

## **AUGUST 17, 2006 SUPERVISORS' MEETING:**

The Mount Joy Township Board of Supervisors met this date in regularly scheduled session at 7:30 p.m. in the Mount Joy Township Municipal Building, 902 Hoffman Home Road, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, with Board Chairman James Waybright presiding. Others in attendance were: Supervisors William Chantelau, George Scott, Samuel Dayhoff, and Harold Kirschner; Solicitor Walton V. Davis; Zoning Officer Dave Crouse; Eric Mains of KPI; Robin Crushong, Treasurer; Jesse Hubbard, Office Assistant; News Reporters Aaron Young (*The Gettysburg Times*); and Meg Bernhardt (*The Evening Sun*); and Brenda Constable, Secretary.

Citizens in attendance were: Tina Midkiff; Sylvia Turner; Bart Breighner; John Allan; Tom Newhart; Carol Newhart; Lyman Schwartz; Marie Chantelau; Ronald Reed; Jerry Althoff representing the Planning Commission; Kitty Hofmann; Joe Hofmann; Margaret Wallen; James Cullison representing Trans Associates; Steve Loss and Joe Erb representing Fairview Farms; Henry C. Reaver, Jr.; Carol E. Holtz; Mary Davis; Linda Bloom; Sharon Payne; Pam & John Roman representing the Watchdog Group; Eileen Holmes; Jeff Mayer; George Manor; Fred W. Lang; Elsie D. Morey; Roger Steele; Fred Heerbrandt representing Steve Knisley; Sally Alexander; Donald L Wickline; Freda Thomen; Erik Slapp; Brad & Libby Trostle; Jack McLatchy; Dean Selby; Bill Oneale; Emily Shoey; Audrey Sanders; Mike McCalla; Betty G. Manno; Kellie D. Hurst; Cecilia Dunchack; Karen Breighner; Toby Hartlaub; Tamara Bream; Audrey Weiland; Sandy DeFoe; Richard Schmoyer of Adams County Planning & Development.

Board Chairman Waybright led everyone with the Pledge to the Flag.

Mr. Waybright announced that the meeting was being recorded.

### **Minutes:**

Mr. Chantelau moved, seconded by Mr. Kirschner, to approve the minutes of the July 20, 2006 meeting as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Chairman's Statement:**

Mr. Waybright stated that as a result of the letters that have been reported in both local newspapers, he felt the need to address them. He doesn't particularly like commenting on articles because you only hear part of the whole story if you don't attend meetings. However, the Watchdog interview has shown what he was afraid of; the real reason and goal of that Group, which is to remove this Board. We, the Supervisors, believe that the Watchdog statements clearly indicate that the real purpose of this referendum, which is not to enhance the government of our Township, which was done in 2000 when the residents voted to increase this Board from three members to five, but it is to cause removal of the current members of this Board because this Board has not done the bidding for their Group. Five board members provide more representation for the Township residents. Five individuals to perform the many tasks associated with township government providing the flexibility to create a committee structure, which we have done. We have addressed many functional areas of township government such as personnel, finance, roads, etc. These committees of two Supervisor members each, serves the citizens of Mount Joy Township well. We can put two Supervisors at a meeting with other individuals and therefore have a better input in these meetings and more representation for the Township. This Board firmly believes this ballot referendum is a step backwards, which if taken, clearly results in less representation; decreased functionality of the government of the Township. What happens if this ballot referendum is approved by the voters and the Board is reduced to three? In November of 2007 the citizens have the opportunity to elect three supervisors. Between the decision of 2006 and January 2008, when the new three member board

takes office, the current board will serve their full terms of office. To summarize, this ballot referendum is not in the best interest of the Township. It is a step backward; a retreat from a positive step taken forward in 2000 by the citizens of Mount Joy to expand from three to five. The justification for the voter decision has been proven wrong. In fact, it has been validated by the improved government that we have in Mount Joy. The goal of this ballot initiative is the removal of the individuals, not the improvement of this government structure. It clearly shows a small group, which has a sole goal, has the implementation of imposing their views and is willing to jeopardize and possibly destroy the solid government structure that the voters of the Township established in 2000. We do not accept this. The Board encourages every resident of Mount Joy to carefully examine the record, strip off the emotion, and look at the future when deciding if it is better to have five supervisors or to go backwards to three. Ask yourselves the following questions: why reduce the number of supervisors; what value do we get; how do three supervisors provide more representation than five? I think if you look at the facts when considering these questions, you can come up to the only rational conclusion; going backwards is not in the best interest of the Township. Remember that anyone can say anything in a letter because it is opinion. The facts aren't checked by the papers. What this Board has done here is that we have to deal with facts. We can use only the facts. We have to take emotion out of decisions and govern the Township for the common good for the whole Township.

**Public Comments:** limited to five minutes and names are to be stated.

1. Marie Chantelau: stated that she is a Supervisor's wife and he did not know she was attending the meeting this evening and the comments made here tonight are her own. Thought it was time for the citizens who support what the Supervisors are doing, to speak up and thank them for the endless hours they spend doing the work of the Township. Several years ago, when only three Supervisors, Mr. Waybright, Chantelau, and Scott looked to the future and realized that three were not going to be able to handle all the decisions needed in the coming years. They pushed for changing the governing body to five members, and the citizens agreed. These five members are not just supervisors, but a functioning, cohesive team whose only goal is to do the best for all the residents of Mount Joy Township. They spend countless hours reading, researching, and discussing all issues that the Township must deal with. Sometimes the citizens are not happy with these decisions made, but remember that the Supervisors can not focus on just one individual's problems and the impact their decisions have made, but need to consider the total impact their decisions make on the entire Township. She applauds the Watchdog Group and their key interest in what is happening in the Township, but they made a huge mistake when they petitioned for three supervisors instead of five. They want to replace these men and start fresh; these men are here because no one else wanted the job. They give up their time freely to make the Township a better place to live and are paid by the taxpayers a measly \$1,875 per year for the job they do. Again, she personally thanked the Supervisors for the job they do for the entire Township. As citizens, we have a responsibility to support this Board and the job they do.
2. Joe Hofman: 217 Mud College Road, resident since 2001. Agree with all the comments said tonight; does not agree with 100% of every decision that has been made, but thinks this Board has done a fantastic job and has the community's interests at heart. Thinks the Supervisors are doing a great job and would be a real discredit if the board went back to three members, as well as an enormous discredit to kick these people out of office.
3. Jack McLatchy: Mud College Road. Against the proposed water park along Route 97 and Plunkert Road. Solicited many neighbors to be present tonight for this. Understands that only one person can stop this project right now and that is the person selling the land. However, he still thinks public opinion has a lot of weight, and if someone can convince him that this park is a good thing, then he would go with it. Went through the Comp Plan for three years, made some changes for the Township, and has a problem with Village, Rural Residential, and Agricultural Conservation within 100 yards of each other.

Doesn't think it should be this way. Thinks in that area it should be all AC because a lot of that area is still agricultural, doesn't think it should be RR, and definitely V. Doesn't blame Mr. Gitt for wanting to sell his land, that is his right, but his land in Village district stretches quite a distance. Would like to see if something could be done to change all the area, especially in the Mud College to Miller Road to Updyke Road area, to AC.

4. Carol Holtz: noted a clarification in the minutes from her comments in last month's minutes. Asked for an explanation as to why last Fall's Newsletter indicated that the golf course development would allow 36 homes and the chart in the recent rec board meeting indicated 81 homes. Mr. Dayhoff responded that the 36 homes were figured with on-lot sewer and water and three acre lots; that is what is used to calculate a yield plan in order to see how many TDRs they need to buy. The 81 homes would be with public water and sewer and would be able to go down to one acre lots, which is what they proposed to do on that property so water and sewer would be available; the developer will bring it there.
5. Carol Newhart: 720 Plunkert Road. Thanks Mrs. Chantelau, Mr. Hofman and Mr. McLatchy for their comments. Stated that she is a member of the Mount Joy Township Planning Commission. For the record, she would like it to be known that she plans to recuse herself from voting on any issues related to the proposed water park on Route 97 and Plunkert Road as a Planning Commission member. Presented a petition by a group of "very concerned citizens", has it on file at Tact, Inc. for resident who wishes to sign it, and was developed to serve two purposes. One, to express the objection of the residents to the installation of the proposed water park by Cali Entertainment, and gave reasons why it should not be considered in Mount Joy Township. Over 150 names have been accumulated on the petition to date and are opposed to this project. The goal is to send a strong message from the residents to Cali Entertainment, and the Supervisors, to assist with the decision making process on this issue. The second purpose includes the support of the residents for maintaining a five member board of supervisors. Feels it is imperative to the future of the Township to maintain five members. Reducing the Board to three would reduce the representation for all residents. The Township is growing, not shrinking and a five member board is even more critical at this time and in the future. All voices need to be heard, not just a few. She added that while discussing these issues with other township residents, they discovered that residents who signed the other petition to reduce the Board of Supervisors from five to three, folks signed it without fully understanding exactly what they were signing. It appears that the petition signed to reduce the seats may have been misrepresented and it this citizens' group goal to further investigate this matter while educating the residents on the facts.

Ms. Newhart noted that this group asked Mr. Richard Schmoyer, County Planning Director, to be here tonight to give some comments. Mr. Waybright noted that this is somewhat out of order in that the Supervisors did not ask Mr. Schmoyer to be here tonight to give formal comment, but he would be allowed to give a brief statement.

6. Richard Schmoyer: County Planning Director. Stated that this water park proposal is not a new idea and in fact, the same proposal was made in another township about six months ago. They talked a little about impact. He would not make comments specific to the review this plan, or on zoning details. Stated that it is very high potential tourism use. Seeing a change of tourism in Adams County, above and beyond battlefield uses and must be very careful about where we accommodate these new uses and make sure that they go into locations where the impact can be properly managed. Tourism is usually perceived as a low impact use of area, but not necessarily true in 2006. This proposal would be a "peaks and valley" types of use (seasonal attractions). This project does not sound "village" to him for the Village District, but rather high impact tourism. Road improvements to Route 97 have been made and improvements in Littlestown are being made. The bridge at the Outlets has been done very well, and roads beautifully upgraded and not at public's expense. Littlestown is rapidly growing as well as Germany Township. Route 15 corridor has an enormous potential for growth in the next 10 years. That will put a lot of traffic on the two lane Route 97 connecting Route 15 to Littlestown. The NPS

Visitor Center will also bring additional traffic. Should look to other areas that already have tourism uses, or use shuttle services to hotel areas, rather than remote areas. Concerned about a two lane road to handle the amount of people that would visit a water park and concert venue. Raises a lot of issues such as traffic impact, aesthetic values, noise, and also access into it.

7. Eileen Holmes: White Church Road. Commented that a petition being handed to her tonight is out of order. Confused about a letter sent to her from Campbell & White regarding sewer easements and questioned why a hike & bike trail was mentioned in it. Regarding the recent Township Newsletter, Zoning Officer report, and issuance of permits for new homes should be broken down. Mrs. Holmes stated that she does not like the idea of the number of houses proposed in the Keystone development at the golf course because it will ruin the view from her home. She questioned Mr. Dayhoff as to the number of homes going in that development. He questioned which location she meant since there were other Keystone developments proposed in that area of the Township. She clarified the one across from where she lives and Mr. Dayhoff responded that this same development is the one in his front yard. Mrs. Holmes stated that she did not care about his front yard.
8. Kelly Hurst: Miller Road since 2000. Moved here from Columbia, Maryland, to get away from the city and live in a rural community. Opposing the water park in the midst of this farm community that is quiet and dark at night, not allowed to have dusk to dawn lights or close lines in the backyard for aesthetics. This type of development would be disheartening.
9. Betty Mano: corner of 305 Mud College Road and Updyke Road. Moved here one year ago from Carroll County, to get to a rural area. Learned that one of her neighbors wanted to sell off some lots on his farm. He was very nasty and very greedy to her because she offered to buy some of that property that is connected to hers. She supports the Supervisors with what they are trying to do with preserving land. She has had to come in to the Township for different issues and has always been satisfied. She supports a five member board of supervisors. Opposes the water park. Thanked the Supervisors for doing a good job.
10. Audrey Sanders: Barlow-Two Taverns Road. Lives on the opposite side of the Township from where the water park is proposed, but there is a lot of development coming in her area too. Opposed to the water park. Asked citizens to oppose the rest of development coming into the Township, not just the water park.
11. Pam Roman: Updyke Road. Addressed Mr. Dayhoff, stating that he had said that it was her personal opinion that she said that the Supervisors had opened the Township up to maximum development. Mr. Dayhoff agreed. She stated that the Watchdog Group has been asking the Supervisors to stop catering to the developers, stop changing the TDR ordinances, stop reducing the lots so that there are more houses, and that he said it was her opinion. But according to the Township's zoning chapter 110 about TDRs, page 110:189, it says that a receiving property shall be within the MDR, SFR1, VH, V, RR. Five areas that open up the township as receiving areas for maximum development, which means where one home can be built, five homes could be built. That is not her opinion, it is the Township law.
12. Carol Newhart: just wanted to point out again that what was just said by Mrs. Roman shows their lack of understanding of how the TDRs work.

### **Announcements:**

Ms. Constable announced the following:

- Public Meeting will be held on August 29, 2006 at 7:30 p.m. to discuss sewer service extensions in the RR district with WRRMA.
- A workshop will be held on August 31, 2006 at 9:30 a.m. to discuss a proposed text amendment to the zoning ordinance that would allow reduced lot sizes in the RR district in order to preserve more open space when TDRs are used, without increasing the number of units.

### **Treasurer's Report:**

Mr. Chantelau moved, seconded by Mr. Scott, to approve the Treasurer's Report for the month of July and part of August as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Kirschner, to approve the bills to be paid for the month of July and part of August as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Subdivision/Land Development Plans:**

1. Fairview Farms-Barton Breighner, Owner: proposed 14-lot subdivision on Hickory Road. Mr. Steve Loss was present to review this plan. He noted that the owner is investigating cluster development versus the single family residences currently under review and is requesting a 90-day extension. Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Dayhoff, to approve a 90-day extension through November 18, 2006. Motion carried unanimously.
2. Knisley, Steve: proposed land development plan for buildings on property located on Hickory Road. Planning Commission recommends approval as a Preliminary/Final with contingencies. Mr. Fred Heerbrandt, Engineer for Mr. Knisley was present to review this plan. Mr. Mains stated that he does not need any additional information at this time for approval. Mr. Althoff stated that the Planning Commission recommendation for approval was contingent on obtaining an acceptable perk. Mr. Heerbrandt stated that they are currently working with the SEO on this. It was also noted that the NPDES permit is still needed. Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Chantelau, to recommend approval as a Preliminary/Final contingent on obtaining an acceptable perk and all necessary permits with Conservation District. Motion carried unanimously.
3. Fields of Gettysburg-Colbier Farms: proposed 55-lot subdivision on Barlow-Two Taverns Road. No action and remains on the table.
4. Westminster-Keystone Custom Homes: proposed 204-lot subdivision on White Church and Goulden Roads. Requesting a 90-day extension through November 30, 2006. Mr. Dayhoff moved, seconded by Mr. Chantelau, to approve a 90-day extension through November 30, 2006. Motion carried unanimously.
5. Penton/Thomson: proposed 2-lot addition at 265 and 301 Crouse Road. Planning Commission recommends approval as Preliminary/Final. Mr. Penton was present to review this plan. Mr. Dayhoff moved, seconded by Mr. Scott, to approve as a Preliminary/Final. Mr. Dayhoff moved, seconded by Mr. Chantelau, to approve a Planning Waiver & Non-Building Declaration. Motion carried unanimously.
6. McCalla/Smith: proposed 2-lot addition at 164 and 165 Heritage Drive. Planning Commission recommends approval as Preliminary/Final. Mr. McCalla was present to review this plan. Mr. Dayhoff moved, seconded by Mr. Scott, to approval as a Preliminary/Final. Motion carried unanimously.
7. Slapp, Robert: proposed 2-lot subdivision at 325 Crouse Road. Planning Commission recommends approval as Preliminary/Final with contingencies. Mr. Eric Slapp was present to review this plan. Mr. Mains commented on a few items that needed to be addressed per his letter dated August 2, 2006. Mr. Dayhoff moved, seconded by Mr. Scott, to approve a waiver for preliminary review and accept as a Preliminary/Final. Motion carried unanimously. Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Dayhoff, to approve a Sewage Facilities Planning Module as presented. Motion carried unanimously.
8. Wickline, Donald L.: proposed 3-lot subdivision at 27 Krug Road. Mr. Wickline was present to review this plan. Planning Commission recommends approval as a Preliminary/Final contingent on satisfying Engineer and County comments, and including language on the plan and recorded on the deed that no further subdivision is allowed for the parent tract. Mr. Mains noted that the proposed driveway and house location is to be shown on the plan. Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Chantelau, to approve a waiver for preliminary review and approve as a Preliminary/Final contingent on including a note on the

plan and recorded deed that no further subdivision is allowed on the parent tract per AC zoning regulations §110-26.B.(3)(a)[1] and (e). Motion carried unanimously.

9. Trostle, Walter: proposed 2-lot subdivision at 1070 Barlow-Two Taverns Road. Libby and Brad Trostle were present to review this plan. Planning Commission recommends approval as a Preliminary/Final contingent addressing a culvert issue at the driveway location, and waiver for a concrete corner monument. Mr. Mains stated that the culvert issue has been revised and is okay, and is fine with a rebar corner marker rather than the concrete monument. Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Dayhoff, to approve a waiver for preliminary review and approve as a Preliminary/Final Plan, and approve the waiver for corner marker. Motion carried unanimously.
10. ShIPLEY Stores, Inc.: proposed land development plan for removal of existing store at 1910 Baltimore Pike, and building of a new store with gas pumps and bank. Requesting a 90-day extension. Mr. Dayhoff moved, seconded by Mr. Chantelau, to approve a 90-day extension through December 14, 2006. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Road Report:**

Mr. Chantelau moved, seconded by Mr. Scott, to approve the Road Report as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Zoning Officer Report:**

Mr. Kirschner moved, seconded by Mr. Chantelau, to approve the Zoning Officer Report as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Building & Grounds:**

Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Kirschner, to approve the Building & Grounds Report as presented. Motion carried unanimously. Mr. Dayhoff announced the Open House for the Mud College Schoolhouse on August 19 and 20, 2006 from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

### **Correspondence:**

Ms. Constable announced receiving the following correspondence:

- Received a petition to rezone Ramsburg property.
- DEP response to Watchdog letter regarding water resources and support of legislation to protect private wells.
- Hoffman Homes applying for an NPDES permit for their wastewater treatment plan.
- Received a letter from House of Representatives inviting Mr. Chantelau to testify at an upcoming public hearing on H.B. 2564, sponsored by Rep. Stephen Maitland. Mr. Chantelau could not attend so Mr. Dayhoff would be testifying. Mr. Dayhoff would be supporting the legislation that would create a category called "Growth Counties", which is a county, according to the draft ordinance, that has 75% growth within three years. Then it could be considered a growth county and then certain powers to the municipalities would become effective and the township could grant moratoriums, enact impact fees, and other things.
- As a follow-up to last month's meeting regarding DEP Secretary's response to the Township's letter suggesting a legislative initiative permitting municipalities affected by the declaration of a drought emergency to have authority to declare a prohibition on the construction of new wells, the Supervisors sent a letter to DEP Secretary McGinty and PEMA Director Joseph, asking them to develop language for an emergency proclamation

to provide the Governor with authority to take appropriate actions and adopt regulations governing drought response.

### **Executive Session:**

Mr. Waybright called for an Executive Session at 8:45 p.m. this date.

### **Meeting Reconvened:**

Mr. Waybright reconvened the Supervisors' Meeting at 8:55 p.m. this date with all in attendance.

Mr. Davis stated that just before tonight's Supervisor meeting, Mr. Stephen C. Alexander handed him and each of the Supervisors a letter indicating that he plans to file a suit against the Township within the next 30 days, and a copy of the suit that he intends to file containing what he considers an appropriate certificate of service saying that he has already served it although he hasn't even filed it yet. That suit concerns zoning in general, the Ramsburg property in particular, and also some road matters. Mr. Davis stated that he has only had a chance to briefly review this but considering what subject matters are touched on upon this suit he has requested that the Supervisors not publicly discuss anything having to do with these subjects until it is determined whether or not this suit is going to be filed, and if filed, determine what the likely disposition of it will be. He suggested that any rezoning matters that have been on the table for the past few weeks, months, not be discussed due to this potential suit.

### **Committee Reports:**

Personnel: Mr. Chantelau moved, seconded by Mr. Scott, to accept, with regret, the resignation of Anthony Graham, Road Superintendent, effective the close of business August 18, 2006. Mr. Chantelau commented that Mr. Graham worked for the Township over six years and has done a terrific job on our roads; he has been a definite asset to the Township. Mr. Waybright echoed those comments and noted that Mr. Graham has offered to help plow snow. With no further discussion, the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Chantelau moved, seconded by Mr. Kirschner, to appoint Mr. Sam Dayhoff as Interim Road Superintendent, effective August 19, 2006. Motion carried unanimously.

Finance: Nothing to report.  
Planning, Land Use & Zoning: Nothing to report.  
Building & Grounds: Nothing to report.  
Roads: Nothing to report.  
Public Safety: Nothing to report.

Agricultural Land Preservation: Noted receiving the monthly report. With recommendation from the Ag Land Preservation Board, Mr. Waybright moved, seconded by Mr. Scott, to approve letters to be sent to applicants of Round III and the actions described therein. Motion carried unanimously.

Recreation Board: Noted receiving the monthly report.

Act 209 Traffic Impact Advisory Committee: Mr. Lou Shuba, Vice-Chair of the Advisory Committee, gave an overview of the Act 209 Committee and its process up to the point of developing the Roadway Sufficiency Analysis (RSA) that was prepared by Trans Associates. He introduced Mr. Jim Cullison of Trans Associates who gave an overview of RSA. He noted

that the first report needed for the Traffic Impact Fee Study was the Land Use Assumptions Report (LUAR) prepared by Martin & Martin. The RSA takes the LUAR one step further and identifies how traffic will change in the Township in the future if the assumptions in the LUAR come to fruition. The RSA establishes what the existing transportation problems in the Township are in regards to traffic congestion and projects what the transportation problems would be in the future. The RSA also establishes the Level of Service, which is a grade assigned to roadway conditions to define traffic congestion. Mr. Cullison explained in detail what the Level Of Service is and how and why the grades were determined. The RSA also reports Transportation Service Areas, suggested projects to remediate for pass-through deficiencies, suggested projects to remediate new development deficiencies, proposed construction schedule, and impact fee derivation. Mr. Cullison gave details on each of these issues as well. It was noted that a major project is to add a center lane to Route 97, making it a three-lane road.

It was noted that the bridge on Route 97 at Barlow-Two Taverns Road, Two Taverns Road and Hoffman Home Road would need to be widened. The Supervisors suggested sending the RSA to PennDOT, notifying that the Township is currently doing an Act 209 Study and show them how the bridge needs to be widened, versus what their report from last year revealed that they are widening the bridge to its current width. Notify PennDOT that the Township could use Impact Fees towards the widening of this bridge. It was noted that the next step is to approve the RSA, hold a Public Hearing by the Advisory Committee for the Transportation Capital Improvements Plan, approve the Transportation Capital Improvements Plan, and then adopt the Ordinance, which also requires a Public Hearing by the Supervisors. Mr. Dayhoff asked how far of an area needs to be considered for improvement when a development comes in. Mr. Cullison stated that the current SALDO specifies a one mile radius around the development site, based on a study. The MPC (PA Municipalities Planning Code) does not allow a Township to require off-site road improvements from a developer; the only thing the MPC allows is for the Township to have an Impact Fee Ordinance to fund off-site improvements. Without the Impact Fee Ordinance, the Township can't try to leverage money from the developer to fund off-road improvements. With the Impact Fee Ordinance, the fees collected for each service area can be used anywhere within that service area.

Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Dayhoff, to accept and approve the Road Sufficiency Analysis by Resolution #18 of 2006, as presented. Discussion: Carol Newhart, Advisory Committee member, suggested that the one-mile radius, as currently in the study for SALDO, be dropped from the language and instead, leave it up to the discretion of the Township Engineer, allowing the off-site improvements by the developer to go further than the one mile. To do this, the SALDO would need to be amended. Mr. Shuba pointed out that this Traffic Impact Study is based over a 20 year period. Each project is projected as to when it should be completed and fees collected over time should be enough to do that project. If that doesn't happen, the Advisory Committee is allowed to meet once each year to re-evaluate the projects and re-prioritize them. In addition, the fees that go into each project; the Committee is allowed once each year, to add an escalator due to inflation. Mr. Scott noted that the impact fee is one more tool to slow down development. Mr. Dayhoff added that it takes the burden of the current residents. Mr. Davis added that it makes Mount Joy slightly less attractive to developers and they move on to other townships where they do not have to pay a fee. With no further discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

The Supervisors thanked the Advisory Committee for all of their work they have done on this study. Mr. Cullison commented that it has been a pleasure working with the Advisory Committee; they have been very involved through the process.

Mr. Waybright announced that the Public Hearing for the Transportation Capital Improvements Plan will be held by the Advisory Committee on September 7, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

Discussion was held with regard to contacting PennDOT and let them know that the Township is in the process of doing the Act 209 Traffic Impact Study and that the RSA projects expansion of Route 97 and they should revisit their project for the bridge widening project in Two Taverns area. The RSA should be forwarded to PennDOT. Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Chantelau, to instruct the Secretary to draft a letter, finalized by Mr. Davis, and send it to PennDOT, along with a letter to Trans Associates to forward the RSA to PennDOT. Motion carried unanimously.

**Other Business:**

Response to Watchdog Group Comments:

Mr. Scott addressed recommendations prepared in a letter from the Watchdog Group dated July 20, 2006. Items 1 and 2 were relative to rezoning the Ramsburg property and amending ordinances to cater to developers. Mr. Scott did not respond to those issues due to the potential suit by Mr. Alexander that was handed to the Supervisors prior to this meeting. Mr. Scott read aloud responses to items 3 through 6.

**New Business:**

Mr. Waybright announced that a meeting will be held on August 31, 2006 at the County EMS facility concerning water in Adams County, hosted by the Adams County Office of Planning & Development.

Emergency Management Coordinator:

Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Chantelau, to appoint Mike Livelsberger as the Interim Emergency Management Coordinator, effective August 19, 2006. Motion carried unanimously.

**Adjournment:**

Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Dayhoff, to adjourn the Supervisors' Meeting at 10:00 p.m. this date. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda J. Constable  
Recording Secretary