

Chairman Barry Rebert called the regularly scheduled meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. Supervisors present: Dennis Luckenbaugh and Tanya Crawford. Present on behalf of the Township: Manager Joy Strausbaugh, Solicitor William Poole and Greg Hertz of KPI. Also present: Recording Secretary and approximately 20 citizens.

I. Minutes

**Motion** by Crawford, second by Luckenbaugh, to approve the minutes of the meetings of July 15, 2008 and August 19, 2008. All members voted aye; motion carried.

II. Treasurer's Report

A. **Motion** by Luckenbaugh, second by Rebert, to approve the Treasurer's Report for August 2008 as presented and the Non-Uniform Pension Report from January to June 2008. All members voted aye; motion carried.

III. General Public Comment

A. Keith Hunnings, of 1479 Seven Valleys Road and employed by Shaw Surveying, was present. He recently enrolled in the pre-certification program to become a certified SEO. He is here to request a letter from the Township indicating that NCT would consider using Mr. Hunnings' services as an SEO or a back-up SEO in the future. He is currently taking courses to become certified as an SEO, and PSATS indicated that if he has a letter as such, he could save \$500 on the course. The course costs \$800; he is looking to pay \$300, since he is funding this on his own. Mrs. Crawford questioned if Keith is planning to do this under Shaw Surveying or do this on his own - response, on his own. Mr. Poole feels that the Township would not be out of line to provide such a letter, since the Township is always looking for backup SEO services and would gladly consider qualified personnel. **Motion** by Crawford, second by Luckenbaugh, to provide a letter stating that the Township would consider Mr. Hunnings' qualifications in the future for SEO services, should the position become available. All members voted aye; motion carried.

B. Rodney Shearer of 5244 Shearer Lane asked about the status of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Amendment of the Police Agreement and the \$28,000 credit to the Township for the 2007 Y/E. As a taxpayer, he does not understand the decision to ignore something that six (6) other people that were involved in its development have explained, as to its meaning. Mr. Rebert reported that it was NCT's thinking, it was not the other three (3) municipalities' thinking. We even had our CPA firm do a letter, but we could not convince the other municipalities' representatives on the Police Board of that point of view. In order to get that Amendment changed, so that we do not continue to go through this from year to year, this Board took the stance that we would be willing to let that money go at this point and get the Amendment rewritten. Supervisor Luckenbaugh stated that all the municipalities voted on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Amendment and the 10% formula. Luckenbaugh continued that this Township spent \$60,000 to get this Amendment changed - "I don't understand what is wrong with a 3<sup>rd</sup> grade formula". Mr. Rebert stated that the Police Board discussed this subject many, many times and he could not get the other members to come to our point of view, and he feels the Article is being rewritten to get everyone on the same page. Mr. Luckenbaugh said that "we all were on the same page". Luckenbaugh added that it is a shame that they cannot understand a 3<sup>rd</sup> grade formula, he was counting on using that money to put up the building planned out back of the Township building. Mrs. Strausbaugh noted that the April minutes of this Board indicate that the \$28,000 would be used as a negotiating tool, but that amount would be deducted from

the 3rd quarter payment to SWRPD if the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment was not in place. This was never actually done and the issue is still not settled. Mr. Luckenbaugh stated that his experience shows that next year, the Police Board will not understand what was done again. He does not understand why the original 10% agreement cannot be upheld. Mr. Hall sat there and explained it to them and they all agreed. Shearer questioned if the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment is going to straighten all this out and read the 10%. Rebert indicated that the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment is going to provide the cash accounts at 10%, it is going to provide the Sick and Vacation Account separate and it is going to provide a Capital Reserve Account separate. Those two (2) items will not be counted in the 10% - all of the other accounts will be counted toward the 10% and this time a mathematical example will be provided. Shearer requested what percent will be retained in the Sick and Vacation - 30% of the Y/E balance as it was before. The Capital Reserve will include the dollars set aside for special items - this year (2009) ½ of the amount of a new server is to be placed in there (\$5,500) along with the \$30,000 for new radios. If there is no money set aside in there, it will start out at a \$0 balance. Shearer questioned what the 10% money will be used for - anything that would come up during the year that the Department does not have money for. Shearer stated that the Police Department will soon have more money on hand at the beginning of the year than the municipalities will.

#### IV. Police Report and Police Board Report

Chief Bean presented the Police Report for August 2008. Two years ago, Ofcr. Dickmyer came to the Chief and suggested a bicycle unit. Ofcr. Dickmyer put himself through the forty (40) hour school at his own expense. The Chief showed off the Police Department's new bicycle, which was mainly purchased by Spring Grove Borough. He noted that NCT purchased the bike rack for the vehicle. The Chief cited some of the things that the bike patrol has already yielded. The PD is getting positive response from the bike patrol.

The Board examined the Police Department Budget for 2009. Mr. Rebert presented the figures, noting that this is a "lean" budget. It started out at a 10.2% increase. Some cuts were made, such as in the overtime hours, the amount of the Chief's salary increase, police and office equipment was cut and various other items. Mr. Rebert stated that hopefully we can do even better next year. The Police Board and the Chief both made some changes. The budget was reduced to a 4.2% increase, which results in a \$31,000 increase to NCT for next year from the original proposed increase of \$78,000. There is not a lot of new equipment in it - one car is being replaced and one piece of office equipment is being replaced. It is extremely lean. Mr. Luckenbaugh pointed out that with our share of the 2009 budget and the payments on the Police Building Loan, police service for 2009 will cost the Township \$812,607.76 and since 2003 (including 2009) the Township has spent \$5,073,914.80 on police service and he does not see where the Township is going to get the money to pay this liability. Mrs. Crawford stated that she will support this budget, but she wants to go on record with her concern that this budget is actually less than the CPI (Consumer Pricing Index), which is currently at 5.4. That produces concern with going over budget, particularly with the utilities. The Met Ed embargo and the tariff will kick in with the increases in 2009. Barry pointed out that the vehicle fuel was increased by \$10,000. **Motion** by Crawford, second by Rebert, to adopt the 2009 SWRPD Budget at a cost of \$734,598.08 to NCT and a total budget of \$1,580,894.77. Two members voted aye; Luckenbaugh opposed. Motion carried. Rodney Shearer commended Mr. Rebert for his efforts in the budget process; however, his concern is that the budget was overstated for so many years, that we will have to wait and see what the savings really are.

#### V. Fire Company Report

Fire Chief Larry Wildasin gave the Fire Company Report for August 2008. Tanya Crawford asked

about the Fire Company participation in the Trick or Treat event. The Fire Department has decided that the Department will not participate in this event for a number of reasons, including safety of the children. The Fire Company would rather have the Trick or Treaters come to them at the Fire Station. Supervisor Crawford questioned why the fire trucks being at stationary locations within a development would pose a safety hazard. She asked if the Company had taken a vote - Wildasin replied yes. The FC was also concerned that each development might not be reached and stated that had they been approached earlier, they would have been willing to help out at the party usually held. Mr. Rebert noted that he has talked to Marvin Stine and Kevin Baum and will attend the Officers' Meeting next week to see if some agreement can be reached in this matter. Perhaps some of the Fire Department's original fears and concerns might be addressed at that time. When the Rec Board decided not to have the party this year, Mr. Rebert came up with the idea to participate in this way, using the Fire Department and Police Department to pass out the bags, presenting a goodwill effort for the public to see. The PD responded in the affirmative immediately. It is an excellent opportunity to show public service co-operation. The Manager questioned what the Department does when they attend a parade, if they take the truck out of service. The truck is in motion along a parade route with many unrestrained children along the streets. That doesn't pose a safety issue, why then does this? It is difficult to understand this decision when the Manager called John Stine, Marvin Stine and Tim Carr in advance of the last Officers Meeting which was held on August 20<sup>th</sup> and all three (3) fire fighters responded very positively about this request. Supervisor Crawford reconfirmed with Chief Wildasin that the Company had voted this request down - she then stated that the "body" should have no problem with any of the other companies who service NCT participating and taking a development or two. Wildasin stated that would be up to them. Barry stated that it is his hope that by attending the Officers' Meeting, he can resolve this in an amiable way so that there is not conflict between the Township and the Fire Department. Supervisor Crawford stated that this plan was an alternative to reach different kids and have different areas share in the fun, giving the plan a different feel. She confirmed the time of the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup>, Chief Wildasin indicated this was the Officers Meeting, not the Fire Company meeting. The Rec Board felt that the party and Trick or Treat was doubling up - these parties were started in various communities to replace Trick or Treat, when Boards chose not to sanction Trick or Treat because of the number of tainted candy and razor blade incidents. They were used as a safety measure, not a duplication of service. (In checking 2007 records, there were about 70-75 children present in 2007 - we prepared for 144 - the balance was donated to York Rescue Mission).

Mr. Wildasin reported on the pump situation with Engine 12-2. Upon examination of the pump, it was discovered that a bushing had seized onto the main shaft of the pump. Water got into the oil, causing severe damage to the pump. This is 1500 gpm pump. The Manager asked how many hours are on the pump - did not know. The pump obviously needs to be repaired. The quote for the pump repair is \$10,697.40. The truck has been out of service for two (2) weeks already and should be fixed as soon as possible. Supervisor Crawford asked if the FD was going to get another quote. The pump is already torn down - it would be difficult to get another quote. The warranty on the old pump was 2 yrs. or 2000 hours. The Manager advised that the Township should make a complaint to Hale Pumps - they are reputed to be the best, this pump should not have gone out this soon. Larry said we may fall into the category that it wasn't serviced properly. Larry reported that Russ (the Road Foreman) was supposed to be servicing the pump. The Manager objected - the Road Crew only services the running gear - lube, oil changes, inspections, etc., regular maintenance items. The Road Crew was never responsible for the technical equipment. Larry insisted that Russ has the manuals in the shop on each truck, and he is sure that the Road Crew has been greasing and lubricating valves on the pumps - Larry insisted they have discussed this many times. Barry indicated that when this truck comes back

from repair, it is important that it is being serviced properly. The Manager insisted this is a technical issue, not something the Road Crew should be handling. **Motion** by Luckenbaugh, second by Rebert, to approve the invoice of Fire and Rescue Products for the repair of the pump on Engine 12-2 at a cost of \$10,697.40. All members voted aye; motion carried.

VI. Permits, Plans, and Modules

A. Attorney D. J. Hart of Guthrie, Nonemaker, Yingst and Hart, Dan Rodgers of REMAX, Doug Stambaugh of GHI, Lisa and Kris Dennis and Lawrence Altland were present on the John Shearer, Jr., Final Subdivision Plan #081720 located on Martin and Cedar Hill Roads. This is a 2-lot S/D that is being proposed to add to the Dennis property from a 29-acre parcel owned by John Shearer. The Dennises are interested in purchasing the parcel. Mr. Poole stated that the Dennises want to purchase ten (10) acres, which is more than the NCT Zoning Ordinance allows, unless the parcel they are adjoining it to is a farm parcel. Mr. Poole added that the issue here is that the NCT Zoning Ordinance Sect. 195.8. D(2) says that no more than 25% of the tract can be subdivided for nonfarm lots, which in this case would amount to about 7.25 acres, roughly. At Sect. 195-5, the NCT Ordinance defines a farm parcel as "A tract or parcel of land devoted primarily to agricultural uses, together with a dwelling and/or other accessory uses". It defines a nonfarm parcel as "A lot or parcel containing one principal use permitted in the underlying district. Agricultural activities may be carried on as part of the use of the nonfarm lot". Mr. Poole added that his meaning of that is, the fact that there is agricultural uses on the lot does not decide the issue of whether or not it is a farm lot. The issue is "What is the principal use of the tract?" Mr. Poole added that the fact that farmers have farmed a portion of the property does not solve the problem of what classification the property is - a nonfarm parcel defines that agricultural activities can take place without that being the principal use. The question for the Board ultimately is the principal use. If the Board decides the Dennis parcel is not a farm lot, they could not do this addition to their property without a variance. Mrs. Dennis said their parcel is about five (5) acres. The Dennises live on the five (5) acre parcel, on which there is also a second house being used as a rental unit. The Dennises brought Lawrence Altland - the Dennises purchased the land from his father-in-law - who can testify the land was being farmed before they bought the property. Mr. Poole said "That may be, but the issue is still, what is the principal use of this lot?" The Manager questioned if the residential units make the principal use residential? Mr. Poole stated there is no legal answer to that question - it is still a policy decision the Board has to make. Mrs. Dennis showed an aerial photo of the property, indicating the degree to which the parcel is farmed.

D.J. Hart noted the exemption to subdivision as "That the subdivision by lease of land for agricultural purposes into parcels of more than 10 acres, not involving any new street or easement of access or any residential dwelling, shall be exempted" (Sect. 195-5). Mrs. Crawford asked Mrs. Dennis if there was a reason why they do not want the 25%. D.J. Hart interrupted stating that he also wanted to address some procedural issues - are all Supervisors voting on this issue this evening? Hart stated that there would be other persons speaking against this S/D tonight who are related to Supervisors. It was noted that Mrs. Crawford has family members in the audience, but there is no monetary benefit to one or the other. Mrs. Crawford's issue from the beginning has been exceeding the 25% the Ordinance allows by definition. In no way, is the primary use farming in this case. Hart questioned the family relationship as reason for Mrs. Crawford to recuse herself. No, absolutely not. Evidently, those family members were previously interested in this parcel and oppose the sale of the land to the Dennises. The applicants would like Mrs. Crawford to recuse herself from the Board because of a possible conflict of interest. Mr. Poole interjected that it is his opinion that there is not an Ethics Code violation because he fails to see any financial impact of \$500 or greater on any family member. Mrs.

Crawford does not stand to gain financially, or in any other way, by the approval or disapproval of this plan and does not need to recuse herself. The Supervisors are elected officials and are all equals, no one can make any Supervisor recuse himself/herself if it is not an Ethics Code violation, which he does not see here. If it becomes an issue, only a court could address that issue. It is up to Mrs. Crawford whether she can render judgement on this issue and whatever decision she makes is not challengeable by anyone here.

Mr. Rodgers questioned on the seven (7) acres allowed to be subdivided, are the building rights on the twenty-nine (29) acres affected by the subdivision of seven (7)? Mr. Poole did not have an answer to this without doing further research. Mr. Stambaugh noted that at the beginning idea of this subdivision, the applicants checked with the Township Zoning Officer who gave the green light, so to speak. The Twp. PC also accepted the agricultural premise. Mrs. Crawford asked if the Zoning Officer gave the applicant the definitions of farm and nonfarm parcels. Mrs. Dennis indicated that he had gone over that definition with her. Mrs. Dennis started on the conflict of interest issues again and was reminded by Chairman Rebert that this Board is not going to get into that issue again. Mr. Poole advised that there is nothing preventing the Dennises from taking the seven (7) acres as allowed. Mr. Rodgers added that there is an approximate \$18,000 rollback tax under Clean and Green if taking less than ten (10) acres. Mr. Poole stated the ordinances are not suggestions, they are the law. Mr. Hart went back to the exemption for subdivision of subdividing ten (10) agricultural acres. Mr. Poole indicated that the ordinance and the MPC state "by lease of land" and this is not a lease of land - it is a fee simple transfer.

Mrs. Crawford feels that the primary use is residential, not agricultural. It was noted that the income from the rental property exceeds the income from the farming use. The language of the ordinance compares farm and non-farm uses. Mr. Rebert does not wish to set a precedent of permitting a greater than 25% subdivision in an RAC Zone. This subdivision can only happen if the applicants can prove that it is a farm to farm transfer. Mrs. Strausbaugh pointed out that the other potential issue here is that this subdivision uses all the subdivision rights for the twenty-nine (29) acre parcel, that is what Mr. Rodgers is interested in. The Manager points out that this is a large part of the issue here and is exactly what the Township was trying to prevent - permitting the agricultural land to be all cut apart. NCT has been trying to save agricultural land. Mrs. Crawford asked again if the issue with not wanting the seven (7) acres allowed to be subdivided is the rollback taxes - Mr. Rodgers affirmed that it was. Mr. Poole pointed out that if a ten (10) acre tract is attached to another farm parcel, that will not count against the development rights and the owner would still retain the development rights on the remainder of the parcel.

Mr. Rebert asked what percentage of the Dennis property is being farmed. Mrs. Dennis responded that about four (4) acres of the five (5) acre parcel is being farmed. Mr. Dennis corrected that to a little over three (3) acres. Currently, about three (3) acres of their property are planted with alfalfa. Crops are rotated as usual. Lawrence Altland, 2932 Cedar Hill Road, attested to the fact that this property has been farmed since at least the mid-sixties. He lives next door to the Dennis property. Mr. Poole asked how much the Dennises receive in rent and how much for farming - \$140 - \$200 per year on farming and \$6000 per year for rent. There are no future plans for the new addition to the property - it is wooded, so will be unable to farm it.

From the audience, Rodney Shearer reminded the Board that there was a previous recent plan in which the Supervisors approved greater than 25% from one owner to another. The Anthony Smith - Kenny Myers subdivision on Waltersdorff Road. There were differences in this case - the entire parcels are being farmed by the Myers boys, their principal use is farming. They own all the land surrounding the fourteen (14) acres they attached it to and farm all of it and more.

Attorney Timothy Ruth was present on behalf of Michael and Judy Goodling, the property owners

whose property is surrounded by the subdivided property. (It was noted that the Goodlings are the relatives of Mrs. Crawford referred to previously.) He agreed that the facts of the case are not in dispute; it is the principal use that is at issue. It is a matter of how the facts apply to our Ordinance. It clearly violates the twenty-five (25) percent allowed. There was discussion on other plans here, there and wherever, but the fact is that makes no difference here tonight. The decision should be what the Ordinance says as it applies to this plan. The discussion about what the Zoning Officer said - again that makes no difference here tonight. He suggested that the Board look at the intent of the Ordinance and how this plan applies to that - it clearly does not meet the 25% limitation. The primary use is for the homestead and the rental property as demonstrated by what is generating the income in this situation. Mr. Ruth pointed out the Board would be unwise if they did not look at what is the intent of our Ordinance with regard to these conditions. The intent as he sees it, is to not allow farm land to be parceled up into small parcels that cannot be practically farmed and have a negative impact on preserving the agricultural nature. He feels that approval of this plan would violate what the Township Subdivision Ordinance provides.

Mrs. Strausbaugh wonders about the future development rights on these tracts. Mr. Shearer would still be entitled to subdivide the remainder of the farm, if the development rights are preserved.

Mr. Rebert feels that he needs more time to review this plan. He also does not like being put on the spot in the middle of a neighborhood problem or dispute. He referred to the previous plans that were approved with similar circumstances. He is not prepared to vote on this plan tonight.

Mr. Poole noted that if the Dennises are not permitted to purchase this parcel, the Goodlings certainly cannot purchase those ten acres either, as their property is in no way in an agricultural use.

**Motion** by Rebert, second by Luckenbaugh, to *table* this plan until the next meeting on October 21, 2008, at 7 p.m. to allow the Board to review the issues. All members voted aye; motion carried.

## VII. Administrative Reports

### A. Manager's Report

1. **Motion** by Luckenbaugh, second by Rebert, to authorize the attendance of Manager, Supervisors, Tax Collector, Zoning Officer, Treasurer and Road Master at the York County Association of Second Class Townships Convention in York on November 13, 2008 at the Township's expense. All members voted aye; motion carried.

### B. Engineer's Report

1. The Ambau Road Culvert project is progressing. Structural Adequacy Approval is expected from PennDOT by September 23<sup>rd</sup>.

2. The Joseph Road (Kinsley) development plan has been postponed again, at least until next month.

3. At the last meeting the Board was informed of an escalator clause on the blacktop materials that was invoked by York Building Products on the Messersmith and Tunnel Hill Road projects. The escalator would have increased the project by about \$60,000. This increase was offset by using millings versus stone and reducing the depth of the paving. This has created Change Order #1 to the York Building Products contract in the amount of \$46,570.62. **Motion** by Crawford, second by Luckenbaugh, to authorize the Chairman to sign Change Order #1 to York Building Products in the amount of \$46,570.62 for the Messersmith and Tunnel Hill Road projects. All members voted aye; motion carried. The use of these materials in stock will actually realize an overall savings of \$11,850.00.

4. Mr. Hertz met with Mr. Bartenfelder on the stormwater issues on his property on Brush

Valley Road. When Greg met with him, the consequences of transferring stormwater from his property to that owned by another individual, was explained to him. Would the neighboring owner, Shearer Partnership, be willing to accept this additional water? Unknown. The elevation of the road was only raised by about five (5) inches, and not in this immediate area. Flooding existed in this area prior to this project. A resolution would involve cutting the road and installing a pipe. If Mr. Bartenfelder clear-cut his property and installed a pond, which added to the water runoff, and the Township didn't cause the problem, why is the Township being asked for a remedy? Is the runoff washing the Township road out? Minimally, at times. Bartenfelder made the point that the stormwater flowed over the road at one time - now it gets trapped on his side of the road. **Motion** by Rebert, second by Crawford, to have Mr. Hertz send a letter to Mr. Bartenfelder indicating that the Township does not feel that it created or worsened the problem and is not responsible for the runoff. All members voted aye; motion carried.

5. The stormwater issues submitted by Mrs. Hamm at 1491 Wishing Well Court were investigated. Mr. Hertz feels that there were problems with the stormwater prior to the sewer construction, but the problems have worsened. There was an existing rock lined swale that was impacted by sewer installation. Matt Calderon, resident at 3480 Salem Springs Drive, has spoken with the Sewer Authority representatives but has not received adequate satisfaction. There is a ground pile on an adjoining land owner's property that is aggravating the situation. The soil is damming up the water. The Road Master will check out the situation.

#### C. Solicitor's Report

1. An assessment appeal has been filed for Franklin Holdings for the warehouse building erected for PHG. Mrs. Strausbaugh requested that Mr. Poole attend the hearing and oppose the reduction. This involves approximately a \$6 million assessment. There is a possibility that this appeal is brought by P. H. Glatfelter. **Motion** by Luckenbaugh, second by Rebert, to have Mr. Poole represent the Township at the Board of Appeals proceeding and to oppose any reduction in the Franklin Holdings assessment. All members voted aye; motion carried.

### VIII. Old Business

A. **Motion** by Crawford, second by Rebert, to *table* the updates to the Personnel Policy until the 24<sup>th</sup> at the Budget work session. All members voted aye; motion carried.

### IX. New Business

A. Application for a junkyard license was made by Harry Joseph Darrah III for the property at 1384 Sunnyside Road. Mr. Darrah and Brian Sterner were present on this request. This application is for the business on the other side of the road from the existing business, this property previously licensed to Harry Eichelberger. **Motion** by Crawford, second by Luckenbaugh, to approve the request by Harry J. Darrah III for a license to maintain a junkyard at 1384 Sunnyside Road. All members voted aye; motion carried. Mr. Rebert asked if the applicant had a problem with combining the two (2) junkyard permits for next year. Mr. Darrah had no problem doing so, in fact it would be easier. Mr. Poole indicated there was no legal reason not to do this.

B. **Motion** by Rebert, second by Crawford, to affirm the decision to renew the health insurance contract with Highmark as it now exists at a cost of \$174,523. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Mr. Rebert noted that this was a \$45,800 increase in the benefits to the employees of the Township. He proposes assessing the employees 5% of the cost from October 2008 until the beginning of 2009, at which time the assessment would be 7.5%, to help offset some of the cost of the insurance. Mrs. Crawford would

like to compare some numbers and discuss this issue at the budget meeting next week. Mrs. Strausbaugh opposes this assessment. Evidently one staff member has other insurance coverage and does not need to use the Township's insurance. In effect, that person would be getting a raise and no other staff member would.

The advertisement for the budget meeting was checked; "any and all other business to come before the Board" was not included in the wording, so action may not be taken on this issue at the budget meeting. This will be discussed in an Executive Session to be held at a later date.

C. **Motion** by Crawford, second by Luckenbaugh, to award the Line Painting Contract to Alpha Space Control Company, Inc., at a cost NTE \$3,960.00 All members voted aye; motion carried.

D. **Motion** by Rebert, second by Crawford, to approve the Winter Services Contract with PennDOT for the 2008-2009 Contract season. All members voted aye; motion carried.

E. **Motion** by Luckenbaugh, second by Crawford, to approve the change of Employee Performance Evaluation Form as presented. All members voted aye; motion carried.

F. Mrs. Strausbaugh noted that several requests for traffic studies have come in to the Township; is there some way she can request these studies as a group and not bring each one before the Board? Mr. Poole urged that any request for a traffic study be examined carefully because the municipality is bound then to follow the results.

**Motion** by Crawford, second by Rebert to approve the requests for traffic studies in the Smith Hill area and the associating intersecting streets. All members voted aye; motion carried.

G. **Motion** by Crawford, second by Rebert, to pay \$802.60 to Seven Valleys Borough as a contribution to the workers' compensation insurance to cover the Tri Community Ambulance services. All members voted aye; motion carried.

H. **Motion** by Crawford, second by Luckenbaugh, to approve the 2009 Non-Uniform Pension MMO in the amount of \$61,229.88. All members voted aye; motion carried.

As referred to at the last meeting, Mr. Luckenbaugh had his septic pump pumped. He presented information on fiberglass risers to bring the tank opening to grade. All in all, a fascinating account.

Mrs. Crawford asked if the Township bills the motorist if a Township sign is damaged in a traffic incident. Yes. And most insurance companies will pay for the sign and the labor to replace it.

#### IX. Announcements

- A. The Rec Board will meet on September 22<sup>nd</sup> at 7 p.m.
- B. The Planning Commission will meet on September 23<sup>rd</sup> at 7 p.m.
- C. The Next Board of Supervisors meeting will be October 21<sup>st</sup> at 7 p.m.
- D. The SWRPD Board will meet on October 8<sup>th</sup> at 7 p.m., at 6115 Thoman Drive.
- E. The Sewer Authority will meet on October 20<sup>th</sup> at 7 p.m.
- F. There will be no Zoning Hearing Board meeting in September.
- G. Budget meeting September 24<sup>th</sup> at 3 p.m.

**Motion** by Crawford, second by Rebert, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joy Ann Strausbaugh, Secretary