

FERGUSON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Regular Meeting
Monday, November 1, 2010
7:00 pm

I. ATTENDANCE

The Board of Supervisors held its first regular meeting of the month on Monday, November 1, 2010 at the Ferguson Township Municipal Building. In attendance were:

Board:	Richard Killian, Chairman	Staff:	Mark Kunkle, Township Manager
	Robert Heinsohn		Trisha Lang, Director of Planning and Zoning
	Steve Miller		David Modricker, Director of Public Works
	Bill Keough		Eric Endresen, Director of Finance
	George Pytel		

Others in attendance included: Marsha Buchanan, Recording Secretary; Marc McMaster, Planning Commission; Rita Watson, 1451 Ash Avenue; Thomas and Jennifer Stahl, Trostle property; Jim Steff, COG; Bill Hechinger and Pam Steckler, 127 Hoy Street, and Rhonda Stern, 119 N. Butz Street.

II. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Killian, Chairman, called the November 1, 2010 meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

III. CITIZEN'S INPUT

Rita Watson, 1451 Ash Avenue (a dead end street), expressed concern about being unfairly treated in her neighborhood. She tries to abide by Code rules and receives fines, but has to look at the Sheesley property, which is not a pleasant sight. Mr. Keough asked if there are any issues that the Board should discuss with regard to buildings on the Sheesley property now that it has been abandoned. Mr. Pytel does not believe so at this time, but said the Code Officer should look at the property again to see what could be done. Mr. Kunkle will contact Code on November 2nd. The building needs to be secured and safe; if so, the buildings can remain.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – RESOLUTIONS

1. A PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE NON-UNIFORMED EMPLOYEES ICMA-RC SECTION 457 DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN ALLOWING PLAN PARTICIPANTS TO TAKE LOANS FROM THE PLAN

At the time of establishment of the 457 Deferred Compensation Plan, the Township had several plan feature options from which to choose. One of the options not chosen at the time was the ability for plan participants to obtain a limited term loan from the funds they had placed in their 457 Deferred Compensation account. These funds are 100% employee contributions and do not represent Township contributions. Loans from the 457 Deferred Compensation Plan are permitted by the IRS regulations and will not affect the plan's qualified status.

Mr. Kunkle said this is a no-cost benefit enhancement of an employee's plan. It would allow them to have one loan per year. The loan amount is normally .5% above the prime rate, which is an attractive borrowing rate. He summarized the features/requirements of the loan.

Mr. Keough made a motion to approve Resolution 2010-29, amending the ICMA-RC 457 Deferred Compensation Plan to permit participant loans. Mr. Heinsohn seconded the motion. With Mr. Heinsohn, Mr. Keough, Mr. Killian, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Pytel all voting yes, the motion passed.

V. ACTION ITEMS

1. THIRD QUARTER FINANCIAL REPORT

Eric Endresen, Director of Finance, provided an overview of the Township's finances for the third quarter, including Actuals through September 30, 2010; Comparison of Budget to Actuals; Summary of Third Quarter 2010; and Comparison of 2010 to 2009. In total the Township is in the positive.

Mr. Kunkle asked if the Township has made the total amount of transfers from the General Fund to various other funds. Mr. Endresen said no, and said that will affect the General Fund. He provided examples.

Mr. Kunkle said as of October the Township had an outstanding balance for Capital Project C-1, which has not yet been paid for. Mr. Endresen said that amount of money would not have shown up as part of his presentation.

Mr. Kunkle commented that the Township does not receive its revenues on a uniform basis throughout the year. Normally their largest portion of money comes in May, after the April 15th filing of the EIT forms. They get small amounts of money from that point on. The Township's revenues are peaked prior to the July 1st time period. Mr. Endresen said they will see more expenditures than revenues coming in over the next three months.

2. MODIFICATION REQUEST FOR SUBDIVISION OF TROSTLE PROPERTY

The modification is being requested since the proposed subdivision of a two-acre residential lot on the Trostle property is to be on a private street. The Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance under Section 504 – Lots and Parcels, 2. *Lot Frontage and Access*, A. *Access to Public Streets*, states: (1) Lots may be created in recorded subdivision plans where private streets existed as of January 10, 1989.

Ms. Lang pointed out the parcel in question on the map. She said the problem is that the applicants have no road frontage, which is required by the ordinance. They are requesting a modification to that requirement in order to be able to subdivide this lot. They do have a recorded right to use right of way all the way to Dry Hollow Road, but they still need a modification of the street frontage requirements from the Township. The main concern is that, based on the development of the two properties (the large Rossman lot and the large Trostle property), there could be a total of 10 lots using this single access, which is an 11-foot gravel cart way, but is within a 30-foot right of way as described in the recorded easement agreement. The Planning Commission suggested that the applicants ask for a wider right of way, but Mr. Rossman has refused to alter it. They also presented the applicant with standard language from the subdivision ordinance that is required when utilizing a private street. Mr. Rossman is not willing to implement the proposed language. They have not yet begun the subdivision process.

The applicants are also required to go before the Zoning Hearing Board to get a variance from the zoning regulations. The Planning Commission recommended that they request additional right of way and include the language of the private street agreement, neither of which they are able to obtain. It is not the intent of the applicants to develop this property further.

Mr. Killian said the Rossman lot was not subdivided at first, but this was done later. Ms. Lang agreed. When they did the subdivision, they were able to get a flag pole providing them with frontage on Dry Hollow Road. A house could be built on the applicant's lot without going through the subdivision process. Ms. Lang said three lots can still be built on the farm parcel.

Mr. Keough asked if there was a statement that would potentially limit any future development. Ms. Lang said the Commission discussed the status of the private road with regard to its ability for cars to pass, etc. There was a suggestion that, in granting a modification, they could require street improvements under certain conditions. They also discussed the fact that if they do not allow the Trostles to subdivide, they are somehow prohibiting them from developing their property. The current proposal does not limit this.

Mr. Kunkle said there is also a recommendation further along in the agenda with regard to the variance request that there be no further subdivision of the property unless there is appropriate public street frontage. Mr. Pytel asked if there is a number of homes allowable on a private street in the Township's ordinance. Mr. Kunkle said they no longer allow any. Ms. Lang said Lot #2 goes back to 1926. It became a Rossman possession in 1997.

Mr. Miller asked if they have a way of limiting further subdivision. Ms. Lang said they can set conditions/restrictions for the Trostle property as part of the modification, but it would be difficult to limit the Rossman's property as part of this action. The applicants are asking for an approval of a modification of the subdivision requirement. Mr. Killian asked who would maintain this private road. Ms. Lang said currently there is no provision within the right of way. Many times there is a neighborly agreement about who does what. Mr. Killian said there needs to be access during an emergency situation.

Mr. Kunkle said the maintenance agreement is for emergency services. If there would be a snowstorm or a medical/fire/police emergency, this would allow the Township to open that roadway so an emergency response could occur, and then bill residents for those costs.

Mr. Pytel asked what would happen if the owner of Lot #2 decided they would not maintain the road. Ms. Lang said there is nothing in the existing agreement that would allow them to maintain the road. Mr. Kunkle said technically the Township could not currently go on that property during an emergency situation. Ms. Lang said that is why this language should be placed into some agreement, but Mr. Rossman is not willing to let that happen.

Jennifer Stahl, applicant requesting modification for subdivision of Trostle property, said these are family-owned lots. They currently plow the lane because they have an interest in the property. They want to build another house to they can help to keep the lane useable. Both parties feel that the current right of way is adequate. Her husband Tom does all the work on this property.

Mr. Pytel said all they need to do is to get an agreement from the owners of that property saying they have the easement going through there so the Township would have the right to enter the property in the case of an emergency. Ms. Stahl said Mr. Rossman is not willing to change the agreement. They are not related to the Rossmans. The Township would still not have access to the main parcel regardless of whether this modification is granted. She said as long as they own the property, they have no intention of having 5 parcels along the property.

Mr. Heinsohn made a motion to approve the request for modification to Chapter 22, Section 504, 2.A (1) to allow for the subdivision of a 2 acre lot, and further to require the following information prior to a

determination: (a) proof of legal access across lands of Rossman Lots 1 and 2; and (b) restriction of any further subdivision without a road agreement. Mr. Miller seconded the motion. With Mr. Pytel and Mr. Killian voting no, and all other Board members voting yes, the motion passed.

The Board would not be asking them to establish a maintenance agreement with this subdivision, but with any future subdivision. Mr. Kunkle said that would require a note to be placed on the plan. Mr. Pytel said they would be putting a subdivision where it is not legal to have one. Mr. Keough explained that the applicants' request has to do with access to the public road. The Board would be allowing a modification based on the fact that they have a land-locked piece of property that does not have the ability to acquire frontage on a public road. They would be allowing in this isolated case, because of those circumstances, the opportunity for this modification to the ordinance to allow for this subdivision.

3. 2011 COG BUDGET REVIEW

Mr. Killian highlighted the certain topics in the 2011 COG Budget.

Mr. Keough asked regarding Page 27 if the total COG Budget has increased by \$4 million in five years. Mr. Miller noted that they cannot compare year to year since large purchases show up one year and not the next. Mr. Killian said this includes capital purchases. **Jim Steff**, COG Executive Director, said this also includes the Library Capital Fund.

The Board reviewed and commented on the following sections specifically:

COG Building Capital

Mr. Keough noted that Halfmoon Township suggested looking into the possibility of the Centre Region Code Program implementing an enterprise fund rather than a governmental fund. Mr. Steff said the idea of an enterprise fund would emphasize the business nature of that particular budget. It would be a slight accounting change, but not a profound difference in how they do business. It would not alter the different municipalities' roles with regard to approving fees and should not require any alteration in accounting software. This is simply a change in accounting to be more business-like.

Mr. Killian said, especially on the commercial side, there is a lot of pressure for staff who review plans, as they are often working more than 40 hours per week. Mr. Steff said, while residential construction has been losing strength, commercial construction has been gaining strength. **Comment: It is not fair that some people are working over 40 hours a week. The current work overload is with the plan review.** Mr. Steff explained.

Mr. Pytel clarified that the Code Inspector does inspections himself without getting an engineer to sign off. Mr. Steff agreed, and explained.

Regional Library

Comment: Mr. Killian said as part of the Finance Committee, the library budget process went very well. Mr. Heinsohn commented that they should continue to urge students to be counted as part of the library usage. The Board agreed.

Comment: Mr. Keough stated that it seems unfair to continue to comment that Ferguson Township has a deficit in its funding share. The library budget should reflect the actual formula used by each particular municipality. Mr. Killian said traditionally they have paid the COG formula, so for budgetary purposes that is the number they use. Mr. Miller said last year Ferguson

Township made up the difference between the formula the Township accepted and the formula accepted by other municipalities. The fact that this was to be a one-time thing did not get built into the COG formula. Mr. Pytel explained why the Township not belonging to the library is a benefit. Mr. Killian stated that using the Township's formula right now, the library budget is balanced.

Centre Regional Planning Agency

Mr. Heinsohn said some townships do not have planners, so they are using the COG planners for assistance. Mr. Pytel said some municipalities cannot afford full-time planners. If any of those planners cut down on their hours, he asked where that falls into the COG budget. Mr. Steff said he has spoken with Jim May about that. There are some expenditure cuts they could make, or they could try to shift some of that work load from county to regional, but all municipalities (the other five funding partners) would need to agree to that. As things currently stand, they have not received a formal request to withdraw from the program. To withdraw, it would require a year's notice. ***Comment: Ferguson Township prefers that any reduction in local planning services require a one-year notice to be fair to the other municipalities.***

MPO

Comment: The funding formula and cost allocation should be reviewed as they now exist. They should consider the possibility of weighted voting based on the municipal contribution.

Regional Fire Protection

Mr. Killian said there are not any major equipment purchases. Mr. Steff said the replacement of a command vehicle was proposed. The Alpha responds to over 1,000 alarms per year. The Assistant Chief uses a COG vehicle for calls.

Code

Comment: The Board supports adding a commercial inspector/plan examiner but wants them to recall that the reduction in Code staff was at the urging of the development community and that, as a result of the reduction of staff, there was less timely service.

Parks Capital

Mr. Killian said there is not 100% agreement regarding how much of the 2011 budget they should be paying toward the Parks Capital Budget. The proposal is to increase the amount from the current level to \$425,000. There are a lot of unknowns as far as the terms of the bond issue, etc. Mr. Keough asked if the Township would be able to fund the higher portion at a faster rate than other townships that cannot afford that at this time, or whether all municipalities have to stay at the same rate. Mr. Pytel commented. Mr. Killian said they have not discussed whether or not a township may want to donate now or later in order to get the parks completed more quickly. But there will probably be just bond or one loan. Mr. Miller said if they cannot work out an increase to \$425,000, it will be difficult to work out other details. ***Comment: The Board supports the \$425,000 contribution level and believes this is sending a message of their commitment for the funding of all three regional parks by all participating municipalities.***

Parks and Recreation

Comment: The Board commented with regard to increasing the municipal share. Mr. Steff said he went out to a municipality that is in opposition of any change. They had proposed a lower borrowing number of \$7 million and had agreed to go up to \$7.5 million. Part of their agreement of this was that the funding level would remain the same.

Nature Center

Mr. Pytel said they had a three-year term of paying \$3,000/year and then it would be self-sustaining. That was about 15 years ago, but it is still part of the budget. Mr. Steff said they have not been able, despite their efforts, to make that building completely self-sustaining financially. Mr. Pytel asked why Ferguson Township is paying over 28%. Mr. Steff said that is due to the COG funding formula.

Mr. Kunkle reviewed the Board's comments on the 2011 COG Budget.

4. STAHL VARIANCE APPLICATION

A variance application has been filed in addition to the modification request. The variance is from the required street frontage for a lot with a structure and the required building lot width at the street line. There was an initial concern from the Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor that, based on the documents submitted with the application, the Stahls did not have legal standing to apply for this variance. This concern has been resolved.

Staff recommends that the Board support this variance application with the following recommended conditions: (a) that the subdivision plan be approved and all conditions of the subdivision plan approval be met; and (b) that there is no further subdivision of the proposed parcel.

Mr. Keough asked for clarification regarding Item (b). Mr. Kunkle clarified that a variance has a more legal standing than a modification as far as the decision of the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated the condition, including that "there be no further subdivision of the proposed parcel unless access is obtained that is consistent with the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations." Mr. Pytel believes it should stay that way. Ms. Lang said the proposed parcel is a two-acre lot that has no further subdivision potential. Mr. Kunkle said the intent is that it applies to the remaining part of the Trostle tract.

Mr. Heinsohn made a motion to support the variance application, changing "proposed parcel" to "remaining parcel," to read as follows: "The Board supports the variance application under the conditions that (a) the subdivision plan be approved and all conditions of the subdivision plan approval be met; and (b) there is no further subdivision of the remaining parcel." Mr. Pytel seconded the motion. With Mr. Pytel and Mr. Heinsohn voting yes, and all other Board members voting no, the motion was denied.

Mr. Miller made a motion to support the variance application, adding language to read as follows: "The Board supports the variance application under the conditions that (a) the subdivision plan be approved and all conditions of the subdivision plan approval be met; and (b) there is no further subdivision of the remaining parcel unless access meets the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations of the Township. With Mr. Pytel voting no, and all other Board members voting yes, the motion passed.

5. PROPOSED TERRACED STREETScape ZONING DISTRICT DISCUSSION

The Board began discussing on Page 7 where they left off with Building Height Incentives. Since the last meeting, they have captured public comments and will incorporate them into the Board's discussions of the proposed ordinance. Ms. Lang explained that in the updated draft of the ordinance the discussion of Building Height Incentives is on Page 6.

Building Height Incentives

They have all agreed that it is important for a building over 55' with a certain level of rental units to have a way to require full-time management. Staff has been researching this, and has determined that this can be a requirement as part of a conditional use. It is no longer an incentive. Ms. Lang said it has been moved to Page 5 of the draft ordinance. Structures above 55' were already subject to conditional use criteria; they simply made one of those criteria to read that if they have more than two floors devoted entirely to residential units they need to provide full-time, on-site management. It would be a requirement.

One thing they have not been in agreement on is what percentages are appropriate for incentives. The current proposal is 10% for owner-occupied housing and 15% for age-restricted housing. Mr. Heinsohn suggested having the President of the Homeowner's Association enforce these requirements.

Ms. Lang said age-restricted is tougher than workforce housing. Often, the best people to be responsible for it are the other people who are subject to the same restriction. There is now a requirement for on-site management, so someone will be there most of the time to have an understanding of who is living in the units. It is a possibility to have units that require someone to be determined eligible to rent/buy the units. Currently it is administered by the Borough. Mr. Keough asked if there is an appropriate document that would reference, for example, the on-site management responsibility for monitoring either the age-restricted or workforce housing. Ms. Lang said there is currently not a document.

Mr. Kunkle said they could have a development agreement that would bind them to on-site management. Mr. Keough expressed concern that in giving these kinds of incentives, there should not only be an initial determination that they are in place but also an ongoing determination that they remain effective. Ms. Lang said there are other examples where the Township has granted authority for something specific and enforced it. Mr. Kunkle said the Township could generate an agreement. Mr. Keough would like it to be referred to in the ordinance.

Right now they have 10% for owner-occupied or affordable units as an incentive for increasing height. Mr. Pytel said they should explain a maximum of 75'. Ms. Lang said there is a statement on Page 12 indicating that the incentives can be mixed or matched, but cannot be used to obtain multiple bonuses. She suggested adding "or exceed the maximum standard" so they cannot use the incentives to exceed the maximum height allowed. ***The Board's consensus was 10% for owner-occupied or affordable units.***

Right now they have 15% for age-restricted housing as an incentive for increasing height. Mr. Miller believes that, if they are going to be build, it will probably be 100%. ***The Board's consensus was 15% for age-restricted units.***

Mr. Killian asked if there was any interest in having a green incentive for building height. Mr. Keough said he recently attended a workshop on energy efficiency changes. They discussed existing old buildings and what kinds of things could be put into place. He feels that more people in the construction field are recognizing the economic value of modern technology. They are opting for green technology. Mr. Heinsohn is opposed to it. Mr. Pytel provided an example.

Pam Steckler, 127 Hoy Street, said the original draft version from June 2010 under building height incentives said, "if the use of environmentally responsible building practices through compliance with LEED Gold standards is achieved, an additional two stories, not to exceed an additional 20', may be added to the permitted maximum." She asked why this was removed. Talking about LEED standards included sustainable, green building practice. She believes green incentives should be a part of the plan for any building above two stories. Mr. Miller said that was removed as part of the discussion that decreased the maximum height from 9 stories to 7 stories. They believed if there were only incentives for an additional two stories, that was not necessary.

Mr. Keough said they have incorporated some of the green incentives into impervious surface coverage instead of with building height. Ms. Lang explained in further detail. The problem with creating a list that is too long is that the developer will not choose the items that the Township desires. Mr. Miller also said there are economic incentives to build energy-efficient buildings. Ms. Steckler urged the Board to look at long-range planning.

The Board's consensus was NOT to have a green incentive for building height.

Building Occupancy

Mr. Killian said the current proposal is for a maximum square footage per individual, non-residential use of 10,000 square feet/floor. Ms. Lang said they have had a debate about what is an appropriate size for a neighborhood use.

Bill Hechinger, 127 Hoy Street, said even at 10,000 or 15,000 square feet, if that is applied on their short block, the number of stores will be limited to 1 or 2 per block. He expressed concern that if buildings of that size are permitted, that is what will be there. Mr. Miller does not believe anyone will open a grocery store or hardware store at much smaller than what is proposed to be permitted.

Regarding Rear Access, Mr. Keough said there is nothing in the wording of this ordinance that would disallow a two-story commercial use. Ms. Lang said the 10,000 square foot limit is a per-user square footage. Mr. Keough clarified that any one individual could only use 10,000 square feet, unless they use incentives. Ms. Lang explained that one storefront could have multiple occupants in a single building. Ms. Steckler clarified that the 10,000 square feet per floor could become 20,000 square feet and the 15,000 square feet per floor could become 30,000 square feet.

There was a comment that multiple dwelling units should not exceed three bedrooms. Ms. Lang said there is no place in the Township where there is a restriction on number of bedrooms. This is a Code issue with regard to living space.

Air Handlers

Ms. Steckler expressed concern about loud air conditioning units. Ms. Lang said this is probably a Code issue with regard to how someone heats or cools a structure. They already have a noise ordinance in the Township. **Rhonda Stern**, 119 N. Butz Street, asked, if there is a five-story building next to a residence and all residences have their air conditioning units on, whether that would be too loud for Code. She suggested revisiting solutions for the noise issue. She expressed that streets are quieter with lower building heights. She suggested that lower building heights, quiet atmosphere, and yards have an impact on humanizing students. Mr. Heinsohn said sound is measured in decibel units. If over the decibel units, then it would be a violation of the sound codes. In the design of these buildings, sound level is one of the criteria used in purchasing these units. Ms. Stern said air

conditioning units are even more of an issue with taller buildings. ***Mr. Killian said this topic will be further discussed in the future.***

Mandatory Recycling

Mr. Killian stated that recycling is already mandatory.

Parking Structures

Parking structures have green incentives, under Building Occupancy.

Yard Regulations are next on the agenda. The Board will begin discussing this topic at their next regular meeting, on November 15th.

6. REVIEW OF PRE-HOSPITALIZATION REPORT

The Pre-Hospitalization Care Report dated September 15, 2010 and discussed at the COG General Forum on September 25th has been referred to the COG Municipalities for review and consideration. The report indicates that the Public Safety Committee did not identify any significant problems that adversely impact Public Safety, based on the presentations of three agencies that provide pre-hospital care. Mr. Kunkle summarized the four findings of the Public Safety Committee. In addition to these recommendations, questions should also be posed to new urgent care centers that have opened in the Centre Region subsequent to the issuance of this report and what impact those urgent care centers may have on pre-hospitalization care in the Centre Region.

Mr. Kunkle said the highest recommendation was that a uniformed police officer be stationed at the hospital. Mr. Keough said he has attended all of the Public Safety meetings and does not feel that having a public safety officer stationed at the hospital was an official recommendation, but rather a discussion item for the committee. But if the Board has recommendations, he will certainly take those back to the committee and Mr. Kunkle can supplement those with a letter from the Board to Jim Steff.

Mr. Killian does not see the advantage for designating a particular ambulance service. Regarding the second point, any non-profit organization must have adequate security. Mr. Pytel said they are discussing something that is University-related. The University should try to do something to stop the problem of people being sent to the hospital during or after various events.

The Board's comments were as follows: (1) They need an understanding of what the advantages are to designating a particular ambulance provider; (2) Some Board members are opposed to assigning a police officer at the hospital because that would be one less police officer on the street at a potentially crucial time; and (3) They asked whether they should consider in the future having a representative from Centre Link discuss with the Board the advantages and answer their questions above. Mr. Keough said they have two choices: recommend to COG that they make a presentation on this topic to the entire COG audience or have them make a presentation for the Township. The Board would prefer having them present to the entire COG body at one time.

7. SEPTEMBER 2011 VOUCHER REPORT

Mr. Heinsohn made a motion to approve the September 2011 Voucher Report. Mr. Pytel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Heinsohn made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Miller seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. REPORTS

a. Manager

- The ALCAB hearing on the Whitehall Road Widening Project will be held on November 18th at 10:00 am in the Township Main Meeting Room. A notification list has been provided to the PA Department of Agriculture so that they may provide notice to adjacent property owners. Staff and consultants are preparing for the hearing. They anticipate that the study of the alternative to the stormwater detention basin on the Campbell's property will be completed in time for the hearing.
- Mr. Kunkle had the honor of representing the Township at the October 26th dedication of the Michael Weston Memorial, which is located in the Greenbriar-Saybrook Park and was constructed by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency.
- The Proposed 2011 Township Budget has been submitted to the Board. Worksessions have been scheduled for November 11th and 16th.

b. Public Works Director

Whitehall Road Widening: Mr. Modricker and Mr. Kunkle made a presentation to the County on October 28th.

Old Gatesburg Road Extension: They are interviewing firms to do inspection. There will be a pre-construction meeting in the near future and he anticipates a Notice to Proceed to HRI for November 15th to start groundbreaking.

Westfield Stormwater Basin: Repairs should begin on November 4th.

c. Director of Planning and Zoning

Ms. Lang reported that the Planning Commission did not hold a meeting on October 25, 2010 as planned. There was not a quorum of Commission members present. The discussion of development of a traffic calming policy and the review of the Airport Overlay Zoning will be on the agenda for the next meeting scheduled for November 8, 2010.

d. COG Committee Reports

1. *Public Services & Environment* – Mr. Heinsohn said they are meeting on November 3rd to consider a response to propose to the Forum regarding greenhouse gas mitigation and energy conservation.
2. *Transportation & Land Use* – Mr. Pytel said Ms. Lang attended the November 1st meeting. They will reconsider including farming as a business in the Township. They discussed having another tier of government, to which most people were opposed. They decided to have someone from each municipality participate on a committee. They also discussed the regional growth

boundary. They are talking about expanding it in Harris Township to provide for more development. They also discussed the sewer system.

VII. MINUTES

Mr. Pytel made a motion to approve the October 18, 2010 BOS Regular Meeting minutes. Mr. Miller seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Board of Supervisors, Mr. Killian adjourned the November 1, 2010 Regular Meeting at 10:28 pm.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Mark Kunkle, Township Manager
For the Board of Supervisors

Date approved by the Board: 11/15/2010