a waiver from completing a Land Development Plan. The York Mall is presently under construction. Mr. Stern had been meeting with Al Mers, and through the process the Township understood certain things were to happen and some things have changed. Early on they had been informed that Land Development would not be required as long as the renovations to the mall remained within the footprint of the existing mall. Until Walmart finalized their architectural drawings, the Township was unaware that there are a few minor additions to the footprint of the mall. There is an addition to the vestibule in front of Walmart; there is an addition of an uncovered, open garden center area. Parking was shown. Had it not been for the addition of the vestibule, there would be no need for this waiver. Mr. Stern recommended approval.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Stern whether the basic information is that the square footage, the parking required, etc. is staying the same or being reduced. Mr. Pasch added that there is very little difference in terms of the key elements involved. Mr. Pasch did not see any problems.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked about the garden center and requested clarification as to where it was shown.

**STERN** Mr. Stern indicated some driveways would be shifted. Mr. Stern introduced Mr. Al Mers of THF Realty, owners of the mall and E. F. Stone from Wolverton & Associates, the engineer for the project.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned the need for the 'jog' in the traffic pattern.

**MERS** Mr. Mers responded that the 'jog' is there because the garden center area is being extended.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked Mr. Stern whether there would be a concern with internal traffic flow.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that to be correct to some degree, but added that it was not a public intersection.

**MERS** Mr. Mers commented on enlarging the garden center, which should help to keep the merchandise contained.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked regarding the garden center whether there would be a way it could be reconfigured to avoid that jog. Mrs. Mitrick stated it could be dangerous and appeared to complicate matters. She asked whether there would be a way of extending it further along the building

rather than bringing it out into the traffic pattern. She stated that there is a lot of traffic there.

**STONE** Mr. Stone stated it would be difficult for him to speak without first discussing it with Walmart. He indicated he would do that.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that would help Home Depot. He felt that it would be a problem and pointed out that motorists would have a difficult time seeing traffic coming.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the matter does not resolve her concern. She requested that they look at revising the garden center extension extending it to the east.

**STONE** Mr. Stone could not offer an immediate solution, but he offered to review the matter.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that what is needed is an approval.

**MERS** Mr. Mers asked John Luciani if the intersection were to stop traffic on three sides, whether some of the conflict and turning problem would be alleviated.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded no and continued that the alignment concern was a valid one.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that, even if a Land Development Plan were done, no Ordinances are in effect that deal with internal flow.

**MERS** Mr. Mers indicated they would pursue the difficulties diligently to get it done and added that timing was a big issue. Mr. Mers suggested that this be approved, conditioned upon their figuring something out as far as the 'jog'.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated he was in favor of approval conditioned upon something approved by the Board.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that Walmart uses the parking lot as an extension of the store. Mr. Schenck asked whether that was an issue between Walmart and the Township or the developer.

**MERS** Mr. Mers responded that, in his opinion, it would be between Walmart and the Township.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated Walmart should be made aware that the township expects their garden center to be enclosed in the garden center, not spilling into the parking lot.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that, in the past, the Township has been looking the other way, but with this extension will not be doing that.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated she had requested Mr. Yost to give some input on this to provide some comfort level.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that what had been requested was a waiver of the process. By the same token, the Township cannot accept this as a "Land Development Plan." Mr. Yost suggested that if the Board would be inclined to grant the waiver, the waiver should be conditioned upon the developer developing the project in accordance with the plans which they had presented to the Township. Mr. Yost further directed that it would identify them including the renovations with and conditioned upon trying to amend the traffic flow for the driveway and come up with a satisfactory plan to address the traffic movement at the south end of the store. At the conclusion of the project they would be directed to file as-built drawings with the Township, previously offered in their letter.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned Mr. Yost about the process, i.e., the Board would still technically be waiving Land Development.

**YOST** Mr. Yost responded yes as to waiving the requirement to submit a Land Development Plan for approval. However, the waiver should be conditioned upon the developer completing the project in accordance with the plans that they have presented and that they abide by all other Ordinances of the township and submit as-built drawings at the conclusion of the project.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether this plan, as it was presented, would not meet with any current Ordinances.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it does not meet with the Land Development Ordinance only in that it doesn't show the items required for processing.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Yost, if the permits are granted, what would happen if something sways in our Land Development requirements.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded that the Township probably could not impose a Land Development requirement, but if something needed to be corrected that is not shown on the plans or look like the plan, we would revoke the permit. The waiver will have been granted based on their constructing the

project in accordance with the site plan and the elevations. The Township has essentially the same thing if it had gone through the Land Development process. Mr. Yost was pleased to see the elevations because those can be made a part of the waiver. Building Code requirements will still have to be met.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS GRANT THE REQUEST TO WAIVE THE LAND DEVELOPMENT FOR THE EXPANSION TO THE WALMART STORE AND THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE YORK MALL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- **THAT THE PLANS SUBMITTED AS OF 2/25/99 IDENTIFIED AS C-1 DATED 1/26/99, SHEET LL2 DATED 2/23/99, AND SHEET A2 DATED 2/8/99 BE THE PLANS THAT THE PROJECT IS DEVELOPED ACCORDING TO WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT THE INTERNAL DRIVEWAY ALIGNMENT BE CHANGED AND MEET THE APPROVAL OF THE TOWNSHIP;**
- **IN ADDITION, THIS WAIVER DOES NOT EXCUSE THE APPLICANT FROM ANY OTHER REQUIREMENTS OF TOWNSHIP ORDINANCES THAT MAY BE ASSOCIATED WITH LAND DEVELOPMENT;**
- **AND THAT A FULL SET OF AS-BUILT DRAWINGS BE SUBMITTED TO THE TOWNSHIP AT THE COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT.**

**YOST:** Mr. Yost requested the following be included in this motion:

- **ALSO INCORPORATE THEIR LETTER TO THE TOWNSHIP DATED 2/15/99.**

**MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND.**

**BISHOP:** Mr. Bishop suggested that a condition be added to the motion that:

- **THE DEVELOPER AGREE TO NOTIFY WALMART OF SPRINGGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP'S NEW REGULATIONS WITH RESPECT TO OUTDOOR STORAGE AND SALE, PARTICULARLY IN THEIR PARKING LOT OF GARDEN MERCHANDISE.**

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that she read of the possibility that consideration is underway to change the name of the mall.

**MERS** Mr. Mers indicated the new name would be York Commons.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that, from history, another mall in the area changed its name, and when people asked where it was, residents continue to refer to its original name.

**H. Request for Waiver from Completing Land Development –  
York County/Pleasant Acres**

**STERN** Mr. Stern provided information regarding waiving Land Development for a 1500 sq. ft. addition of the Pleasant Acres Hospital and Home to the dietary kitchen area. Mr. Stern introduced Tom Connelly of C. S. Davidson to represent this request and provide the drawings. This new development will be an area tucked in between a few buildings.

**CONNELLY** Mr. Connelly informed the Board that the York County Home received a recommendation to make their kitchen area more efficient and as a result plan to expand the area. A sketch was provided to the Board of this plan. The expanded area will cover what had previously been paved.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that York County Planning approved the waiver.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani pointed out a few concerns regarding the traffic flow. He reviewed architectural standards regarding parking and traffic and does not believe there is adequate room for vehicle traffic.

**CONNELLY** Mr. Connelly commented that only a few staff members and not the general public would utilize the area of concern to Mr. Luciani.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned the availability of emergency access and asked Chief Flohr whether he had reviewed this project.

**FLOHR** Chief Flohr reviewed the drawings with the Board. He reassured the Board that the Fire Company's access is through the main entrance and they would have to back out if it were necessary to access the area under consideration.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Luciani a question relating to covering the gas line and whether it affects any of Springettsbury's Building Codes.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded with a question to Mr. Connelly as to whether that would be a problem.

**CONNELLY** Mr. Connelly indicated this would be constructed all within the Building Codes and with the gas company's requirements. He added that with regard to the storm sewer they would probably replace that with concrete.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned Chief Flohr whether he believed there is adequate access with the facts in mind there is a dietary center on one side and laundry on the other.

**FLOHR** Chief Flohr indicated there would be adequate access into any of the areas in question both from the Springettsbury Station and from the Commonwealth Station.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR WAIVER FROM COMPLETING LAND DEVELOPMENT OF YORK COUNTY/PLEASANT ACRES CONDITIONED UPON SITE PLAN C1 OF 1 DATED 2/16/99. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**I. Transfer of Sewer Capacity – 3 EDU’s – 1,050 Gallons from Meadowlands to Concord Road**

**STERN** Mr. Stern presented the above item for transfer of sewer capacity, 3 EDU’s – 1,050 gallons from the Meadowlands to Concord Road Associates facilities. Mr. Stern indicated Paul Francis had previously provided an overview. Paperwork had been provided as well. Mr. Stern explained where the different sites are located. Lot 4D are the colonial buildings that are to be surrounding Nutec’s barn on Concord Road, which had been approved in December of 1997. Each of the buildings had a certain number of tenants based on an estimate by Kinsley. The buildings were not built, so the previously approved EDU’s are not being used. They are asking to move some of those EDU’s because they have several tenants for other facilities, tenants which cannot move in because the Ordinances require at least one EDU for each entity. The other facilities are Building D of the Concord Road Associates facility. They also propose to submit a Land Development Plan for Building E for which they would need at least one EDU. The third EDU is for the other Concord Road facility, which is the old Sears warehouse building on Industrial Highway, which was recently renovated. There is one tenant there now; 3 tenant spaces vacant as they don’t have capacity. They have secured a tenant for the empty space. Mr. Stern recommended that the vacant spaces be used rather than having its use tied up in vacant land.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis stated that he had come before the Board in 1997 with an attempt to decide what types of buildings should go into the Meadowlands. He explained the proposed use. It was decided to place some professional office space there as well. An industrial space is leasing, which is prompting the potential building at Concord Road as well as the Sears building which is a different case. One EDU was associated with that. Some additional capacity was available in December of 1997.

There are two additional spaces which they would like to transfer, as well as the pre-paid tap to our facility. All the capacities are included in Chapter 94. As the capacities are transferred, they are asking for a transfer of the EDU's from one owner to the same owner of another facility.

- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that, even though he was not in attendance at the last meeting, it seemed from his reading of the Minutes that ownership was a big issue.
- YOST** Mr. Yost stated that the Kinsley family does not own everything.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that Solicitor Yost is clearly correct, that these are not the same owner; on the other hand, I don't have a problem with that in this situation personally; it's essentially the same owner, although it technically is not.
- YOST** Legal ownership is held in different names and in different partnerships.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that this land is owned by a family and in a group with which the Board is familiar.
- STERN** Mr. Stern clarified that the EDU's are not pre-paid taps; they are actually permits that have previously been issued.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the letter from Pat Kinsley stated that he is an authorized benefactor.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Stern how there is control going from three tenants to two tenants or two to one if the tenant now takes up all the space that was in that building. It had been his understanding that the sanitary discharged is caused by bodies and not by number of tenants.
- STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the Township Ordinance requires that regardless of how much capacity is actually used, a minimum of one EDU must be available. Building D will have three tenants if the transfer is approved. They must have at least three EDU's and even though they will only be using one EDU, three must be allocated.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked about the one from which the EDU's are being transferred.
- STERN** Mr. Stern stated that Lot 4D, which is different, a condition needs to be placed on the approval because building plans were submitted showing separate tenants. If any two of the EDU's are removed from that building,

then they can't have three tenants in that building. Since these are offices, the chances of one tenant utilizing over 350 gpd is remote.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost added that each of the tenants is required to have a sanitary facility.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO TRANSFER THE SEWER CAPACITY OF 3 EDU'S 1,050 GPD FROM MEADOWLAND TO CONCORD ROAD CONDITIONED UPON CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND PERMIT THAT LOT 4D MUST BE MODIFIED TO SHOW ONE TENANT ONLY IN ITS BUILDING AND ONE IN BUILDING 2. KINSLEY MUST AGREE NOT TO OCCUPY MORE THAN ONE OF THE TENANT SPACES WITHIN EACH BUILDING 1 AND BUILDING 2. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that an evening seminar will be held on April 28, "Working with Your Volunteer Fire Co." in Lebanon, Pa. Content of the course covers background of fire emergency services, municipal responsibilities, training of firemen, fire services in the 90's and beyond, working together, etc. Chief Flohr will plan to attend.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that he attended a meeting of the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. There will be a parade held on August 29<sup>th</sup> with fire department apparatus, a car from the police department and the committee recommended that the Supervisors either walk or ride in the parade.

**Consensus of the Board was to participate and ride in the parade. Mr. Gurreri will submit this information to the committee.**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Committee provided some ideas for participation. There are 26 to 28 concerts planned, and during those concerts speakers promoting the Township, history, etc. will speak for about 10 minutes. There was discussion about having bus tours. The group, Re-creation, will perform in July, which is the biggest promotion. The Committee would like to have a community picnic and invite all service clubs to participate. Mr. Gurreri requested the Board's blessing.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that anytime community groups work together, it benefits the community. He was in favor of this action.

**Consensus of the Board was to proceed as Mr. Gurreri recommended.**

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that the Board had been invited to tour the York County Prison Friday, February 26 between 1 and 5 p.m. Mrs. Mitrick asked whether Mr. Amic would attend.
- BOWDERS** Mrs. Bowders indicated that it was on his calendar.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Chief Eshbach whether he planned to attend.
- ESHBACH** Chief Eshbach indicated the York County Police Chiefs also have a meeting coming up and will meet at the prison and tour the facility during that time.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that it is important that someone from Springettsbury attend.
- BOWDERS** Mrs. Bowders indicated that she would follow up.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick publicly recognized that Mr. Mark Levin, a resident of Springettsbury Township will be doing his Eagle Scout Project in Kingston Park. This Board has encouraged activities of this nature, and Mrs. Mitrick was very pleased that Mark Levin had selected Springettsbury in which to do this project.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported for informational purposes, she had a problem with York Waste where they somehow had not picked up the recyclables. She telephoned and was extremely pleased with the public relations; the gentleman was very polite and stated that someone would be out by 8 a.m. the next morning, and they were.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick complimented Mr. Stern on the excellent Work Session. Unfortunately, not all Board Members were able to attend; however, the session was well worth the effort. She was very pleased to read the letter to Senator Armstrong about traffic concerns in Springettsbury Township.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that a few letters had been received from residents, employees and volunteers regarding Township matters. Mrs. Mitrick had responded to those letters with telephone calls.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated that on the 19<sup>th</sup> of February Messrs. Stern, Amic and she met with Representatives from the Hawk's Gunning Club regarding a proposal that they may be bringing forward. They came to mend wounds that had occurred with a communication which had gone out to their membership regarding lack of good communication with the Township. This was a very positive meeting.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that some time ago the Board met with the attorney for the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Bishop was unable to attend that meeting; however, there was a need to close the loop between what was learned then and what members of the staff need to know from that meeting.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck agreed with Mr. Bishop and indicated the need to share what was ascertained from that meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that any issues that needed discussion could be brought forward at the Executive Session.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reported on the Emergency Services Commission which met earlier during the month of February. The Subcommittee is putting together some ideas on possible reorganization. Progress had been made with Chief Eshbach's help. The basic concept was to create one new organization that would basically become an umbrella organization and have three organizations that represent the two volunteer fire companies and the ambulance company that will still exist in some form as legal entities. A concept had been developed for discussion with Mr. Yost in two weeks to figure out how to make that work.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri added that he had been on that committee and could not make the meeting. Chief Eshbach took his place. Mr. Gurreri thanked Chief Eshbach for doing that.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost apologized for not providing a written report; however, he had been on vacation for the previous 10 days. Mr. Yost reported that the Livingstons continue to do everything possible to obstruct the extension of Pleasant Valley Road. The most recent act had been to file an appeal of the permit that was granted by DEP for the wetland encroachment. In Mr. Yost's opinion the appeal was filed late, and rehashed all of his real and imagined grievances setting forth letters from other people but nothing to do with the project, making derogatory remarks about Board members; indicating he was being mistreated by Springettsbury Township. Mr. Yost is having a difficult time being nice to Mr. Livingston, Jr. any more. He spoke with him personally and his wife on February 11<sup>th</sup> when he came up from the Carolinas to oppose the motion. He again reiterated to Judge Kennedy all of his grievance all of which Kennedy said had nothing to do with what is actually going on. The motion was granted. Mr. Yost tried to communicate at that time, but Mr. Livingston just indicated he wanted Springettsbury Township out of the picture.

Mr. Yost is having a problem with the constant falsehoods that are being published in court documents and appeals to the Environmental Hearing Board. His appeal was not timely filed, and the Township has filed a motion to dismiss it. He would anticipate that the Chief Counsel for DEP would file a similar motion.

Mr. Yost indicated he is not concerned about the permit at this point in time; but there may be another delay.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether Mr. Livingston can keep throwing things in to delay this project.

**YOST** Mr. Yost responded that it will come to a halt. A motion is pending before the court. He is resisting our request for a Writ of Possession so that we can occupy the property and build the road. Mr. Yost believes that will be resolved on March 8<sup>th</sup>. Even if the Encroachment Appeal is still pending as of that time, the Township would have the right to proceed from that point forward. Mr. Yost had asked the Judge to schedule a hearing to determine whether or not the Livingstons should not reimburse/pay Springettsbury Township for the cost and expense they have required to incur as a result of their vexatious and dilatory conduct. Mr. Yost believes that would be a good case. He is prepared to take them to a hearing, a fact known to the Livingstons. On his appeal of the encroachment permit, the only thing which has any validity is that DEP failed to publish notice of the issuance of the permit in the Pennsylvania Bulletin. The Motion to Dismiss had attached to it the page from the Pennsylvania Bulletin where it was in fact published on December 18, 1998. He had a telephone conversation with a DEP representative on December 9<sup>th</sup> who told him that the permit had been issued, which gave him actual knowledge and told him he would have to appeal the permit. He had 30 days from the date of the publication or actual knowledge. He is beyond both of those dates.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether the project can proceed if the appeal is dismissed.

**YOST** Mr. Yost stated that they can proceed as soon as the court gives a Writ of Possession, which he anticipates happening on March 8<sup>th</sup>.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Yost how long would he project that the delay would be.

**YOST** Mr. Yost responded that, if the matter would have to go to a hearing before the Environmental Hearing Board, it could be held up for another six months. Mr. Livingston does not want to talk about damages. He tells

us we've never offered him anything and what we have offered is outrageous. Mr. Yost will not rest until these issues are resolved.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the only course of action is legal course of action.

**YOST** Mr. Yost stated that it is and he has every intention of meeting tit for tat and keep going until it is resolved with no rest in between. No more Mr. Nice Guy!

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated it was unfortunate that it had to go to this point.

**YOST** Mr. Yost stated agreement and added that he would love to discuss this with the elder Mr. Livingston; however, there is no access.

**Police Rules of Conduct**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the Agenda calls for a Motion regarding the Police Rules.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost recommended the motion as stated in Paul Amic's memorandum of February 18<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Yost met with Chief Eshbach and a member of the bargaining unit with indications that they, too, are anxious to sit down as quickly as possible to resolve this.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that, based on Mr. Yost's recommendation, she wished to move forward with this motion.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT THE RULES OF CONDUCT FOR THE SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP POLICE DEPARTMENT ADOPTED BY THE BOARD ON AUGUST 27, 1998 BE REPEALED AND THAT THE POLICE DEPARTMENT RULES OF CONDUCT ADOPTED AUGUST 25, 1983 AS AMENDED BE REINSTATED CONDITIONED UPON AND EFFECTIVE WITH THE WITHDRAWAL BY THE POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE FILED BY IT AGAINST THE TOWNSHIP WITH THE PENNSYLVANIA LABOR RELATIONS BOARD RELATING TO THE RULES OF CONDUCT AND THAT THE SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION PROMPTLY ENTER INTO NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE APPROPRIATE TOWNSHIP OFFICIALS FOR THE PURPOSE OF RESOLVING THE OUTSTANDING ISSUES IN THE NEW PROPOSED RULES OF CONDUCT. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated he would notify the council of the adoption of that Resolution.

**9. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Ordinance 99-02 – Amending Article 17 Signs**

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that about a month ago a particular sign was brought to his attention on East Market Street which was not designed or installed in accordance with the way he thought the sign should be designed and installed under the new Sign Ordinance. The sign does meet the Ordinance. As a result Mr. Stern was requested to prepare an Ordinance that fixes that problem to eliminate this in the future.

Mr. Stern informed the Board that No. 1 in the Proposed Ordinance on that subject will probably not be completed with the action tonight. Unless an Ordinance is passed which is very specific concerning how a sign is to be built and the materials to be used, this cannot be achieved. However, earlier discussions with Mr. Yost revealed concerns about such an Ordinance that specifically identifies the design of signs.

Mr. Stern additionally indicated that No. 2 addresses a problem in the language dealing with V-shaped signs concerned in a particular case about what interior angle meant. In order to resolve that we've also specified exterior angle so that no matter how it is interpreted it must look exactly like the drawing

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked how long ago the new Sign Ordinance was approved.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it was approved in September, 1998.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that was less than six months ago. Mr. Gurreri questioned whether everytime this situation happens will there be a need to change the Ordinance. Mr. Gurreri reiterated that a lot of time and effort was spent on this issue, nearly two and a half years. Mr. Gurreri revealed his concern about how this appears if the Township changes it within six months. Mr. Gurreri was not in favor of removing the square footage of the signs.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the message area is what is being discussed.

**STERN** Mr. Stern continued that in Issue No. 2 there are language errors.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he would be against changing that part of the sign. Mr. Gurreri was in favor of making the sign look better.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she could possibly live with the size of the sign but then not giving some direction to the message area will lose any sort of

input on what that sign will look like. The information coming from the standard to look into is simply reducing the message area part of the sign, not the size of the sign itself. Mrs. Mitrick continued that reducing the message area, would require some sort of framing that aesthetically would be more pleasing. This was an issue when the Board addressed the Ordinance; this isn't coming up with something different.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated that the Board had approved that 16 sq. ft.; now we're going to take it away.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he had a problem with the process. The Board made a real big deal about having the Business Association involved in the process and getting their input. Mr. Bishop suggested that the first step would be to draft an Ordinance and send it to the Planning Commission and then get as many heads as possible involved with the process. Mr. Bishop cautioned against reacting to one sign and changing the Ordinance because of one sign. Mr. Bishop agreed with Mr. Gurreri's point about changing the Ordinance in six months. Mr. Bishop additionally stated that if it enhances the signs in the Township, he is in favor. The Business Association is here and wants to be a part of the process. Mr. Bishop stated that the Business Association agrees that there is still work to be done.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that he agrees with Mr. Bishop. Mr. Schenck indicated that there are two issues, one of which is perception that the Board would do something without the Business Association's input.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick had received a call from Tim Beaver, and she reassured him that the Business Association would be involved in the process.

**BEAVER** Tim Beaver responded that the Business Association does not disagree with what the Board is trying to do. Mr. Beaver also stated that the Business Association would take what's proposed to achieve that. Mr. Beaver recommended that if the Business Association and the Board spends some more time trying to iron out some of the details up front, then we'll move through the process a little better.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that when he reviewed the Business Association's letter, it indicated that the Association did not say it does not want change; it said you recognize that it can be tweaked a little.

**BEAVER** Mr. Beaver continued that any worthwhile effort will have some adjustments that have to be made. The Business Administration is not going to say that we made the most perfect Ordinance that there ever was.

The Association wants to continue to work with the Board to have a document that you're happy with and we're happy with.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that the message area could be reduced, and it could be a clear white Plexiglas from there out, which really would enhance the appearance.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that idea came from their session.

**BEAVER** Mr. Beaver stated that he is unsure whether there is understanding of what the problem is; everyone picks out a different thing.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she appreciated the input and presence of the Business Association. She continued that one of the reasons why this appeared on the agenda is that this is one of the tweaks for consideration and improvement.

**STERN** Mr. Stern recommended the two issues be separated so that No. 2 can be sent through the process.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that she would be in favor of moving that on.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated that to be just a clarification and definition, and he had no problem moving that forward. Mr. Schenck suggested setting up a meeting during the day with the Business Association and Andrew.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT THE BOARD DIRECT MR. STERN TO HAVE A WORK SESSION WITH THE BUSINESS ASSOCIATION TO DISCUSS THE ISSUES THAT ARE BEING ADDRESSED WITH RESPECT TO THIS SIGN IN AN A-O RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND TRY TO COME UP WITH SOME IDEAS THAT CAN IMPROVE THE ORDINANCE AND ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT HAVE COME FORWARD. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked that Mr. Amic be notified that a member of his staff had been directed in this way.

**STERN** Mr. Stern asked whether he could send No. 2 to the Planning Commission.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated he would like to understand if there is an enforcement issue that is a problem.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned the enforcement issue too.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that there is one particular sign, the first of the V-shaped signs to be installed. The particular developer's interpretation of interior was different from Mr. Stern's. The developer filled in that area and said there is no longer an interior angle. Technically Mr. Stern indicated that they had a point.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reiterated that technically they're correct.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that just because the developer challenged the Ordinance verbally, or however, they did it, doesn't make it right.

**YOST** Mr. Yost stated that the angle refers to the sign face. The sign has a face and has a back to it, not the structure, but there's a back to the sign. You still have that angle no matter what's filled in in the structure. The sign has an exterior and an interior face.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned whether the fact that we're doing this hinders our ability to enforce the Ordinance that is currently in effect with respect to signs that were built before we make any change. Is this an admission that our Ordinance was not clear.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that when the meeting is held with the Business Association that could be discussed.

**STERN** Mr. Stern's point with No. 2 is that there is concurrence.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated there is not much of an issue there.

**STERN** Mr. Stern wished to get that resolved.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether the Board could send a proposed Ordinance to the Planning Commission with big edits.

**YOST** Mr. Yost stated that Mr. Stern would be able to explain it.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED ORDINANCE 99-02 WE REFER SECTION 1, SUBSECTION 2 ONLY TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION SECTION THAT REFERS TO ARTICLE 17, SECTION 1704.11.B OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE FOR THEIR REVIEW. MR.SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. PASCH ABSTAINED.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that if the Ordinance is unclear, then the benefit goes to the applicant.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck suggested that Mr. Stern test whether the function is correct to let it go through the process. The appeal would be made to the Zoning Officer, who is Paul Amic.

**YOST** Mr. Yost stated that Mr. Stern, as deputy, issues the enforcement notice, and the remedy from the enforcement notice is for the owner of the sign to request the hearing before the Zoning Hearing Board.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck was puzzled as to why Mr. Stern would not pursue a test if he was not sure he's right or not.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that it's not a matter of saying I can't think I'm right or not. Mr. Stern indicated that he must make a determination.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that Mr. Stern had made the determination that the sign is legal based on the Ordinance.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that it's not clear enough to give him the grounds to tell someone of a violation which must be corrected.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated he was not telling Andrew how to rule on a zoning issue.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated he was prepared and then the loophole was explained to him. He stated that he actually went to Bradley Academy and looked through the geometry books because he was sure he was right, but he couldn't prove that he was right. Mr. Stern stated that if he can't prove it to himself, he can't prove it to the Zoning Hearing Board.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that Mr. Stern should make the decision. Regarding the first item, she reiterated that Mr. Stern should meet with the Business Association and report back to the Board. Mrs. Mitrick asked Mr. Stern to please keep this moving as quickly as possible.

**BEAVER** Mr. Beaver stated that signs are somewhat subjective, and the Business Association knows there are concerns. He requested that if the Board could convey their concerns through Andrew, it would help to speed up the process.

**B. Resolution 99-22 – Re-establishing Capital Improvements Committee**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that this item was brought forward because of Mr. Bishop's concerns.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that, upon review of Mr. Amic's memorandum of the Capital Improvements Committee, he understood it better. He personally did not see a whole lot of value to the Capital Improvements Committee. Mr. Bishop stated he is not against the concept of citizen input into the process, but from his observation it had not been feasible for citizens involved in this committee to give any kind of realistic valuable input. Mr. Bishop stated that the Township has a good internal staff ability to bring forward this process, as well as a Board of Supervisors that have the ability to weigh the issues and to take staff input and make the right decisions. Mr. Bishop is not in favor of re-establishing the Capital Improvements Committee.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that not all members of the Board had information with regard to the issue.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether there is any requirement that states it must be in place.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated no.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated this Committee still functions under Resolution 88-11.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the Committee has not functioned as it had in the past for about two years.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned that it is still a legal entity but is not functioning.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED THAT ACTION BE TABLED ON RESOLUTION 99-22 AND AT THE SAME TIME DIRECT THE MANAGER TO PREPARE A PROPOSED ORDINANCE RESCINDING THE PREVIOUS ORDINANCE THAT ESTABLISHED THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE SO THAT BOTH ITEMS ARE AVAILABLE FOR DECISION TO PASS. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Resolution 99-23 – Disclosure Statement and Rules Governing Taxpayer Bill of Rights Administrative Appeals**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-23. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**Resolution 99-25 – Establishing the Historic Preservation Committee**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick brought forward a matter of the extension of the size of the Historic Preservation Committee. This Resolution is 91-25

establishing the Historic Preservation Committee. In this Resolution it says that the Committee is established as a five member citizen committee appointed by the Board. Mrs. Mitrick requested the Board to amend this Resolution to indicate that it would be a nine-member citizen committee appointed by the Board.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Yost how to handle an amendment to an existing resolution.
- YOST** Mr. Yost stated that rather than amending an existing resolution, a new Resolution should be established and then re-establish the Committee with nine members.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked if a motion is needed to have that drafted.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked why the need for nine members.
- MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick stated there are five now and they have several citizens that have come forward stressing interest and skills that would be very beneficial for this committee. They had asked that the size of the Committee be extended.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether by increasing the Committee 80% would increase the budget by 80%.
- MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated no and asked Mr. Yost how this matter should be handled.
- YOST** Mr. Yost recommended that the old Resolution be modified and re-stated as a motion.
- GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that he wondered what the Board was creating and commented that he had experienced so much difficulty in the York City.
- SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck assured Mr. Gurreri that the Board has no intention of creating a HARB Board in this Township.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING  
RESOLUTION 99-24 ESTABLISHING AN HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
COMMITTEE.**

- **WHEREAS, PRESERVATION OF HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT  
ELEMENTS OF THE ENVIRONMENT IS BENEFICIAL TO THE QUALITY  
OF LIFE IN A COMMUNITY, AND**

- **WHEREAS, CERTAIN HISTORIC FEATURES OF SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP HAVE ALREADY BEEN DESTROYED, AND**
- **WHEREAS, RESIDENTS OF OUR COMMUNITY HAVE A VESTED INTEREST IN ASSURING THAT REMAINING HISTORIC ELEMENTS OF THE TOWNSHIP ARE RETAINED FOR THE FUTURE BENEFIT OF ALL,**
- **NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT THE SPRINGETTSBURY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE IS ESTABLISHED AS A NINE (9) MEMBER CITIZEN COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE BOARD.**
- **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE FUNCTION OF THE COMMITTEE IS TO REVIEW THE ISSUE AND PRESENT RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF AN HISTORIC PRESERVATION POLICY FOR THE TOWNSHIP.**

**MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked whether each member needs to be re-appointed.

**YOST** Mr. Yost recommended that the five existing members be re-appointed, and appoint the four additional new members.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE RE-APPOINTMENT OF THE FIVE EXISTING MEMBERS OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF MR. JORDAN, MR. SOWERS, AND MS. STETS TO THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested Dori Bowders to notify the newly-appointed members to the Committee.

**10. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. Board of Supervisors Work Session – February 1, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION FEBRUARY 1, 1999. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. BISHOP ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**B. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – February 11, 1999**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 11, 1999 MINUTES AS AMENDED. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. SCHENCK ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri commented that in the January 28<sup>th</sup> Minutes, on page 16, he had requested a comment be placed in the Minutes regarding a lease back opportunity, which would save about 30%, over ¾ of a million dollars. Mr. Gurreri had indicated this would be worth looking at. In Mr. Gurreri's approved Minutes, this comment does not appear.

**ABREGHT** Ms. Abreght indicated she would double check her information and indicated she recalled inserting the comment.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she had received a letter from Carol Tanzola. The Historic Preservation Committee requested authorization to pursue the documentation of the Civil War Entrenchments found in Springettsbury Township. The property is on the market, and if this is sold, the documentation could be lost. Tom Shaffer, a historian who attended a meeting of the Historic Preservation Committee today, indicated that these entrenchments are historically significant and to his knowledge are the only entrenchments in York County. The Historic Preservation Committee has \$1500 in their budget which they would like to use toward this documentation.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether it is certain that it is an entrenchment.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether there is a second opinion.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated that Mark Shermeyer attended the same meeting of the Historic Preservation Committee with Tom Shaffer. Both gentlemen have visited the sites and claimed that the entrenchments were dug to protect the railroad bridge which crosses Codorus Creek. There are two other entrenchments on the other side of the creek.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that he is not opposed to this investigation but would like to see some diversion from the normal way of handling things, such as contacting someone from the National Park System or Gettysburg as a resource to confirm its authenticity.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick pointed out that Tom Shaffer is credentialed. He teaches historic preservation at the college.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch agrees with Mr. Schenck. If the entrenchments are a tremendous find and should be preserved, there are national groups which

would be very interested in this find. If there are artifacts there, a National Museum would be tremendously interested.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick responded that it was a concern of the Historic Preservation Committee that this area should not receive too much publicity at this time. The landowner always has the option to get in there and destroy it if too much attention is brought to his property. What the Historic Preservation Committee is hoping is that they can investigate this prior to the publicity and at least document it in case it's lost. The former owner of the quarry, Kline, was very interested in it and was thinking of contributing that piece of property to the Township as a historic site. He no longer owns the quarry. When someone learns that they have something that may hinder the sale of their property or bring increased trespassing to their property, that they might destroy it. Following documentation the Historic Preservation Committee is interested in taking it further.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the entrenchments are three depressions in the ground, and Tom Shaffer stated that, even if he took you there and pointed to them, you would not have any idea what it is; it's just dips in the ground. If the property owner doesn't want to take the chance of what might lay in those dips in the ground, all you have to do is drive over top of it and the dips are gone.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated he did not see anything wrong with the documentation if that's what the Historic Preservation Committee wants to do with their budget.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that they are working within their budget. Mr. Shaffer also stated that there were entrenchments in Hanover and Wrightsville, but they are all destroyed. This is very closely tied to black history in York County.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that the entrenchments were dug out by free blacks in Pennsylvania.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked for clarification that the money would be used to solidify that the entrenchments are there.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that what would be accomplished would be to give us photographs, surveys, definite official information. With the land owner's cooperation they would then see if they could see if they could push the historic preservation of it further. Mrs. Mitrick strongly recommended this action.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 25, 1999  
APPROVED**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated the intentions are correct, i.e., if it is truly a historical site they should be concerned with it. Mr. Schenck was not convinced that the Historic Preservation Committee or Mr. Shaffer is the person to determine that. Mr. Schenck stated there must be Civil War experts that could walk up there and confirm the entrenchments.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri agrees with Chairman Mitrick.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that if the Historic Preservation Committee is working with their budget and if there is some way that I can convince you of Mr. Shaffer's credentials, statements from him could be secured.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned whether they had considered contacting the National Park Service that really know about the Civil War.

**STERN** Mr. Stern stated that according to Mr. Shaffer the process is for the local area to identify it, document it and send what they know to the State Park Service.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO LET THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE USE A MAXIMUM OF \$1500 TO DOCUMENT THE CIVIL WAR ENTRENCHMENTS. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

There was no Old Business brought forward for discussion.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

There was no New Business brought forward for discussion.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 11:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 11, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Bill Schenck

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Mike Myers, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Mike Kyle, Director of Wastewater Treatment  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Chairman Mitrick announced that there would be an Executive Session following the Regular Meeting regarding legal and personnel matters.

**2. COMMUNICATION FROM CITIZENS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that this portion of the agenda is the time for citizens to state matters of interest to the Board.

**KNAUB** Mr. Jeff Knaub of 719 Academy Road, York, PA brought forth a matter regarding his property, which was purchased five years ago. Upon purchase his driveway entrance was blacktopped. Some months later the blacktop was removed and replaced with stones. For three years the Township works on the driveway entrance and removes the stones. Autos are bottoming and scraping coming into the drive.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 11, 1999  
APPROVED**

**LUCIANI** Mr. John Luciani indicated he had visited the property with Charlie Lauer about four months ago. There is a steep driveway with a defined gutter along one side of the street and their driveway is included. An adjustment had been made forcing water out into the street, which resulted in a complaint from a neighbor down the street indicating water was pouring into her home. There is a continuing problem. The Township should be sure that the water stays in the gutter. Mr. Luciani suggested that Mr. Knaub meet with Mr. Lauer and Mr. Luciani.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Mrs. Doris Flury, who lives in the house across the street from Mr. Knaub and down the grade, had telephoned perhaps half a dozen times, most recently a week ago. Messrs. Amic and Lauer visited her home. They had spoken with Mr. Knaub at that time. Mr. Luciani's statements are correct. When the gutter is changed, the water crosses the road and goes down into Mrs. Flury's home. Both parties have a problem. Mr. Amic and Mr. Luciani plan to visit the property again in an effort to correct the problem for both properties.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Amic when he would anticipate visiting the property.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that Ms. Bowders is scheduling a date with Mr. Luciani to proceed with this visit.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani indicated he would be available during the week of February 15, 1999.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Knaub to leave his phone number with Ms. Bowders.

**KNAUB** Mr. Knaub stated his phone number as 840-4744.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick indicated Ms. Bowders would advise Mr. Knaub of the scheduled visit.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called for other Communications from Citizens.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Paul Francis of LSC Design appeared representing Concord Road Associates and Kinsley Equities II Limited Partnership. Mr. Francis requested that the Board consider transferring three (3) EDU's from the Meadowlands property back to Concord Road Associates facility located on Concord Road. Mr. Francis indicated a plan to appear as an Agenda item at the next Board of Supervisors meeting; however, the schedule needed to be accelerated, which resulted in his appearance before the Board. When the Concord Road Associates project originally was being planned in 1995, 11 EDU's were allocated to the facility. This was a 4-

building complex. The Meadowlands project was being planned and the Board in December of 1997, transferred four EDU's from Concord Road over to the Meadowlands project, which was approved under Section 1893 E of the Township Code. A 40,000 square foot building presently is being planned to the rear of the Concord Road Associates facility, and requested Mr. Francis to obtain the transfer three EDU's to that facility prior to submittal of a Land Development Plan. A potential tenant is available for an existing building in the Concord Road facility, which will require one EDU. While it was not anticipated that one EDU was necessary, it is understood to be warranted, based on discussion with Mr. Stern, who advised the policy. The rationale is that Kinsley Equities II Limited Partnership and Concord Road Associates are all family companies with the same members being partners. Mr. Francis stated that he had not had the opportunity to provide this information to Solicitor Yost.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that Mr. Francis would like to have a decision made during this meeting; however, she also stated that she had not reviewed any material to date.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he had not reviewed anything either; however, there had been a meeting with Mr. Francis last Wednesday, but no information had been provided to him. Therefore, he could not recommend to the Board that this be done unless a conditional motion would be made subject to review by the Wastewater Director, management and a conditional review by the attorney.

**STERN** Mr. Andrew Stern stated that he and Mr. Kyle had reviewed this matter. As Mr. Francis pointed out, a few weeks ago this had been discussed at staff level, but a need became evident to speed it along for the tenant to move into existing space. This cannot take place because the Ordinance requires that there is at least one(1) EDU for each business entity. There are two tenants presently occupying quarters, one with no bathrooms and the other which has only a handful of employees. The Ordinance prohibits granting permits or occupancy certificates. The leases are scheduled to begin March 1.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Kyle if he was familiar with this situation.

**KYLE** Mr. Kyle responded that he was familiar with the matter and that Mr. Francis reviewed everything with him. Mr. Kyle assured the Board that everything is in order. All the statements made are correct. It is a matter of the Board's decision to allow the transfer, disregarding all other issues, which involve Mr. Stern and his permits. Mr. Kyle pointed out that allowing the transfer of those plumbing permits back to that property would allow that development to proceed, which was the original intent of the Board when the existing paid plumbing permits were extended through

June. This action would allow at least three of these permits to be used this year as opposed to having them expire in June. Mr. Kyle stated they had been accounted for in last year's Chapter 94 report, and this would be a positive move. Mr. Kyle's Wastewater staff recommended the action.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic asked Mr. Francis if he had any documents that state which lots would be transferred to which lots.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis indicated he could provide the documents.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he had not yet heard any real reasons for transferring the EDU's and stated that he preferred to review the matter more thoroughly.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis indicated he understood the Board's position and would be prepared to attend the next Board of Supervisors meeting as an agenda item. He asked that the Board's decision be accelerated.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch agreed with Mr. Bishop and commented that there probably would be no problem in allowing the transfer because it has been the Board's decision to do this type of transfer, especially when the same ownership is involved. Mr. Pasch indicated a need to insure the Solicitor and Board members that the ownership is the same. Mr. Pasch stated that until those assurances are met, he would not vote in favor of the transfer.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that matters of this nature are very sensitive for Springettsbury at this time. She also indicated that she would not anticipate any problems involved with granting this request.

**FRANCIS** Mr. Francis understood the need for the Board's review of the matter and indicated he would leave the documentation for this purpose.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn, Inc.**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Mike Schober reported that in preparation of the estimate to prepare contract documents for the utility water system, information had been provided to staff regarding the scope of this project. Mr. Schober will have an estimate for review early during the week of February 15 for consideration at the Board of Supervisors on March 25, 1999.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated the advertisement had been completed on the 537 Plans for action by the Board at the March meeting.

**SCHOBER** Mr. Schober responded that the 537 Plan would then be ready for adoption.

**B. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. John Luciani provided one brief update regarding the geotechnical work regarding the Municipal Building. The service contract appeared on the agenda for approval. Some of the preliminary work had been completed indicating no rock had been revealed. The budget for the basement portion is on target.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned the status of the Pleasant Valley Road soil samples.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that the concrete thickness was verified indicating there was no problem.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked specifically about whether the developer performs the maintenance on it.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that, as part of excavation, they had to remove all the vegetation from the embankment, and after a few rains the grass and vegetation wasn't re-established. There is a great deal of mud in the channel if you drive up and down Pleasant Valley Road. Prior to acceptance of that project, the contractor will be asked to clean that out in order to have a fresh start. At that point there should be no about run off filling in the storm pipes.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick also questioned an area on the other side of Pleasant Valley Road where "Lake Springettsbury" appears, and asked when this would be resolved.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that with any sedimentation basin such as the one in question, there is a need to keep several feet of water in a basin as a temporary measure in order to stabilize the area. The mud that washes into the basin settles, and clean water is skimmed off the top. Mr. Luciani stated that the work regarding the Kohl's project is completed, but all the seeding is not in place. The Target project has just begun. Mr. Luciani anticipates that "Lake Springettsbury" will be visible for another four or five months before final stabilization.

**C. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**HALBERT** Mr. Robert Halbert provided an update regarding the diversion pumping station and interceptor. Concerning Conrail, Charlie Myers, the Manager of the group, which reviews documents such as have been submitted, is

going through a transition. He is the only staff member versus a former staff of 27 people. Mr. Myers has agreed to provide the submittal for review by an outside consultant, Frederick R. Harris of Philadelphia. Mr. Halbert stated that Mr. Harris' review should help expedite approval, and R.K.&K. will respond to any comments they have to keep the matter on track.

Mr. Halbert reported on a second item submitted to Solicitor Yost concerning contract agreements for documents regarding easement acquisition properties. R.K.&K. is cooperating with York County Soil Conservation District, and documents have been submitted for review.

Mr. Halbert continued his report with regard to the schedule. The final design drawing and specs are due to the Township by the first week of March. That date is also R.K.&K.'s schedule for delivery to DEP for their permit application. Final documents will be submitted in the normal form to the construction grants group administered by the Corps of Engineers in Philadelphia in that same week. The project is on schedule. The project will be advertised for construction on or before May 1.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked how long construction would continue.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that the plan calls for one year.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether during that time there is a plan for contingencies.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that the pump station will be built in nine months.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that it would be necessary to cross the Codorus and through other obstacles. He questioned Mr. Halbert whether he still believes the project can be done in one year.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert reassured Mr. Pasch that the project would be complete in one year.

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

**A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 2/1/99**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick commented that during the past week Mr. Bishop was not feeling well and she came in and signed the checks. She provided a word of appreciation for the time Mr. Bishop spends to sign all of the necessary documentation.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he appreciated Chairman Mitrick's comment.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO PAY THE REGULAR PAYABLES DETAILED IN THE PAYABLE LISTING OF 2/11/99. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether the entire Accounts Payable would be voted upon with one motion.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that at the last meeting the Board approved a motion to pay items A. through D.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop suggested that the Board complete Item A, since a motion was already on the floor. The other three items were then covered with one motion.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that Mr. Mike Myers will be taking his place during the February 25, 1999 meeting.

- B. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Design Engineering – Progress Billing #6 - \$36,758.95.**
- C. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Overview/Mt. Zion Road – Progress Billing #1 - \$410.**
- D. Murphy & Dittenhafer – Architectural Design – Invoice #4 - \$13,077.70.**

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE PAYABLES LISTED UNDER ITEM #4 SHOWN AS B., C., D. BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

- A. Geotechnical Services – Rettew, Inc. – Municipal Building Site - \$3,950**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Item A related to geotechnical services regarding the Municipal Building. The quotes were taken in order to keep the project moving. Mr. Amic indicated he had authorized the low quote, and he requested ratification of his action. The work had been completed in the amount of \$3,950.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO RATIFY THE MANAGER’S ACTION IN RETAINING GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES OF RETTEW, INC. TO PREPARE THE MUNICIPAL BUILDING SITE WORK IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3,950. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- B. Aeration Technologies, Inc. – Check Valves and Membrane Kits - \$9,445**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic discussed a quote provided to the Wastewater Director to replace 900 membranes and check valves for the Treatment Plant aerobic digester from Aeration Technologies in the amount of \$9,445. This item appeared in the Capital Improvement Budget at \$8,000. The Wastewater staff indicated this to be a one single-source supply and requested permission to proceed with this, and Mr. Amic concurred.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned the term, “single-source supply” and asked for clarification.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that Aeration Technologies manufactures the equipment, as well as the replacement item.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether Aeration Technologies is the only place you can buy the replacement parts.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that they are the only manufacture who can supply the replacement item.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated then that there is no further requirement to bid.

**YOST** Mr. Yost indicated the amount is under the bidding amount of \$10,000.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE OF CHECK VALVES AND MEMBRANE KITS FROM AERATION TECHNOLOGIES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$9,445. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether it is a normal practice when facilities are being built in the sewage treatment plant, that the Township would tie itself into one supplier.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the manufacturer would simply be providing the same membrane replacement as was originally supplied.

**KYLE** Mr. Kyle responded that in this case the structure that allows for the application of that diffuser requires that that particular brand and style of diffuser be used, so it does tie us into that vendor. They sell these worldwide so they stay fairly competitive because they also market the structure that these diffusers are placed onto.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked the question whether the diffuser is a component that fits into a larger assembly, and Mr. Kyle confirmed that it was.

**C. LRM, Inc. – Chlorine Regulators - \$1,308**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Wastewater Director asked permission to purchase two chlorine regulators for a total amount of \$1,308. This item appears in the capital budget in the amount of \$3,800. Permission was requested to proceed to spend the capital money.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF CHLORINE REGULATORS FROM LRM, INC. FOR \$1,308. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Millcreek Interceptor Repair – Buchart Horn, Inc. - \$10,500**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided information regarding the Millcreek Interceptor Repair to the Board. This covers an ongoing effort to remove stormwater from the wastewater system. A quote had been received and approved by the Board; however, prior to signing a contract the contractor attempted to increase the price and would not warranty the work. The Wastewater staff then requested Buchart Horn review this matter. A different approach was suggested, i.e., to place a box over the interceptor and make the repairs. Their fee for this engineering work is \$10,500.

**KYLE** Mr. Kyle provided the Board with a few photographs to show the area. Mr. Kyle added that this item will be a shared cost with other municipalities.

**MR. PASCH MOVED TO APPROVE THE ASSIGNMENT OF THE MILLCREEK INTERCEPTOR REPAIR ENGINEERING TO BUCHART HORN IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,500. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

There were no Subdivisions and Land Developments brought forward under this item.

**7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick requested that Mike Kyle come forward. She announced that the Board of Supervisors had very mixed emotions regarding the fact that Mr. Kyle resigned from Springettsbury Township and will go to Roanoke, Virginia. The Township will miss him but realized the wonderful opportunity opened to him.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Mr. Kyle reading, *“To Michael A. Kyle in recognition of 19-1/2 years of faithful service to the Township in the Department of Wastewater Treatment, we hereby*

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 11, 1999  
APPROVED**

*acknowledge and extend our sincere thanks for your contributions affecting the successful operation of our Township.”*

Mr. Bishop stated that it is gratifying to the Township to know the quality of people who serve the Township and, unfortunately, Mr. Kyle’s loss would be greatly felt. Mr. Bishop thanked Mr. Kyle for his service and wished him good luck.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reiterated how much the Township will miss Mr. Kyle.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that on Wednesday, April 28, in Lebanon a seminar on fire service would be conducted. More information will be forthcoming.

Mr. Gurreri attended the Local Government Advisory Committee on January 27 on the Agility Program with PennDot, a program for traded services.

Mr. Gurreri reported that he and Mr. Pasch visited Shippensburg on January 30 for an interesting seminar. One item of interest was that other municipality board meetings last an hour and a half. Smaller townships than Springettsbury are involved. Mr. Gurreri reported that they have a Supervisor testify at all their Zoning Hearing Board meetings as a regular practice. The newsletter is used to educate the public. Windsor Township has 15 people who come in to help with zoning problems.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch added to Mr. Gurreri’s report on the Shippensburg seminar, that the seminar was very interesting, particularly with respect to the Zoning Hearing Boards. The Supervisors make sure they are represented at the Zoning Hearing Board meetings if there is going to be a controversy to advise the Zoning Hearing Board their thinking on a subject.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported that a few letters of interest had been received from gentlemen interested in the Historic Preservation Committee. Normal practice suggested that an opportunity be provided to meet with the gentlemen before appointment.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested this be done prior to the next meeting (2/25/99) since only one meeting will be held in March.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick called for this action to be held at 6:45 p.m. prior to the meeting on February 25, 1999. She asked Ms. Bowders to set up appointments with Mr. Jordan and Mr. Sowers.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 11, 1999  
APPROVED**

Chairman Mitrick also commented on the Library Report from Martin Library and stated that it was nice to see a consistent number of township residents are utilizing the library.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch suggested someone talk to Bradley, or put in the next newsletter to advertise it even more. Mr. Pasch stated that there are people who do not know it is available to them.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the library system included an insert in the newsletter scheduled for release the week of February 15, 1999.

Chairman Mitrick commented with regard to the lettering on police cars. The larger letters is an improvement and Springettsbury Township is more visible on the vehicles.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch agreed that it looked good.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that a memo had been received regarding portable toilets. She requested the Board review this matter in order to act and provide an opinion for the Park and Recreation Board.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that there is no problem with placement of portable toilets. He would like further information from the Park and Recreation Board as to where they wish to place them, i.e., the amount of use they project.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned what created the need for portable toilets.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated she believed the Panthers put one up and the public then stated the need.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic added that if children are there for some lengthy period of time and there are no facilities they have to get in their vehicles and go to another location.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reported Mrs. Fry contacted her regarding storm water problems along Route 30. She spoke highly of our Township Manager and the cooperation received from his office. Chairman Mitrick thanked Mr. Amic for his help.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop reported that the Emergency Services Commission met, and it was again reaffirmed to move forward with the idea of consolidating the two fire companies and the ambulance company. It was determined to develop a plan. Mr. Yost attended a meeting of the ESC and explained the legal intricacies of how things should proceed. A subcommittee was put together of people directly involved, who will draft a plan for

organization of the new group and how it would be governed, etc. The process is moving forward. Feedback is expected at the next meeting. Chief Eshbach was volunteered to help with that subgroup and has met with them. They are making progress.

**8. SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost reported two supplements to his written report both of which are in writing. The first dealt with Southern York County Sludge Ordinances. Mr. Yost stated that this was informational and required no discussion.

Solicitor Yost stated a second item dealing with police rules will require action of the Board. Solicitor Yost did not ask for action on this matter but recommended a motion at the February 25, 1999 meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick reiterated that Solicitor Yost would like this item on the agenda for the next meeting.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that he is preparing a Resolution on the Rules Governing Taxpayer Bill of Rights, following a discussion previously held with Solicitor Yost.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost also indicated that it was not too early to begin thinking who might be best designated as a Tax Review/Hearing Officer. Mr. Yost reported that there are three choices: the Board of Supervisors can act as the Appeal/Hearing body sitting in Executive Session; an appeal officer can be designated where you can appoint a Board of Appeals. Mr. Yost recommended a single Hearing Officer as opposed to the entire Board sitting as the appeal body.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that there is a movement on in the Manager's Association to appoint our legislators and senators as Hearing Officers.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated he had some Executive Session matters.

**9. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that on Friday, 2/12/99 he would be at DEP in Harrisburg for the purpose of the Environmental Protection personnel providing literature and forms needed along with instruction as to the process for drawing down the Federal Sewage Grant. He hoped to return with information toward getting the money as the process goes forward with the sewer connecting system.

Mr. Amic indicated he had an Executive Session matter involving legal counsel representing the Township.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick questioned an item in Mr. Amic's report regarding the fund raising consultants for the Springettsbury Township Park.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that the Board requested this information during a time when he had been out of town. He indicated it is up to the Board as to how they wish to proceed and suggested that perhaps the Board wished to meet with fundraisers who will advise how they go about raising money for the new park facility. Information had been provided to Mr. Amic and to the Board.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the information was very sketchy. He suggested that Mr. Amic narrow this down and select three best people. At that point they can be interviewed and gather ideas.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether there are any local firms that do this work.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that one of the firms has done work in York County.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop mentioned the Newton Group, and Gordon Freirich, a partner in that group, also a resident of Springettsbury Township. Mr. Bishop was not certain as to whether this Group had any municipal experience.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop also suggested that Dave Halliwell is a professional fundraiser.

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Ordinance 99-01 – Practice and Procedures Under Act 50**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that this item, Local Taxpayers Bill of Rights, had been advertised.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Mr. Yost whether he recommended this Ordinance.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost responded yes and that the Ordinance is necessary in order to report the disclosure statement and the appeal process that will be established at the next meeting.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether this item will be processed by every municipality.

**YOST** Mr. Yost reported that every municipality is required to be in place by January 1, 1999. Springettsbury is on schedule with other municipalities.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked what action is required other than establishing a review officer or board.

**YOST** Mr. Yost responded that two things are being done. If anyone has any questions or appeals, applies for a refund, challenges an assessment of an eligible tax, mercantile business privilege, and occupational privilege, Springettsbury Township must be in a position to provide the taxpayer with a disclosure statement that discloses to the taxpayer all of his rights under the statute. The disclosure statement is a re-run of the statute itself. The second item necessary is a procedure for hearing tax appeals. There must be rules and regulations governing that procedure. This is an implementing Ordinance that will form the basis for adopting that Resolution. This will enable Springettsbury to have a procedure for hearing tax appeals.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE 99-01 PRACTICE AND PROCEDURES UNDER ACT 50. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session – January 7, 1999**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that these Minutes were a previous agenda item held in abeyance for Mr. Bishop's vote.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 7 MINUTES AS DRAFTED. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. PASCH ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**B. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – January 28, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING JANUARY 28, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. BISHOP ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that no action was required under Old Business. Several items will come forward at the February 25, 1999 meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that Mr. Stern had prepared some draft information regarding the Sign Ordinance as suggestions and questions

may come by the Board. Mrs. Mitrick requested Mr. Stern to provide those to the Board for discussion at the February 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Chairman Mitrick also stated that Mr. Stern responded to the Board's request to provide packets of information previously submitted, one regarding permits. It had been suggested that the Board have several Work Sessions on these items. She asked Mr. Stern to provide a verbal rundown for the Board.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the items in question are:  
Development Zone  
Blighted Properties/Residential Inspections  
Permit Report  
GIS

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick suggested that two items be reviewed per Work Session. She would like to begin moving on these projects.

**Consensus of the Board was to meet on Tuesday, February 23 at 6:30 p.m. regarding the Development Zone matter.**

**Consensus of the Board was to meet on Friday, February 26 at a Noon Work Session for discussion of Blighted Areas and Permitting.**

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick asked Ms. Bowders to notify Supervisor Bill Schenck of the above meeting dates.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic brought forward Ordinance 99-02, which the Chair had Mr. Stern prepare. Mr. Amic questioned whether it is the Chair's intention to advertise this Ordinance or is this just for information purposes.

**MITRICK** Chairman Mitrick stated that the Board had just received this information and was requested to review it for the February 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

There was no New Business for discussion.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 11, 1999  
APPROVED**

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

Chairman Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairman  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Nick Gurreri

**MEMBERS NOT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Don Bishop

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
Donald Yost, Solicitor  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Mike Schober, Environmental Engineer  
Robert Halbert, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Dave Eshbach, Police Chief  
Dan Flohr, Fire Chief  
Mike Kyle, Director of Wastewater Treatment  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and wished everyone a Happy New Year. Mrs. Mitrick apologized in behalf of the Board of Supervisors for the cancellation of the January 14, 1999 meeting due to inclement weather.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick announced that there was an Executive Session held prior to this meeting at 6:45 p.m. regarding personnel matters. Mrs. Mitrick announced that there would be an Executive Session at the conclusion of this meeting regarding legal and personnel matters.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick advised that the Agenda for the January 28<sup>th</sup> meeting had been revised by moving No. 9 on the Agenda (BIDS, PROPOSALS AND QUOTES) to follow No. 4 (ACCOUNTS PAYABLE). This procedure will be done routinely for meetings to follow.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick, on behalf of the Board of Supervisors, thanked the employees of Springettsbury Township, particularly the Directors and

Department Heads that service the residents of Springettsbury Township for the excellent job being done. The Board of Supervisors looks forward to continued service in the future.

**2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS:**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick commented that at this time citizens might state matters of interest. Hearing none, Mrs. Mitrick proceeded.

**3. ENGINEERING REPORTS:**

**A. Environmental Engineer – Buchart Horn**

**SCHOBER** Mr. Mike Schober presented two reports for the month. The 537 Plans have been revised; all comments have been addressed. The Act 339 application has been completed for the annual State subsidy.

**A. Civil Engineer – First Capital Engineering**

**LUCIANI** Mr. John Luciani provided two updates in addition to his written report. With regard to the Municipal Building geotechnical work, Mr. Luciani reported that he and Mr. Dittenhafer will stake out the building and have a geotechnical firm check the subsoil on Tuesday, February 2, 1999. Mr. Luciani reported he met with PennDot regarding North Hills Road coordination of traffic improvements for Fleming. This meeting went very well, and he expects a Land Development Plan to come forth in the future.

**B. Design Engineer – Rummel, Klepper & Kahl**

**HALBERT** Mr. Robert Halbert provided an updated status report regarding the diversion pumping station. A primary objective is permits and rights-of-way. Norfolk Southern and Conrail have delayed to March, 1999. A meeting is planned for the first week in February with Conrail, and an application will be resubmitted to Conrail.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that Conrail has always been a problem in transactions of this nature. Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Halbert whether he believes obtaining this right-of-way will ever happen.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert responded that R. K. & K. is dealing with Charlie Myers, a man whom they have dealt with many times, along with his boss. Final drawings and plats are being submitted to them for approval. Right-of-way easement plats and an updated Mosaic are being submitted to Solicitor Don Yost. Mr. Halbert expressed concern as to the Conrail

difficulties; however, R. K. & K. will work with them at the staff level, and if anything changes, the Board of Supervisors will be advised.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert continued his report and discussed the permits associated with this project. Act 47 letters have been sent to the City of York providing certified mail receipts to be included in their application.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert stated that negotiation of rights-of-ways for the fee acquisition and individual utility easements per lineal foot. Standard rates will be used in that negotiation. Mr. Halbert reported that construction grants are proceeding. A brief meeting is planned with Mr. Amic February 3 for continued planning.

**HALBERT** Mr. Halbert provided an updated photo“rendering” of the facility. This provided the overall appearance of the project.

**General consensus of the Board of Supervisors showed approval of the appearance of the facility.**

**4. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic recommended moving on the items in Accounts Payable in a single motion including items A through K.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that, if the Board arrived at any questions, the motion could be amended.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck suggested that discussion be handled before any motion is made.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned that the Minutes list each individual item and the dollar amounts.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri questioned an item for Nello Tire Co. which has the same invoice number and the same amount of money. He asked whether that was a duplication.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would review that item and provide information to Mr. Gurreri.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Kyle whether, because there were a couple of sizeable invoices for repair and maintenance on some of the equipment, he has records by vehicle to indicate how much money is being spent on repair and maintenance.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

**KYLE** Mr. Kyle indicated the GM numbers allow for that internally through the accounting system. The numbers provide costs of materials and supplies, maintenance and repairs and labor to be accounted by vehicle.

When the front end loader needed replaced there was documentation indicating the increased maintenance costs.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that the present method seems laborious to determine the costs for vehicle maintenance. He recommended (to Mr. Amic) that a new procedure be developed for quick tracking of costs.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick commented that information received from Gregory Contractors is never on letterhead stationery. It is difficult to determine where the information is coming from.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated he would address that with Gregory Contractors.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE A THROUGH K AS FOLLOWS:**

- A. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 1/14/99.**
- B. C. S. Davidson – Erlen Drive – Progress Billing #14 - \$1,110.44**
- C. C. S. Davidson – East/West Interceptor Phase 1 - Invoice #3 - \$1,665.78**
- D. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Design Engineering – Progress Billing #5 - \$52,055.95**
- E. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Act 537 Phase II – Progress Billing #14 - \$2,264.40**
- F. Murphy & Dittenhafer – Architectural Design – Invoice #3 - \$10,114.98**
- G. Gregory Contractors – Lynbrook Drive – Change Order #1 - \$1,340**
- H. Gregory Contractors – Lynbrook Drive – Progress Billing #1 - \$20,900**
- I. Regular Payables as Detailed in the Payable Listing of 1/28/99**
- J. Doug Lamb Construction – East Market Street Storm Water – Progress Billing #4 - \$1,010**
- K. Buchart Horn, Inc. – Act 537 Phase 2 Progress Billing #15 - \$1,641.85**

**MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

- L. Purchase of Manhole Inserts – Exeter Supply Quote - \$9,231.50**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the purchase of manhole covers. The Wastewater Treatment Director recommended purchase of 350 covers from Exeter Supply at \$24.95 each. This item appears in the capital improvement budget.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that this item should be an expensed item.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed with Mr. Schenck's point.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE OF THE MANHOLE INSERTS FROM EXETER SUPPLY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$9,231.50. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**M. Purchase of Flow Monitor – ISCO, Inc. Quote - \$2,370**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the purchase of flow monitor recommended by the Wastewater Treatment staff. The low quote was received from ISCO in the amount of \$2,370. This item is carried in the capital improvement budget. Mr. Amic recommended approval.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE OF THE FLOW MONITOR FROM ISCO, INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,370. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**N. Purchase of Wastewater Sampler – ISCO, Inc. Quote \$4,576.85**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on the purchase of wastewater sampler from ISCO in the amount of \$4,576.85. Comments from staff were received with regard to not accepting the low quote. Mr. Amic was in agreement with the staff's recommendation.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE OF THE WASTEWATER SAMPLER FROM ISCO, INC. FOR \$4,576.85. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**9. BIDS, PROPOSALS, QUOTES:**

**A. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl – Final Design/Permits/Geotechnical-Parallel Interceptor - \$35,204**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided background information regarding the above item. Mr. Amic recommended approval.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE PROPOSAL BY RUMMEL, KLEPPER & KAHL FOR THE FINAL DESIGN PHASE, THE PERMITS AND THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING BE APPROVED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$35,204. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Sale of Two (2) Sludge Spreaders – Nolt Spreading - \$5,155**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the sale of these spreaders was advertised in compliance with Township Code. High bid for the purchase of these

spreaders was received from Nolt Spreading in the amount of \$5,155. Mr. Amic recommended acceptance of this quote.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO SELL THE TWO (2) SLUDGE SPREADERS TO NOLT SPREADING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,155. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Appleford/Stoneridge Sewer Rehabilitation – C. S. Davidson - \$7,810**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented on item C to evaluate the sewer and recommend repair alternatives and draft specifications. He indicated staff recommended acceptance of this quote. Mr. Amic itemized the other quotes received indicating this to be the low quote.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE APPLEFORD/STONERIDGE SEWER REHABILITATION – C. S. DAVIDSON IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,810. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Approval of Architectural Drawings and Authorization to Complete Design/Draw Specifications.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that a luncheon meeting was held three weeks ago with the architect regarding the plan for the new Municipal Building. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Board members in attendance concluded that the basement should be included; the trade-off by eliminating the basement and putting 1330 sq. ft. for storage on the first floor saved \$100,000 (net). The upper floor is 13,240 sq. ft.; the basement is designed at 6,468 sq. ft. Those three Board members indicated that this is what they preferred. This is the plan as presented. Mr. Amic asked for the concurrence of the Board to approve this design in order that the architect may move forward and complete the final design and draw the necessary specifications for bidding the project.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked if approval is given tonight how long it would take for the bid to go out.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer indicated this would be completed in four to six weeks.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated, (to the Board members not in attendance at the luncheon meeting), they had not minimized the pain for Mr. Dittenhafer going through this process. He totally walked those present through the old plan in great detail and discussed the storage that would have been brought upstairs. It was scattered throughout the design. A lengthy discussion ensued with regard to the cost for the

basement and the overall effect it would have on the space that would be gained.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck questioned the lobby area and asked whether it presently shows glass partitions.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer responded that it shows a glass wall.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri questioned the use of glass doors.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer indicated double doors will be used.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that his opinion on the basement is known to the Board. He was unable to attend the meeting when the decision was made regarding the basement. He indicated he is opposed to it as \$100,000 will be used for what he considers excessive space, which will get filled. He stated he will not vote in favor of it.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated there will be 5,000 more sq. ft. by building a basement for \$100,000.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer indicated that much discussion had been held regarding renovation of the existing building. A number of revisions were made, which saved about \$250,000 on the renovations. These revisions were reviewed with the Police Chief.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri questioned whether this motion will include the farmhouse.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that this motion is designed to approve the work of the architect, the new municipal building, the renovation of the current administration building and the \$65,000 for renovation of the farm house. The motion can be modified any way the Board desires.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri questioned the bidding process, i.e. a separate bid for the house, a separate bid for the building.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer responded that this is bid all at one time, but would be phased, i.e. Phase I New Construction; Phase Renovation Work.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated the Board had discussed bidding the farm house separately.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer indicated an alternate price could be obtained for that separately.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated that, in consideration of bidding the farmhouse separately, some community involvement may be obtained in helping to renovate that building. Mrs. Mitrick questioned whether that would hurt the overall process.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer responded that this might attract a different type of contractor.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated that two motions would be needed.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated Mr. Dittenhafer is recommending that the bid specs would go out all inclusive plus the alternate for the house separately. It would be better to bid the house separately.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer indicated there would be two bid packages; one would be just the house and one would deal with everything else.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri indicated he would like to handle these items separately, because he is against doing anything with the house. In his opinion it should be torn down.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that, if two packages are to be bid, the house must be bid separately.

**DITTENHAFER** Mr. Dittenhafer recommended, if the Board wishes to attract some smaller contractors, he would handle the bid separately. Then the renovation and the new building is still just under \$2.5 million.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWING AND AUTHORIZATION TO COMPLETE DESIGN/DRAWING SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE NEW MUNICIPAL BUILDING AND THE EXISTING RENOVATIONS TO THE PRESENT BUILDING. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. PASCH VOTED AGAINST THE MOTION AS HE IS OPPOSED TO THE BASEMENT ADDITION.**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THAT SPECIFICATIONS BE DRAWN AND BID SPECS BE PREPARED FOR THE RENOVATIONS TO THE BRICK FARMHOUSE. MRS. MITRICK WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. GURRERI VOTED AGAINST THE MOTION AS HE IS OPPOSED TO RENOVATION OF THE FARMHOUSE.**

**E. Solicit Proposal from Buchart Horn, Inc. Wastewater Utility Water System**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that this item relates to a request from the Wastewater Director for permission to solicit a proposal from Buchart Horn to design

and prepare a cost estimate for replacement of the utility water system in the wastewater facility. Mr. Amic had provided background information regarding this item. This item was prioritized by Buchart Horn in the Act 537 Phase II report. Mr. Amic recommended authorization for staff to accept a proposal from BH.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO SOLICIT PROPOSALS FROM BUCHART HORN FOR THE WASTEWATER UTILITY WATER SYSTEM. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**F. GPUA Agreement – Electric Supply**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic had provided information to the Board relating to staff's work on this item, which Mr. Yost reviewed as well. There are savings to be gained and Mr. Amic recommended that permission be obtained to sign the agreements.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated \$10,000 concerns him because every day of delay money is lost. Mr. Pasch continued with a recommendation that within the next 12 months an investigation be done to answer all the questions involved with other providers. He questioned whether GPUA is a part of GPU.

**KYLE** Mr. Kyle responded that GPUA is the parent company.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch concluded that the Township receives the same electricity we used to get before from essentially the same company but saving over \$3,000 a month.

**KYLE** Mr. Kyle indicated that choosing different suppliers doesn't necessarily mean choosing a different source of energy. You're not really choosing the power plant in choosing GPUA as opposed to Exelon.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that we've been overpaying all these years.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE TOWNSHIP MANAGER BE AUTHORIZED TO SIGN AN AGREEMENT WITH GPUA AS STATED IN HIS MEMORANDUM FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**5. SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS:**

**A. Planning Module – Manchester Township/West Side Board Road – A3-67939-321-3**

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic discussed the above Planning Module for 2,450 GPD. This item is recommended by the Wastewater Director.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PLANNING MODULE IN MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP WEST SIDE OF BOARD ROAD A3-67939-321-3 2,450 GPD. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Land Development 98-05 North Hills Elementary School Granting Extension To 3/26/99.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern spoke with regard to the extension of time granted to the Township for the North Hills Elementary School Land Development 98-05 to March 26, 1999.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR ACCEPTANCE OF THE GRANT OF AN EXTENSION OF TIME FROM THE NORTH HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROJECT 98-05 TO MARCH 26, 1999. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Subdivision 98-07 – Anderson/Snyder Granting Extension to 3/1/99.**

**STERN** Mr. Stern reported that an extension of time has been granted to Robert Anderson's Subdivision 98-07 Druck Valley Road until March 1, 1999.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR ACCEPTANCE OF THE GRANT OF AN EXTENSION OF TIME FROM ROBERT ANDERSON PROJECT 98-07 TO MARCH 1, 1999. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND.**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick commented on the motion. She believed the form should have the number 98-07 on it.

**STERN** Mr. Stern will be sure that the number is on it.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**YOST** Mr. Donald Yost asked for time to discuss a Subdivision matter. Agreement between the Township and Mark S. Kroh and his wife, Kari A. Behers. In October of 1996, Mr. Jeffrey Snyder and his wife purchased A & B and an adjoining acre tract of land. In October of 1996 he subdivided the 11 plus acre tract of land and on that plan there is no 12, which says that lot #2 coming out of that 11 acre tract has to be attached to Jeffrey Snyder's land. It didn't say to adjoining land. Mr. Snyder last September sold lots A and B and lot 2 to Mr. Kroh and his wife. Their title company said that their title is defective because it says lot 2 can't be sold to anyone but the Snyders'. It can't be conveyed to anyone and no one but Snyder

can own that lot. The intent was that all three plots would be combined. Simply all the agreement in front of you does is to approve the conveyance of lot #2 from the 11 acre tract to the Krohs.

**PASCH** We want something that says that lot will not be transferred and that it's still worth doing to be separate lot.

**YOST** Mr. Yost stated that the Agreement intends that the subdivision plan back in 1986 does what was intended when it was approved back in 1996; they have all three of those lots in one ownership.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that now the Agreement in the transfer for the people who it has been transferred to cannot separate any part of those lots and sell them without approval.

**YOST** Mr. Yost indicated that to be correct.

**MITRICK** Mrs. Mitrick questioned whether there is a reason to have the Snyders signature on this plan.

**YOST** Mr. Yost indicated no.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated he could see no problem with the transaction; he would prefer to see it reverse subdivided.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick concluded that the Agreement is clear and clean enough not to bring repercussions to the Board.

**YOST** Mr. Yost indicated he did not think it will come back to the Board. It may appear with other parcels at another time.

**KROH** Mr. Kroh stated he does not intend to do any subdivisions. Beyond that there is an easement on it through Farmland Trust preventing any further subdivision providing a permanent easement through the York County Farmland.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck asked whether the title company said action such as this would make them happy.

**YOST** Mr. Yost responded he had a telephone call from their attorney who indicated this to be fine.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR AND SECRETARY TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN MARK KROH AND KARI BEHERS. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SUPERVISORS:**

Mr. Gurreri stated that a Park and Recreation Conference will be held in Seven Springs March 20 through 24<sup>th</sup>. Other Board members were invited to attend.

Mr. Gurreri reported that the Township boundary signs have been replaced.

In December Mr. Gurreri attended Todd Platt's Open House. Grants were secured for Exits 7 and 8. They are working on the plans for redoing them as well as for Concord Road.

A Spring Garden Township resident discussed with Mr. Gurreri that he'd like to see Spring Garden Township join with Springettsbury. This was a compliment to Springettsbury as the gentleman thought Springettsbury Township to be well run.

Mr. Gurreri attended a meeting of the Emergency Services Commission. New officers were elected. Secretary: Bud Wertz, Vice Chairman: Dave Eshbach, Chairman: Don Bishop. ESC voted to consolidate the Commonwealth and Springettsbury Fire Department and EMT's. Solicitor Don Yost attended the meeting and explained the matter.

Mr. Gurreri reported a discussion concerning the possibility of combining six fire companies to save money: Windsor, Yohe, Dallastown, Felton, York County and Red Lion.

Mr. Gurreri attended a meeting of the Local Government Advisory Committee. A Full Committee Meeting will be held at 6:30 p.m. February 3, 1999 at Days Inn on Rt. 30. There will be discussion on the Agility Program with PennDot. The Board is invited to go.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated he plans to attend.

**BOWDERS** Ms. Bowders will make reservations for two.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri mentioned the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. There will be a meeting at the Township office on the February 4th. Mr. Gurreri asked for a budget figure for a float. Mr. Gurreri would like to be able to report there will be some monies available.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch stated that the Township would be open to a reasonable expenditure.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick suggested Mr. Gurreri get a recommendation from the Township Manager.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated that a letter was received from Charlie Stuhre regarding his term on the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mrs. Mitrick reported a letter received from Blanche Innerst, who lives just south of Route 30 on North Sherman Street. Mrs. Innerst was very upset about the way that street was plowed; the porches are nearly on the roadway, and PennDot plowed the snow up to her door on the east side of the house. She is also concerned about something the Township had done in the past. She has a driveway on 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue that when it's plowed in and the snow melts there is a dip in her driveway and her driveway is then covered with ice. She asked that PennDot be notified to please pile the snow elsewhere and secondly that our Public Works Department attempt to plow the snow across the street.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic will follow up.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated the Board received a copy of the response document on the permitting from Glatfelter Paper Company. Mrs. Mitrick asked the staff to call Steve Baker from the Recycling Committee, who came and spoke to the Board, to be sure that he has a copy of that response document.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick reminded the Board of a Noon Work Session Meeting with the Park and Recreation Board on Monday, February 1, 1999.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated that a quorum will not be present for the March 11 Board of Supervisors Meeting. This meeting could be rescheduled or the option could be exercised to have only one meeting.

**Consensus of the Board was to hold only one meeting during the month of March.**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick asked Dori Bowders to be sure to advertise only one meeting in March.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck indicated he would not be present for the March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri reported that he attended a business social of the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary at the York Expo Center.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick thanked Kelly's Inn for a \$400 donation to the Springettsbury Park and Recreation Department. She also acknowledged

and congratulated the staff which was very generous in its United Way contribution this year.

Mrs. Mitrick stated that Mr. Bruce Bainbridge, Director of Parks and Recreation for our Township was nominated for the Fred M. Kuntz award. The nomination is significant and Mrs. Mitrick congratulated him on this nomination.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick attended a meeting with Ken Pasch with some volunteers from the Springettsbury Fire Department as well as Commonwealth on the 20<sup>th</sup> of this month. She complimented Chief Flohr on the very enthusiastic and positive atmosphere that was demonstrated at that meeting. A very realistic approach to improvement of future volunteers was presented by the Chief. Chairperson Mitrick stated she believes the Fire Company is moving in the right direction.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated, in addition to the earlier announcements, that an Executive Session was held prior to this meeting tonight regarding personnel matters.

**7. SOLICITOR'S REPORT**

**YOST** Don Yost provided a supplement to his written report. The Board received a letter regarding Mr. Lutz and requires no explanation or discussion. In his report for the January 14 meeting, a fairly extensive pack of papers was prepared concerning the Taxpayers Bill of Rights. Under item 10, Solicitor Yost requested advertising the Ordinance that is needed for the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights for adoption at the next meeting. The actual disclosure statements and forms are being prepared.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE TOWNSHIP ADVERTISE FOR THE TAXPAYER BILL OF RIGHTS THAT THE BOARD WILL MOVE ON IT AT THE NEXT MEETING. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned Solicitor Yost concerning the Livingstons. The various difficulties in procedures are not going to delay the work being done.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that it should not. Concurrently the Township can take possession of the original 60 ft. right-of-way as soon as Mr. Yost gets the \$35,000 paid into court. This transaction is expected to happen next week. There is nothing to impede progress.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Township has obtained all the permitting and everything necessary to proceed.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick asked about the status of the occupancy of Kohl's.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that the general contractor should be turning the building over to Kohl's within the next few weeks at which time they will have a partial occupancy permit. By the end of March or early April the store will open to the public.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick questioned the time frame for Target.

**STERN** Mr. Stern responded that Target started last week with footers and indicated that all Target stores will open the second week of October.

**8. MANAGER'S REPORT:**

**A. Act 537 Phase I (permission to advertise)**

**B. Act 537 Phase II – (permission to advertise)**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that both agenda items under his Manager's Report had been concluded. Mr. Amic gave a brief synopsis concerning Phase I Act 537, which had been set aside on November 14, 1997. Mr. Schober had responded to questions at that time. Concerning Act 537 Phase II, all the changes and comments were incorporated. Mr. Amic requested permission to advertise Phase I and Phase II for a 30-day public comment period. At that time the final plan will be provided. Mr. Amic stated that Messrs. Schober and Kyle worked on this project and provided a wonderful 537 Plan to take Springettsbury Township into the future.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether, with only one meeting in March, there will be any time constraints.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated Mr. Pasch's point is well taken and care should be taken in stating the date in order to provide for the 30 days.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick considered this item a milestone.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE THE ACT 537 PHASE I AND PHASE II. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND.**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick asked whether this motion should be done separately or together.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated it could be handled together.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Amic whether information is being secured regarding the correspondence from Glace Associates regarding the proposed sewage biosolids pelletization. Mr. Pasch indicated this might be an answer to the sludge problem.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he is not opposed to looking at this concept. It was informational at this time. He will go back to Mr. Berman and ask for more information.

**KYLE** Mr. Kyle stated that the technology had been evaluated when a sludge disposal alternative analysis was done five to seven years ago. The issue was the marketing and ownership and operation by a second party and marketing sludge which delved into other areas.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicates this is an area which needs to be examined.

**10. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS:**

**A. Agreement – First Capital Engineering – Springettsbury Township Services – New Municipal Building**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Mr. Luciani provided a proposal for the scope of services to work on the New Municipal Building. Mr. Amic recommended this proposal to the Board for approval.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri asked whether the cost for building of \$115 per square foot is reasonable. Windsor Township is building a building for \$110 per sq. ft.; New Freedom was \$85.00 per sq. ft.; Manchester was \$75.00 per sq. ft. They are considered lease-backs. Manor Township in Lancaster was \$70.00 per sq. ft. Mr. Gurreri wondered whether Springettsbury should consider a lease back opportunity.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani responded that in the case of Manchester, they did not own a piece of land large enough. Kinsley, Wagman and other design-build contractors bid a parcel and a building and then leased it back to them for a minimum number of years.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic questioned Mr. Yost as to whether or not Springettsbury could do that with its own property?

**YOST** Solicitor Yost indicated that could not be done with Township-owned property.

**LUCIANI** Mr. Luciani added that, if one looks at their building, it appears to be villa boxes as opposed to the design of the proposed Municipal Building with

its curves and more architectural features in it. One of the reasons for the higher cost is the Davis Bacon requirements to pay the prevailing rate.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated he would want to take a very careful look at any type of lease back situation.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated it might be a good exercise to determine the true cost.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick asked Mr. Amic to obtain that information.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated the Manchester Township Manager had been very candid with him and would most likely provide financial information to him.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether the First Capital Agreement is based on existing rates.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that to be true.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN FIRST CAPITAL ENGINEERING AND SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE NEW MUNICIPAL BUILDING. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Agreement – Holland & Knight, LLP – Springettsbury Township**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic provided background information in his memorandum regarding Holland & Knight's proposal. Mr. Risetto had been on the West Coast. On Monday Messrs. Amic and Stern spent the day in Washington in a series of meetings with Senators Santorum, Specter and Goodling's staff and with Mr. Peterson who has the 5<sup>th</sup> Congressional District. Mr. Amic indicated he felt positive about those meetings. The proposal from Holland & Knight for \$60,000 plus is about what was previously billed for Phase I. Mr. Amic requested permission to write the Agreement for \$65,000.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether Mr. Risetto is giving Mr. Amic the same feeling about this second 'bite.'

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated Mr. Risetto is optimistic. There are no guarantees.

**STERN** Mr. Stern agrees with Mr. Amic's perception. Additionally, two of Senator Specter's staff and Congressman Goodling's staff remembered details of the project from last year. It is their desire to finish projects from the previous year.

- AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that they would prioritize the projects that were not completed and that there is strong support for it.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic asked Mr. Yost whether this is the proper time for discussion concerning the Sewer Authority. Mr. Yost had informed Mr. Amic that the people on the Authority will not participate in the next round of grant applications.
- YOST** Solicitor Yost stated that the information regarding Mr. Amic's comment had come through a secretary of his partner following a discussion at the Authority meeting and, having paid the last bill, they would not participate in any additional services.
- MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick reported that additionally she had attended a meeting where one of the members of the Sewer Authority had been in attendance. His statement was that they were in on it, and it was what they considered their first attempt, but it was their attempt, and if Springettsbury wanted to proceed that they felt at this point to go it alone. They were acting in good faith through the first attempt and they came out with \$1 million and even though Springettsbury would be utilizing some of their capacity, the benefits were going to the Springettsbury system.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic reported on a more positive note, the matter was discussed at Mr. Kyle's municipal meeting. The sister municipalities indicated they're not worried and to tell the Board they are going to participate in this fully.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED THAT THE BOARD RETROACTIVELY AUTHORIZE THE COSTS FOR PHASE II OF THIS GRANT UP TO THIS POINT THIS EVENING AND AUTHORIZES HOLLAND & KNIGHT TO EXECUTE AND FORWARD AN AGREEMENT UNDER THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THEIR LETTER OF DECEMBER 22, 1998. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Improvements Agreement Home Depot – Springettsbury Township**

- AMIC** Mr. Amic requested that the Board authorize proper Township officials to execute the new agreement with the changes made and to forward to Home Depot for their signature. This Agreement had been provided to the Board previously.
- PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked whether all the changes discussed at the Board meeting when it was approved are included.
- AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that to be correct. A number of items have been incorporated including the bus shelter.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

**YOST** Solicitor Yost stated he had received a telephone call from Mr. Cox questioning whether the Board would be acting on this issue tonight.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT THE AGREEMENT WITH HOME DEPOT AS CHANGED AS OF TODAY'S DATE (JANUARY 28, 1999) BE APPROVED. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that items D, E, and F are not necessary to act upon unless it is the desire of the Board to do so. The Actuary indicated this is proper. These officers are requesting these numbers.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked how long this will go on.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that it will go on until the Ordinance calls for a 30% cap, so if they would retire at \$2,000 a month, they could go to \$2,600 a month, which would be as high as they can go.

**D. Resolution 99-19 – Cost of Living Increase – Richard R. Zeigler, Jr.**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-19. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**E. Resolution 99-20 – Cost of Living Increase – Donald W. Winkel**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-20. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**F. Resolution 99-21 – Cost of Living Increase – Scott E. Shewell**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-21. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**G. Resolution 99-13 - Appointment to the Planning Commission**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick followed up with Mr. Donald Allison regarding the vacancy on the Planning Commission. He had investigated and studied what would be involved. Mr. Allison comes highly recommended, and he is enthusiastic about filling that vacancy if that is the pleasure of the Board.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch indicated that, based on the interview with him, he would be a very good addition to the Planning Commission.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-13 APPOINTING DON ALLISON AS A MEMBER OF THE SPRINGETTSBURY**

**TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND.  
MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that thanks go to Chairperson Mitrick for the background work that she does, not just on items of this nature, but also in general. She puts in a lot of time and follow up work.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick asked Dori Bowders to notify Mr. Allison tomorrow of his appointment. He would like to pick up the Ordinances and information to prepare for the meeting in February.

**11. ACTION ON MINUTES:**

**A. Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session – November 16, 1998**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET WORK SESSION NOVEMBER 16, 1998 AS DRAFTED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session – November 19, 1998**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET WORK SESSION NOVEMBER 19, 1998 AS DRAFTED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session – December 2, 1998**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET WORK SESSION DECEMBER 2, 1998 AS AMENDED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session – December 9, 1998**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET WORK SESSION DECEMBER 9, 1998 AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**E. Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting – December 10, 1998**

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned the matter of the contractor's sign during the removal of the Stoney Brook bridge. It was to be removed and the last time he had driven by the sign was still there.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the sign was still there today. Mr. Amic asked Mr. Stern to pick up the sign and advise the contractor of its whereabouts.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING DECEMBER 10, 1998 AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**F. Board of Supervisors Work Session – December 15, 1998**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION HELD ON DECEMBER 15, 1998 AS AMENDED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**G. Board of Supervisors Work Session – December 16, 1998**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORK SESSION HELD ON DECEMBER 16, 1998 AS DRAFTED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. SCHENCK ABSTAINED AS HE WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE.**

**H. Board of Supervisors Reorganizational Meeting – January 4, 1999**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REORGANIZATIONAL MEETING HELD JANUARY 4, 1999 AS AMENDED. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**I. Police Pension Board Reorganizational Meeting – January 4, 1999**

**No formal action was taken with regard to the above item. These Minutes will be approved by the Police Pension Board at its next meeting.**

**J. Board of Supervisors Work Session – January 7, 1999**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick questioned procedure since three members were in attendance; however, Mr. Bishop was not present this evening.

**YOST** Solicitor Yost advised these Minutes should be held in abeyance until the applicable Supervisors could vote.

**12. OLD BUSINESS:**

**A. Resolution 99-02 – Appointing Solicitor to Zoning Hearing Board**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated she had questioned Solicitor Yost as to whether or not the Board should act on Resolution 99-02. Since this is a yearly appointment action was recommended.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that, based on information learned recently, he has more questions than answers; however, he is not uncomfortable with making the appointment of the Solicitor used in the past.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch agreed with Mr. Schenck.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick indicated that the session was very informative, and the Board was able to express some of its concerns, which had been very well received.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck recommended follow up with Mr. Amic, Mr. Stern and staff members regarding this information.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-02 APPOINTING BILL HOFFMEYER AS SOLICITOR TO THE ZONING HEARING BOARD. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that no further action is necessary under Old Business. He stated that he did analyze the Agreements under I., J., and K. These Agreements have been reviewed, but follow up is necessary with the Townships involved to ascertain their position.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated that, in addition to items under Old Business as items outstanding, the Board had asked for Mr. Amic to draw up a charter for the Capital Improvements Advisory Board.

Chairperson Mitrick also commented on a request from the Board to get information on professional fund raisers for Springettsbury Park.

Chairperson Mitrick previously had requested Mr. Amic to write a policy for volunteers in Springettsbury Township when they complete or resign from a term so that a framework is available within which to work.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated he is working on all the above items and will have something available at the next meeting.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri stated it is most important to recognize volunteers.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated that Mr. Stern had provided a lengthy report on Permits, etc. This item needs to be placed on an Agenda in order to review the matter thoroughly.

Chairperson Mitrick indicated that Mr. Stern had provided a report on how to address possible blighted areas, as well as residential inspection.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Mr. Stern had done a great deal of work in these areas and this should be reviewed in a Work Session. He needs comments and questions from the Board on the report.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch commented that with regard to the Permit report, which he indicated to be very good. Mr. Pasch has a problem with the recommendation on the dollar amount for repairs. He is looking for something supplemental or different than having a dollar amount. Even with the BOCA Code, perhaps it could be lifted, and indicate that's what is desired.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri was in agreement.

**STERN** Mr. Stern agreed that there are problems in stating amounts, and there are also problems not having an amount.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that there have been a number of really good reports received from Mr. Stern. The Board had not had an opportunity to address some of the concerns in these reports. Mr. Schenck requested Mr. Stern to inventory the reports he has written, and bring the list to the Board for action.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick informed the Board that she attended a meeting on the topic, "York County Sprawl" Sunday evening and noted that one representative was in attendance from six or seven municipalities. York County Planning did not send a representative. Tom Wolf from Better York was in attendance. It was a brainstorming meeting on concerns that municipalities have; laws that were made posing difficult situations for municipalities. There is no responsibility to this group, simply getting to know your neighbors. A follow up meeting will be held.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch asked Mr. Amic for an explanation concerning item K. under Old Business, West Manchester Township/York Township Agreement.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that this item is informational only. No action is necessary.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated that, in view of the request made to Mr. Stern to itemize his reports to the Board, we need to fast track some of the items that have been held and get them off the table, since the Board will be extremely busy with other things in the future.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 28, 1999  
APPROVED**

**13. NEW BUSINESS:**

No new business was brought for action.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic  
Secretary

PWA/ja

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REORGANIZATIONAL MEETING**

**JANUARY 4, 1999  
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a reorganizational meeting on the above date at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, Pennsylvania.

**MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Lori Mitrick, Chairperson  
Bill Schenck  
Ken Pasch  
Don Bishop  
Nick Gurreri

**ALSO**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Paul W. Amic, Township Manager  
John Luciani, Civil Engineer  
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations  
Dan Flohr, Fire Chief  
Betty J. Speicher, Director of Human Services  
David Trott, Corporal  
Ken Witmer, Patrolman  
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**MITRICK** Mrs. Lori Mitrick called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. and stated that the meeting was called for the purposes of reorganization of the Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors.

**2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:**

**A. Chair of the Board of Supervisors**

**MITRICK** Mrs. Lori Mitrick opened the floor for nominations.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE NOMINATION OF LORI MITRICK AS CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND.**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick called for questions.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick called for other nominations. Hearing none, Mrs. Mitrick called for a motion to close the nominations.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED TO CLOSE THE NOMINATIONS. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick called for action on the ballot.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT THE BALLOT FOR THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BE APPROVED. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Vice Chair of the Board of Supervisors**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick called for nominations.

**MR. PASCH MOVED THAT WILLIAM SCHENCK BE NOMINATED AS VICE CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND.**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick called for other nominations. Hearing none, Mrs. Mitrick called for the vote.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Assistant Secretary/Treasurer**

**MR. GURRERI MOVED THAT DON BISHOP BE NOMINATED AS ASSISTANT SECRETARY/TREASURER. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND.**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick called for other nominations. Hearing none, she called for a motion on that ballot.

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**3. MOTION:**

**A. Appointment of Delegates and Voting Delegates to the PSATS Annual Convention.**

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck stated that it was his understanding that all the Board members were appointed.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that the appointment should only include Delegates.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic clarified that what was done in the past is that all the Board members were appointed as a Delegate, which gives everyone an opportunity to attend if they choose. However, a Voting Delegate and an Alternate Voting Delegate were appointed.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated that she called first for the Appointment of the Delegates to the PSATS.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT ALL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BE APPOINTED AS DELEGATES TO THE PSATS ANNUAL CONVENTION. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick called for motion for the Voting Delegate.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED THAT NICK GURRERI BE NAMED AS VOTING DELEGATE AND BILL SCHENCK BE NAMED ALTERNATE VOTING DELEGATE TO THE PSATS ANNUAL CONVENTION. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**4. RESOLUTIONS:**

**A. Resolution 99-01 Appointing the Solicitor for Springettsbury Township**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that all of the resolutions on the agenda were placed similarly to last year. Supporting information was provided to the Board members for their review. With regard to the Solicitor's appointment, there is a modest \$5.00 increase in rate.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-01 APPOINTING THE FIRM OF BLAKEY, YOST, BUPP AND SCHAUMANN AS SOLICITOR. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. Resolution 99-02 Appointing the Solicitor for the Zoning Hearing Board of Springettsbury Township.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the rate suggested for 1999 remains the same as last year at \$75.00 per hour. A meeting is scheduled with the Solicitor for the Zoning Hearing Board for January 28, 1999 at 6:45 p.m. prior to the Regular Meeting.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO TABLE ACTION ON RESOLUTION 99-02. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**C. Resolution 99-03 Appointing the Civil Engineer for Springettsbury Township**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that he had made a comparison of the rate increases by the Civil Engineer as requested by the Board. Supporting documentation had been provided to the Board. A number of changes appear in the Rate Schedule; however, the common Registered Professional Engineering Rates remain the same. A number of new services have been added which

Mr. Luciani and his field survey crew provided last year. Approximately 5 to 7% increases have been requested.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-03 APPOINTING THE FIRM OF FIRST CAPITAL ENGINEERING AS CIVIL ENGINEER FOR SPRINGGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED. MR. BISHOP ABSTAINED DUE TO A BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP WITH FIRST CAPITAL ENGINEERING.**

**D. Resolution 99-04 Appointing the Environmental Engineer for Springgettsbury Township.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that supporting information had been provided to the Board of Supervisors for Buchart Horn, Inc. rate increases amounting to between 3 to 8% depending upon the services performed.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned the average increase figure.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that to be 5 to 5-1/2% for the services that the Township would be using.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri questioned whether other firms had submitted information.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there were proposal letters received from three interested firms, i.e., Buchart Horn, Inc., R. K. & K. and Acer Engineering.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick called for a motion.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-04 APPOINTING THE FIRM OF BUCHART HORN, INC. AS THE ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**E. Resolution 99-05 Appointing the Secretary/Treasurer for Calendar 1999.**

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-05 APPOINTING PAUL W. AMIC AS SECRETARY/TREASURER. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**F. Resolution 99-06 Designating Depositories and Safe Deposit Box.**

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REORGANIZATIONAL MEETING**

**JANUARY 4, 1999  
APPROVED**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Resolution 99-06 covers all the banking institutions holding investments for the Township and designates these depositories and safe deposit boxes for approval by the Board.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch questioned whether any changes have occurred.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic responded that there is nothing new; however, there are fewer institutions listed this year, and stated that there is further consolidation being planned, which will be noted next year.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO ACCEPT RESOLUTION 99-06 DESIGNATING DEPOSITORIES AND SAFE DEPOSIT BOX. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**G. Resolution 99-07 Appointing a Representative to the York County Earned Income Tax Bureau for the Calendar 1999.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that this Resolution covers representation to the York County Earned Income Tax Bureau. In the past the financial person who handled the General Fund work was the representative, and Mr. Amic is placed as an alternate in the event of inability to serve.

**MR. PASCH MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-07 APPOINTING RANDY WACHTER AS REPRESENTATIVE TO THE YORK COUNTY EARNED INCOME TAX BUREAU AND PAUL W. AMIC AS ALTERNATE. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**H. Resolution 99-08 Appointment to the Local Government Advisory Committee**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Mr. Gurreri served in this capacity last year.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-08 APPOINTING NICK GURRERI TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**I. Resolution 99-09 Appointing a Citizen as Vacancy Board Chairperson**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that 99-09 is the appointment of a Citizen to the Vacancy Board Chairperson. Mrs. Bowders contacted Mr. Chester Roback who has served in this position for a number of years. He has no problem with continuing.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-09 APPOINTING CHESTER ROBAK AS VACANCY BOARD CHAIRMAN. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**J. Resolution 99-10 Appointing Setting of Secretary/Treasurer and Assistant Secretary/Treasurer Bonds.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that this Resolution 99-10 covers the setting of bonds for the Secretary/Treasurer (Paul Amic) and the Assistant Secretary/Treasurer (Don Bishop). Following review by the auditors there may be an additional Resolution if the auditors increase the amounts. If so, a change will be recommended to the Board.

**MR. PASCH MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-10 SETTING THE BONDS FOR THE SECRETARY/TREASURER AT \$500,000 AND ASSISTANT SECRETARY/TREASURER AT \$250,000. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop questioned whether Mr. Amic had referred to the “elected auditors.”

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that to be correct. A meeting with these auditors will be held on January 5, 1999. If the amounts are correct, there will be no further action necessary.

**K. Resolution 99-11 Approving Signatory’s on Checks Drawn on the Accounts of Springettsbury Township.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that Resolution 99-11 is the same Resolution for the accounts of Springettsbury Township. This authorizes each member of the Board to sign in conjunction with the Secretary/Treasurer and/or the Assistant Secretary Treasurer or without. Mr. Amic recommended adoption.

**MR. GURRERI MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 99-11. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**L. Resolution 99-12 Appointing Members to the Springettsbury Township Emergency Services Commission for Calendar 1999.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Resolution 99-12 appoints Members to the Springettsbury Township Emergency Services Commission. Mr. Amic stated the following individuals who had been involved in this Commission.  
Section 1 - Michael Bashian, President of the Commonwealth Fire Co.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REORGANIZATIONAL MEETING**

**JANUARY 4, 1999  
APPROVED**

Section 2 - Ken Myers, President of Springettsbury Fire Co.  
Section 3 - Scott Williams, President of the Ambulance Service  
Section 4 - Lurth Wertz, Fire Police Captain  
Section 5 - Dan Flohr, Fire Chief  
Section 6 - David Eshbach, Police Chief  
Section 7 - Nick Gurreri, Supervisor  
Section 8 - Don Bishop, Supervisor  
Section 9 - John Krout, Citizen

Mr. Amic recommended the above individuals to serve on this committee.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch recommended that the two Board Members who had served on this Committee during the past year had established a basis for future activity. He would like to see continuity.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick agreed with Mr. Pasch.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop agreed with Mr. Pasch and further stated that consideration should be made toward action for the future. Mr. Bishop agreed to serve in this capacity.

**GURRERI** Mr. Gurreri agreed to serve in this capacity and further stated that he enjoys the position.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-12 APPOINTING MEMBERS TO THE SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP EMERGENCY SERVICES COMMISSION AS INDICATED BY MR. AMIC. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**M. Resolution 99-13 Appointing a Member to the Planning Commission Until the First Monday in January 2000 to Fill the Unexpired Term of Mr. James Tanzola.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that the appointment had been advertised for this position. Mr. Amic recommended tabling action until the normal procedure of the Board can take place.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that there had been an individual in mind and asked whether anyone had spoken with that person.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick had contacted the individual, who stated that he knew Alan Maciejewski well. It was his intention to contact him to discuss the position and call back following that discussion.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that no action could be taken during this meeting.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick volunteered to contact the individual again and asked Mr. Amic to place this item on the agenda for the first Regular Board of Supervisors Meeting in January.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic agreed to do so.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO TABLE RESOLUTION 99-13. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**N. Resolution 99-14 Appointing a Member to the Plumbing Board for a Three(3) Year Term**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that Resolution 99-14 Appoints a Member to the Plumbing Board for three years. Mr. James Henry had agreed to continue serving in this capacity.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-14 APPOINTING JAMES A. HENRY AS A MEMBER OF THE PLUMBING BOARD. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**O. Resolution 99-15 Appointing a Member to the Plumbing Board for a Three(3) Year Term**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-15 APPOINTING ROBERT BORTNER AS A MEMBER OF THE PLUMBING BOARD. MR. GURRERI WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**P. Resolution 99-16 Appointing a Member to the Plumbing Board Until the First Monday in January 2001 to Fill the Expired Term of Mr. Clifford Arndt.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic commented that Resolution 99-16 covers the Appointment of Mr. Clifford Arndt to the Plumbing Board. Supporting documentation provided a listing of the Master Plumbers who agreed to serve on the Plumbing Board for consideration.

**SCHENCK** Mr. Schenck commented that it was his understanding that the Plumbing Board was made up of one citizen-at-large, the position Mr. Arndt held. He would like to have that reviewed before taking action.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO TABLE RESOLUTION 99-16. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**Q. Resolution 99-17 Appointing a Member to the Sewer Authority for a Five (5) Year Term.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that Edward Waltemyer resigned from the Sewer Authority. There is no one to fill the position at this time. This Authority is required to meet at least bi-annually.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop inquired who remains on the Authority.

**PASCH** Mr. Pasch inquired as to whether they have meet their requirement.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic indicated that was correct – they had met their requirements.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO TABLE RESOLUTION 99-17. MR. SCHENCK WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**R. Resolution 99-18 Appointing Two (2) Members to the Capital Improvement Advisory Committee**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that Mrs. Jeanne Nichol and Mr. Lawrence Stets are presently serving on this Committee. Both have agreed to continue in this capacity.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop asked whether this Committee actually met this year.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that the Committee had not met and suggested that for the future this Committee be activated asking for their suggestions.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that he would like to explore this to see if the Committee is really needed at all. The work done in the past – they did not have enough information to provide much input. While the individuals are qualified, they were not provided background input to provide valid suggestions. Mr. Bishop indicated he would be persuaded either way – to disband it or to make it something real.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated that at one time this was a very active group. Mrs. Mitrick agreed with Mr. Bishop to establish a Charter for them that it would be beneficial to have citizens in this capacity.

**MR. SCHENCK MOVED FOR THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 99-18 APPOINTING JEANNE NICKOL AND LAWRENCE STETS AS MEMBERS OF THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick stated conclusion of the Resolution portion of the Agenda.

Chairperson Mitrick asked for follow up letters to be sent to the people who have been appointed and also a note of appreciation for the letter of resignation from the Sewer Authority.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic reported that U.S. Senator Rick Santorum's staff (Miss Ladd and Mr. Malone) will visit the Township office on Wednesday, January 6, 1999 at 9:30 a.m. Mr. Amic recommended that the Board of Supervisors meet with these staff individuals. The Senator has selected municipalities in Pennsylvania in which his staff will meet on economic development issues. They will be asking what Springettsbury would like them to do for us. Mr. Amic suggested that Mr. Luciani be in attendance.

Mr. Gurreri indicated that Springettsbury's Letter of Intent was approved through Todd Platts. While there is nothing official, it has been indicated that if the Letter of Intent is approved, it is very optimistic and positive with a high percentage of success. Mr. Stern should have an answer by Wednesday prior to the meeting with Senator Santorum's people.

**5. OTHER BUSINESS:**

**A. Reorganization of Police Pension Board**

**MITRICK** This item required a separate meeting to follow the Reorganizational Meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

**B. Labor Contract – Police – Springettsbury Township**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick brought the matter of the Labor Contract with the Police in Springettsbury Township to the floor. She indicated from a discussion with Mr. Amic that the Board can opt to proceed into Executive Session.

**AMIC** Mr. Amic stated that, in the discussion between Mrs. Mitrick, along with his letter and copy of the proposed contract, he indicated his support of this contract and asked for approval. Mr. Amic indicated if there are no major concerns and there is no problem with bringing questions to the floor.

**Consensus of the Board indicated there were no major concerns.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic recommended that Labor Contract between the Police Bargaining Unit and Springettsbury Township for the years 1999, 2000,

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REORGANIZATIONAL MEETING**

**JANUARY 4, 1999  
APPROVED**

2001 and 2002 be approved and that the proper Township officials be authorized to execute the contract.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED FOR ACTION AS STATED ABOVE BY MR. AMIC. MR. PASCH WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**AMIC** Mr. Amic thanked the Board for their support and the committee who worked on this matter including Mrs. Speicher, Mr. Madden, and the Police Committee. The Board's support of the negotiating committee was particularly appreciated.

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick commented that a letter has been sent to the members of the Park and Recreation Board regarding the meeting previously scheduled for Noon on Monday, February 1, 1999. Responses will flow into Dori Bowders' office.

**6. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MITRICK** Chairperson Mitrick adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul W. Amic

PWA/ja