

**RICHLAND TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Business Meeting
December 12, 2016**

Chairman Timothy Ritter called the Richland Township Board of Supervisors Business Meeting to order. Those present are as follows: Timothy Ritter, Supervisor; Timothy Arnold, Supervisor; Rick Orloff, Supervisor; Paul Stepanoff, Township Manager; Mike Schwartz, Township Engineer, Gilmore & Associates; Ray Aleman, RTPD; Judy Goldstein, Township Planner, Boucher & James; B. Lincoln Treadwell, Township Solicitor. Amy Kaminski, Traffic Engineer, Gilmore & Associates was absent.

I. OPENING

- A. The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm.
- B. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
- C. Mr. Arnold gave an Invocation.
- D. Roll call was taken.
- E. There were no Board and Staff Appointments.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS There were no public hearings for this meeting.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT There were no public comments for this meeting.

IV. PRESENTATIONS

James Dunn, Mayor of Richlandtown Borough thanked the supervisors for allowing Mr. Stepanoff and Chief Ficco to help Richlandtown Borough with their police coverage questions. He thanked Mr. Ficco for being a great Police Chief and for attending all three Town Hall meetings and the borough's Community Day festivities. Chief Ficco stayed after every meeting and Community Day to answer every concern that the residents had, he truly went above and beyond. Council member Giovanni Martello is conducting a door to door survey to find out what is the will of the residents, as of now a quarter of the residents are covered and it is about 50/50. Fifty percent want to go with the Richlandtown Police coverage and the other fifty want to stay with the existing State Police coverage. The question and issue with the Richlandtown Police that the residents have is what will the money be used for, will they hire a new police officer or promote a part-time police officer to fulltime. Another concern is the max limits on calls before the added cost. The biggest concern with the residents is their taxes going from a 5mil increase to a 17mil increase. Some of the State Police issues are slow response time, no answers for security reasons, can't force the local Ordinances, and the lack of controlling the speed limit on Main St. No decision has been made and do not foresee a decision being made before summer of 2017 and at that time they will explore their options on how to pay for the coverage if it's at the will of the residents to switch.

V. BOARD AND STAFF REPORTS

- A. Township Manager – (1) The Township Manager reported while reviewing all the books and financial statements, the Township does not account for the financial services provided for the Police Department. To get an accurate representation of resources that the Police Department is using we need to bill them. The Township Manager is asking for permission to modify the reports to include police cost. Tim Ritter supports and Tim Arnold seconds the support. (2) Township Manager reports that the Township received 260 property tax

bills that paid the Township \$1255 but the Township paid the tax collector \$1380. Township Manager is asking if there is anyway the tax collector can consolidate the bills and pay consolidated bills a flat rate to get some revenue out of it instead of losing revenue. Township Manager will ask the Solicitor if the Township has a tax bill less than ten dollars does the Township have to collect it. Township Manager would like the opportunity to investigate what the Township could do in this situation. Supervisors agree to an investigation. (3) Township Manager reports that the Township signed an agreement a couple years ago with the Heritage Conservancy to inspect the open space properties. There are approximately thirty properties. The properties need to be inspected every three years and 2017 is an inspection year. Township Manager reporting that the Township still has an active agreement with the Heritage Conservancy and that the rates are the same. Inspection will include some open space properties within the Township. (4) Lifequest is doing a development in Milford Township that will require some improvements to Rt. 663. They are asking for Richland Township to send a letter of support for the improvements to be done. Township Manager and Solicitor will contact Traffic Engineer because actual development is in Milford Township but the traffic implications may be within Richland Township. If there are no issues Township Manager is asking for permission to send the letter of support. The board would like to know what the improvements are before sending letter and to make sure Traffic Engineer has no issues.

B. Supervisors –Mr. Arnold had no reports at this time.

(1) Mr. Orloff would like to obtain documents from the Richland Township Water Authority. He would like the audit report, travel expenditures; for example he would like to know why the Township is sending 3-4 people to the PELRAS conference when one person could easily go. Mr. Orloff would like to do a several year analysis of the travel expenditures. Mr. Orloff also states that not one idea has ever been brought back from the PSATS conference in the ten years and that sending seven people to the conference is disproportionately representing the Township. Mr. Orloff would like to go back to 2008 and do a cash flow analysis of the Richland Township Water Authority; he would need access to QuickBooks and back up documents. He would like to take a look at vender histories, payroll houses put forth, procedures and controls and staffing vs workload. Mr. Orloff would like the information requested on behalf of the Township. Mr. Ritter and Mr. Arnold agree that Mr. Orloff is requesting the audit so all information should be requested by himself not the Township.

Motion: Mr. Orloff made a motion that the Township officially asks the Water Authority for certain financial information especially related to capital, their books and their vendors. There was no second and the motion was not acted on so the motion falls to the floor.

(2)Mr. Orloff stated it was a sad state of affairs to come to and that it was harder not to bring it up then it was to bring it up. Mr. Orloff stated that 15-17 years ago he sponsored Mr. Arnold's appointment to the Water Authority Board; it was great when he got the job to help out with his family. Mr. Orloff says he then started to connect the dots and started seeing a trend of self servingness. Mr. Orloff continues on to say he is not happy about what Mr. Arnold has done and he is very disappointed with Mr. Ritter for what he has not done. He reports that he has spoken to a number of people within the community showing them the documentation and not one said it wasn't a problem.

(3)Mr. Orloff's last item of business is about the Water Authority's retained counsel. He reports that they don't like him and that he is made to be sounding awful bringing up some of the exposures. One thing in particular is that they are asserting that Mr. Orloff had direct conversations with Chairman Vanelli specifically concerning the issue with the HSA

payment. Mr. Orloff categorically denies it stating there are no emails or letters to prove that is true. Mr. Orloff goes on to state that it was his idea to give Mr. Arnold a vehicle allowance, which was in a contract. He reports he would not give a 5,500 HSA payment without putting it in writing. Mr. Orloff would like to give the letter from the Water Authority's special counsel to the press. Mr. Orloff states he will put a written request into the Water Authority for the documents he is requesting to perform the audit.

Mr. Ritter had asked how the Township dinner went. Mr. Arnold reported that it was a great time with over 100 people. He then congratulated Tracey Virnelson for becoming employee of the year and Thomas Steinfort for being the volunteer of the year and Jim Benner for receiving the new special achievement award.

- C. Solicitor – The only item the Solicitor has to report is that the letter Mr. Orloff is referring to was given to him late in the day and is not signed. He only gave the letter to Mr. Orloff as information and isn't sure if it should be handed out not signed. Mr. Orloff stated that the Water Authority is directing a threat of litigation toward him in the letter. He says they state transparency in the literature and Mr. Orloff reports it's been anything but transparency. For the first time in 21 years he says he is going to have trouble getting information from the Water Authority or any other Township agency. Mr. Ritter reports there has been a tragic lack of transparency with the Township's authorities or the Township dealing with the authorities over the past 10 years. He stated that apparently most of what has transpired between the board and the Water Authority has been done out of the light of day, not done by board resolution. Interference from Supervisors instead of making board resolutions, Supervisors were just showing up every couple of years wanting to change things. Mr. Orloff asked if Mr. Ritter could be more specific and Mr. Ritter said he could but doesn't want to open up the argument. Mr. Ritter states that he has emails of a lot of deliberations going back and forth between Supervisors and the Water Authority. Mr. Orloff asked that Mr. Ritter bring out the emails. Mr. Ritter stated that will be forthcoming.
- D. Engineer – The Engineer has no reports at this time.
- E. Traffic Engineer – The Traffic Engineer was absent from this meeting.
- F. Police Chief – Ray Aleman reports that Chief Ficco is pleased to announce that on December 7th and 8th the Richland Township Police Department was examined for an accreditation assessment. The assessor's conducting the assessment of their department policy and procedures was a chief from Springettsbury Township, a sergeant from Lower Paxton, and officers from East Lampeter Township. The assessor's found that the Richland Township Police Department met the standards set forth for accreditation by the state of Pennsylvania. The Richland Township Police Department is being recommended for the accreditation. Pennsylvania law enforcement accreditation commission will hold the vote to accept the recommendation from the assessors and grant the accreditation status to the Richland Township Police Department in January of 2017. Currently there are over 1100 law enforcement agencies in the state and approximately only 110 agencies are accredited which the Richland Township Police Department will be one of.
- G. Planner – The Planner had no reports at this time.

VI. DEVELOPER'S ISSUES

A. Request for Escrow Release

1. CVS Pharmacy Escrow Release #7.

CVS has requested site improvement escrow release #7, and Boucher & James, by their letter dated December 6, 2016 has recommended release of \$62,314.26, with a remaining balance of \$56,179.06.

Motion: Mr. Arnold made a motion to recommend the release of \$62,314.26 subject to any outstanding fees or dues that are owed to Richland Township. Mr. Orloff seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Secant Medical Escrow Release #3.

Secant Group has requested escrow release #3, Boucher & James, by their letter dated December 7, 2016 has recommended release of \$31,785.10, with a remaining balance of \$37,924.40.

Motion: Mr. Arnold made a motion to recommend the release of \$31,785.10 subject to any outstanding fees or dues that are owed to Richland Township. Mr. Orloff seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

B. Notification of Extensions

1. Milford Acquisitions/Tollgate Crossing Extension Request

Eric Williams submitted a letter requesting a 6 month extension on the Tollgate Crossing Development. The current extension expires on January 4, 2017, however, he is now requesting a 6 month extension that will expire on July 4, 2107, as per his letter.

VII. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS (Old and New)

A. Minutes from November 14, 2016 Business Meeting.

Motion: Mr. Orloff made a motion to approve the minutes from November 14th. Mr. Ritter seconds the motion to open it up to discussion. Mr. Arnold opposed. Motion carried 2:1.

Mr. Ritter reports that there has never been a presentation especially an impromptu one entered into the minutes. Other than the recorded minutes from the Recording Secretary there was a power point presentation in the minutes. Mr. Ritter doesn't believe it should be in there and moves to strike it. Mr. Orloff reports there has been presentations attached to minutes before. Township Manager reports that if a Board Member requests that something be specifically inserted into the minutes, an accommodation can be made as long as it factual accrued. Township Manager also reports that the minutes are the Board of Supervisor's minutes and the Supervisors have the right to vote in or out anything. Mr. Ritter reports that there were certain parts of the presentation that didn't seem factually accurate. Mr. Ritter wants to know if the presentation is left in the minutes does that give it a stamp of approval or a certification. Mr. Orloff reports the minutes are a record of what happen in the meeting and not everything said is always factually accurate. Solicitor reports leaving the presentation in the minutes doesn't evidence any recognition by the board that what is stated in the presentation is factually accurate or inaccurate. Solicitor also reports that the only legal requirement is that there is written minutes that summarize what accrued during meeting. It is up to the board as to what they would like to include and not include

in their minutes. Mr. Ritter reports if a Supervisor wants a presentation entered into the minutes, the presentation needs to be put into the agenda. Mr. Orloff reports he will put his presentation into the agenda for the next meeting so it can go into the minutes.

Motion: **Mr. Ritter made a motion to strike the presentation from the November minutes. Mr. Arnold seconds the motion. Mr. Orloff opposed. Motion carried 2:1.**

Motion: **Mr. Ritter moves to approve the amended minutes with the presentation struck. Mr. Arnold seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**

B. Financial Business - Approve payment of bills.

Motion: **Mr. Orloff made a motion to approve the bills. Mr. Ritter seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**

C. Review of Open Burning Ordinance.

Township Manager reports at the last meeting the Township was asked if there could be any modifications made to the Open Burning Ordinance. He refers to the email from Mr. Ryan Ingham of Hough Associates which summarizes the open burning requirements per DEP. As can be seen in his e-mail of 29 November, "DEP will consider the Township noncompliant if it allows any type of open burning" except for the DEP specified exceptions. Non-compliance would jeopardize our Act 101 and Act 140 grants (~\$45-50K/year). Mr. Ritter reports when he read through the letter it seems our ordinance currently maxes out the exceptions that the DEP allows. With those exceptions it would seem to permit a lot of open burning within the DEP rules. Mr. Ritter suggests advertising or promoting the exceptions as long as the Township would still be in compliance. Educate people that you can burn under certain criteria. Township Manager suggests submitting an article to the newsletter to advertise. Mr. Ritter thinks that is a wonderful idea. No change to the Open Burning Ordinance.

D. Approval of Consortium Salt Bid Contract for 2017 to Morton Salt at \$56.13/ton.

The Consortium Salt Bid was approved at a previous BOS meeting. Since then Bucks County found an irregularity in the bidding process that required a re-bidding. Once again, Morton Salt was the low bidder (but at an even better price of \$56.13/ton, or \$7.79/ton lower than 2016 pricing).

Motion: **Mr. Ritter made a motion to withdraw the previous salt bid and award it to Morton Salt at the price of \$56.13/ton. Mr. Orloff seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**

E. Resolution #16-20 for Township Manager to sign Application for Traffic Signal for Penn DOT regarding the proposed at-grade crossings for the Upper Bucks Rail Trail Project.

The Upper Bucks Rail Trail Project requires at grade crossings that will require traffic signals. This resolution is required by Penn DOT to authorize the Township Manager to sign the required applications for the at grade crossings.

Motion: **Mr. Ritter made a motion to approve resolution 16-20 authorizing Township Manager to make application for traffic signals regarding the at grade crossings for the Upper Bucks Rail-Trail Project. Mr. Arnold seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**

F. Consideration of Employee Health Insurance Options from Minnis Group for 4% employee contribution of PPO Platinum (current plan), 3% contribution for PPO Gold Preferred, and 0% contribution for Gold Preferred. For PPO Gold Preferred and Gold Preferred plans the Township will self-insure employee co-pays for hospital stays of up to 2 occurrences per

family for up to 5 days each. The self-insured fund is targeted at 4 total 5-day hospital stays per year equaling \$12,000.

RT negotiated a very favorable 4% increase in our 2017 rates (for our base plan: PPO Platinum). The Minnis Group suggested we offer 2 other plans that would save Township approximately 7% from the 2017 rates (or 3% from 2016 rates). However, to make this worth-while for employees, The Minnis Group suggests the Township self-insure employee family hospital stay co-pays and lowers the employee contributions for the alternate plans. The costs shows how even with the lower employee contributions and self-insurance, the Township will save on health care costs compared to the base PPO Platinum plan currently offered. Mr. Ritter asked if there were other numbers and plans looked at. Township Manager reports yes the consortium and they did not give better pricing, they didn't even bid. Mr. Orloff addresses the Solicitor about the Supervisor's insurance being locked in and if it will change. Solicitor said he would need to look into that but he believes when the insurance changes it would only apply to the next elected term. The Solicitor is going to confirm that the Supervisors are locked into their current insurance plan.

Motion: Mr. Orloff made a motion to offer the three insurance plans as the Manager has presented. Mr. Ritter seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

G. Consideration of letter to property owner Godshall at 1730 California Road (TMP 36-009-120-1 and 36-009-122) to clarify that the Open Space easement includes "livestock" and livestock related structures as a permitted use.

Both RT and Bucks County agree that livestock was omitted from the permitted use in the Open Space Agreement for these lots. Most all other such agreements in Bucks County include livestock specifically. The current owner has requested from RT and Bucks County a change in the agreement, since both RT and Bucks County agree this was an oversight. However, Bucks County has a practice of not amending easement language once they have been approved and offered the owners a clarification letter stating Bucks County's position is that livestock is a permitted use under the current agreement. They have already provided the owner with such letter. These letters will be temporary solutions until such time (if ever) that Bucks County agrees to amend the current agreement. Township Manager reports Richland Township has sent a letter requesting Bucks County to amend. Property owner is asking that the Township do what Bucks County is doing and give her a letter for now which may be permanent. Richland Township has to follow Bucks County's guidelines in their easement, if Bucks County will not amend then neither can Richland Township. Solicitor states the Township cannot amend on their own. Mr. Ritter asks the Solicitor if the letter from Bucks County is legally binding enough. Solicitor reports it is what it is and comes down to an enforcement issue. It would be better if the easement was amended but if property owner is comfortable with only having the letter from Bucks County and from Richland Township stating we don't have a problem with the livestock and knowing that that is all they are going to get. Property owner reports it is her understanding they may never get an amendment and agrees she would be more comfortable with the amendment but that could take a long time, if ever. Property owner doesn't want to get the livestock without any documentation because down the road she doesn't want any problems. At this present time she is satisfied with only having the letters. Mr. Ritter states a resolution for the letter can certainly be done, he then asks if the situation that caused the problem was remedied. The Solicitor stated it is all within the Bucks County Open Space Program and that is where the agreement is coming from.

Solicitor isn't aware if they've made a subtenant change. Something to look out for the next time this happens.

Motion: Mr. Orloff made a motion to allow the Township Manager to send the letter. Mr. Ritter seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

H. Consideration to Advertise RT Chapter 27 amendment Ordinance for B1 and B1A uses. The amended ordinance for B1 and B1A, which clarifies language in the original Ordinance, needs to be advertised prior to adoption. Mr. Ritter reports there was some action on this a couple months ago. Township Planner reports a very short presentation was given a couple months ago and then it was sent to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission recommend it go through. It is a cleanup Ordinance amendment. Solicitor reported all that is needed is authorization to advertise it and then bring it back for a hearing and adoption.

Motion: Mr. Orloff made a motion to advertise and bring back for a hearing and adoption. Mr. Ritter seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

I. Consideration to Accept Lowest Quote for Sidewalk Snow Removal Contract.

Motion: Mr. Arnold made a motion to accept the lowest quote for sidewalk snow removal to Dave's Services, LLC of Quakertown, PA and the cost per occurrence is 1"-10" is \$1,260, 11"-20" is \$2,400, 21"-30" is \$3,500, and anything over 30" is \$4500. Mr. Orloff seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

J. Consideration of Creating a new Category of Employee, Seasonal Hourly, providing partial benefits and making appropriate changes to Employee Handbook. Richland Township has no category for "Seasonal Employees". Without a change, a Seasonal Employee by DOL rules, that works >30 hours per week would be considered "full-time" if the employee worked more than a few months. This proposal is to fill the gap in our employee definitions by creating a new category of employee, Seasonal Hourly, with benefits that are in-between a full-time employee and part-time employee. No health benefits, if the employee was scheduled to work full time prior to the holiday and after the holiday then the employee would be eligible for the holiday pay. The employee would get two personal days if worked for more than 4 months. Vacation days would be a percentage of hours worked. Township having fewer than 50 employees makes this acceptable. Should this motion pass, Township Manager would make changes to the Employee Handbook commensurate with this change.

Motion: Mr. Orloff made a motion to allow Township Manager to make changes. Mr. Ritter seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

K. Data on RTWA payments to RTWA Director. At the November 2016 BOS meeting the BOS directed the Township Manager and Solicitor to review RTWA compliance to RT/RTWA agreement enforce from 2011 to 2013. Two anomalies were found. The first is HSA payments to RTWA Director increased to \$5,500/year during this time when Township Manager payments were \$3,500/year. Secondly, the PLGIT contribution to RTWA Director occurs up-front in a lump sum for ensuing year. Township Manager reports there was an agreement between the Water Authority and the Township that was signed in January of 2011. That agreement specified that a new agreement be created between Water Authority and the Director of the Authority. Exhibit B specified the salary and benefits. The pension benefits were to remain defined contribution and at the current rate and that was adhered to. The only issue that was found was that the pension benefits were paid one time at the beginning of the year rather than spread out throughout the year but the number was accurate. The salary of \$91,000 was adhered to within a couple hundred dollars. The \$10,000 bonus was not

paid during that 3 year period. Township Manager reports the same benefit package as Township Manager and Assistant Manager including but not limited to vehicle allowance, cell phone and health insurance benefits were all adhered to except for the insurance benefits. Township Manager reports the HSA portion was different. Mr. Orloff asked when the contract between the Township and the Water Authority was signed. It was signed on the 3rd of January. Mr. Orloff asked when Mr. Arnold was given his HSA payment in 2011. Township Manager reports that Mr. Arnold didn't sign his contract until February 9, 2011. Mr. Orloff wants to know when the \$5,500 was given to Mr. Arnold. Township Manager stated he only has the amounts for the year 2011 but said he will find that out. Mr. Orloff reports that the staff normally gets their HSA payments at the very first pay of the year. Township Manager reports that that is the way it is done. Mr. Orloff stated that if the contract was signed in January of 2011 and the HSA payment was supposed to be the same for Mr. Arnold as the Township Manager then why within days or weeks was Mr. Arnold given \$2,000 more. Mr. Orloff asked Township Manager if he looked at the minutes from the Water Authority. Township Manager reports he couldn't find any specific item. Mr. Orloff stated that there was no record of authorization. He then asked if there was anything found that it said he was okay with Mr. Arnold getting \$5,500. Township Manager reports no. The only inconsistency found was from 2011-2013 the Township Manager and Assistant Township Manager were paid \$3,500 and the Water Authority Director was paid \$5,500 which was confirmed. Township Manager reports there was no record in the minutes and no motion was made but it could have been done another way. Mr. Orloff wants to know who authorized or directed to pay Mr. Arnold \$5,500 instead of \$3,500 which continued for 6 years when the contract was only for 3 years. Solicitor reports contract was for only 3 years and what happen after the 3 years wasn't under contract. Mr. Ritter asks if the HSA payments that the Township made to the employees are a health benefit or additional compensation. Township Manager reports it is a benefit package, not part of the salary. The HSA is not W2 income, tax deferred. Mr. Orloff would like to get a copy of the guided document of how Mr. Arnold got the compensation. Township Manager reports he believes it was done by email and will obtain a copy. Mr. Orloff reports the Water Authority's special counsel states that Mr. Vanelli discussed the HSA payment with an agent or representative of the Township. Mr. Orloff said he specifically remembers discussing the vehicle allowance with Mr. Arnold and he agreed to support it but that is all. Mr. Orloff asks if Mr. Arnold should have to reimburse the Township or the Authority for the years in question that were at least under the contract. Solicitor reports when making sure a contract was adhered to there is a whole analysis that needs to be gone through including was there a breach, was it a material breach, what are the damages to the non-breaching party, and various other things that need to be analyzed. Mr. Orloff reports that the contract was put into place because of the behavior by Mr. Arnold which included a three year severance pay. Township Manager will look into the concerns regarding the matter.

- L. Township Manager reports no changes have been made to the budget from when it was presented and advertised. The 2017 budget is ready to be adopted.

Motion: Mr. Orloff made a motion to adopt the budge as presented. Mr. Ritter seconded the motion. **Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**

VIII. TOWNSHIP KPI's:

Accounting:	08/2016	09/2016	10/2016	11/2016
Checks Issued	132	196	225	230

Transactions	458	194	281	542
Bills Entered	121	209	191	180
Reception:				
Munilogic Entries	23	33	69	63
Deposits	107	128	261	137
Front Door Walk-Ins	140	198	134	96
Zoning/Permits:				
Total Permits Issued	37	35	27	31
Permit Denials	4	3	2	1
Developer/Resident meetings	15	13	10	9
Complaints Investigated	11	12	9	1
Code Enforcement:				
Building Inspections:	110	92	62	68
Fire Inspections:	20	23	13	14
Plumbing/Mechanical Inspections	32	44	17	16
Non RT Inspections/Permits:	4	6	5	8
Permits and U&O's:	29	19	16	5
Meetings and Calls:	120	84	54	56
Plan Reviews	4	2		2
Public Works:				
Miles on Trucks:		472	1981	2072
Hours on Equipment		191	133	58
Tons of Blacktop/Leaf Loads:		483	80	24
Resident Interactions		34	26	34
Police:				
Incidents	554	550	514	449
Accidents	53	50	70	71
Crimes	47	47	43	48
Arrests	16	11	12	24
Traffic Citations	96	12	36	34
Community Policing	91	87	74	53
Miles			8,638	7599

Township Manager reports in the future he may only provide the KPI list in a tab for the Supervisors to view. Mr. Orloff asked if doing the KPI's has been meaningful or meaningless and if there are things that should be taken out or added. Township Manager reports there should be a 6 month time frame to exactly figure out what we should be tracking.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT - At discretion of Chair. No public comment at this time.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Mr. Orloff made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Ritter seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,
Alicia Garner
Recording Secretary

Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 3, 2017 at 7:00 PM.