

Londonderry Township Board of Supervisors

March 6, 2006

The Londonderry Township Board of Supervisors held their regular scheduled Board meeting on Monday, March 6, 2006 at the Municipal Building, 783 S. Geyers Church Road, Middletown, PA 17057 beginning at 7:00 p.m.

Present:

Ronald Kopp, Chairman, Board of Supervisors
Anna J. Dale, Vice-Chairman, Board of Supervisors
Andy Doherty, Member, Board of Supervisors
Daryl LeHew, Member, Board of Supervisors
William Kametz, Member, Board of Supervisors
Robert Knupp, Township Solicitor
Steven Letavic, Township Manager
Jim Jenkins, Assistant Secretary/Treasurer

Items Addressed:

1. **Salute the Flag**

2. **Citizen's Input**

Paul Geyer
Paul
Sam Naples

3. **Solicitor's Report-** Mr. Knupp

Lot Add on Ordinance- Mr. Knupp discussed the draft, it was given to the Board before hand. The planning commission reviewed the draft and they recommended that the Board authorize the advertising of it, so that it can be enacted as an amended Ordinance at the April 3 meeting. Mrs. Dale had a question about the wording on Item 3 P, Mr. LeHew had the same question. Mr. Knupp stated that this was language that came from an ordinance of another Township and that the intention was that at a later date someone does not argue that the new lot is a stand-alone lot. Mrs. Dale stated that her concern is that, because we really need to take a comprehensive look at all of the Township's Ordinances, she wants to make sure that the Board is not creating another problem, down the road that would create a situation for litigation or having to come before the Zoning hearing Board. The language, as is, for me as a lay person, indicates to me that if I was the owner and I had put a lot add on to this, to create a large parcel of land with a home on it, that it could not be then sold. Mr. LeHew had the same question. Mr. Kopp stated that there was some language that was missing, the intent was to make a sub-standard piece of land to make it standard. This should say that the Lot Add-on cannot be a Stand-alone, the new lot probably going to meet all the regulations. Mr. Knupp stated that he could just eliminate the last sentence of this item and that should help clarify the confusion that is coming from it. If we eliminate the last sentence then, we will eliminate the problem, I would be happy

to strike it. Mr. LeHew wanted to make sure that it does not create any legal issues. Mr. Knupp assured the Board it does not. Mr. Doherty stated that he was not sure if he agreed with striking that sentence. Mr. Doherty felt as though it should be worded as the Add-on Lot, he feels something should be in place, as far as, not being able to sell the Add-on lot. Mr. Kopp stated that once that new lot is created it is a brand new lot. The property line is canceled out. At that point, if it meets all our regulation then they can do with it what they want. Mr. LeHew asked if this has to go back anywhere or anything because of the changes. Mr. Letavic asked if this would need to go back in front of Dauphin County or not. He asked if he needs to call them and let them know the changes. Mr. Knupp said yes that was correct, Mr. Letavic would have to call the Dauphin Co. Planning Board and let them know. Mr. LeHew made a motion to advertise the Ordinance with the changes. Mrs. Dale seconded motion, motion passed.

Mr. Kopp asked about the Inter-municipal Agreement with Lower Dauphin Comp. Plan. Mr. Letavic stated that he received the agreement from Supervisor Doherty just tonight and stated that he thought the recommendation from the Solicitor was that the Board engage Mr. Scott Weyland, of Pulp, Mackey, Sizemick and Kenner, to prepare the agreement. In view of the sample Ordinance that was received from Supervisor Doherty, Mr. Letavic felt the Board needed to get this to our Solicitor to see if that would suffice and then engage Mr. Weyland to do the work. Mr. Knupp- Stated that it was a recommendation made by the Planning Commission, that Mr. Weyland be engaged. Mr. Weyland has proposed to do his work for a flat fee of \$1,500, which would be shared equally by the Borough of Hummelstown, East Hanover Township, and Londonderry. Neither of the Municipalities have been apprised of this yet, but when I looked at the complications that are contained in both the Act 71 and the MPC amendments. I felt it might be advisable to get an independent person to represent all three Municipalities rather than trying to have three Lawyers work through the process. I did not receive this until just a moment ago so, I would like time to review it and make a recommendation at a later date. Mrs. Dale had a question; Mrs. Dale attended the Regional Planning Commissions re-organizational meeting in January. One issue that was talked about was whether or not a School District employee could be a voting member and I see that it is written in this agreement. I am asking if Mr. Doherty has had a meeting, because the re-organization did not take place that night. Mr. Doherty stated that was correct. They have not met since that meeting. Mr. LeHew interjected and stated that it was His understanding that the School District does not have any say so, in part of this. They are not participants of the MPC, Municipalities Planning Code, so the only voting members that would apply to this would be, East Hanover, Londonderry, and Hummelstown. Mr. Knupp said that it is clear, earlier in the document that this is refereeing only to an advisory board, and has no zoning powers. Mr. Kopp asked the Solicitor if he would like to have time to review and get back to the Board. Mr. Knupp stated that he would have something for the Board at the Work Session meeting on March 21. Mr. Kopp tabled this subject for now and bring this back up on our agenda for the March 21 meeting.

4. **Manager Report** – Mr. Letavic

Mr. Letavic talked about the need to appoint a commercial inspector, as Mr. Foreman is not qualified to do those types of inspections. Mr. Letavic asked that the board approve Commonwealth as the primary inspector's and Arro as the secondary inspector's.

Mr. Doherty made the motion to approve Commonwealth as our, primary, third party Inspectors for Commercial and Arro as secondary. Mrs. Dale seconded motion, motion was approved.

-Keystone Flying Club- Mr. Letavic has been working with this group to find an alternative site. Mr. Letavic visited Ft. Indian Town Gap and a place in Lancaster County off 441. He felt as though the latter was the better site.

- Fire Police-Mr. Letavic asked that the Board grant the Londonderry Township Fire Police permission to work outside of Township

Mr. LeHew made motion to allow the Fire Police to work outside the Township, Mrs. Dale seconded motion, motion carried.

5. **Treasurer Report-** Jim Jenkins

.Mr. Jenkins gave a Month-to-date report of funds and then asked for:

-\$ 85,496.34 in General funds

-\$ 22,939.13 in Golf Course funds

Also as of 2/28/06, the General fund has \$ 251,007.53 & the Golf Course has \$ 83,153.35

Mr. LeHew made a motion to pay the bills and Mr. Doherty seconded, motion carried.

6. **Public Input**

Mr. Kopp and Mr. Doherty met with the Board of Directors of the Fire Company. Had a good meeting and they both learned a great deal of information. There is also a Friday night meal on the fourth Friday of the month, a different entrée each month. The Board was asking for, even non-fire fighting, volunteers.

-Paul Geyer- The set backs in Commercial areas, I would like to see if you would address them and make them more uniform. Right now it is seventy feet on each side of a lot that is going to be used as commercial and you have house on either side and they call them residential use, there is no ground left. So, now you do not even have a commercial strip anymore, you need to make a change on this.

Mr. Kopp- I thought at the last meeting we directed you to go to the Planning Commission and discuss this, was there any discussion at the last Planning Commission meeting? Mr. Knupp- Yes there was. Mr. LeHew- yes there was, but I do not think there was any action taken, was there. Mr. Knupp- I think Jim Foreman was going to take it and work on it, that is what I believe. Mr. LeHew- yes, I think that we should ask Jim to work on it. I was at the Planning Commission meeting and there is a lot of pre-existing commercial and residential districts that but up against each other. One instance that we are talking about is down at the tool shed. Mr. Kopp- right that is one, but I think all along 230 is where we are talking about here. Mr. LeHew- if He (Paul) wants to use that for a

parking lot for the trailers to get them off the highway. That takes away from the site distance, blockage of people pulling out of the Tool shed and also out of Deodate there, that would be good. There is also Barry Brisner's home, between them there is a fence up there, that is falling down. That is between commercial and residential, but I think what we need to look at is consistency. Consistently wrong or consistently right, but be consistent and we are not, I don't think. Mr. Kopp- What do we need to do to correct this, we have to go through a whole Ordinance update, or what. Mr. Knupp- Jim Foreman is on vacation, as you know, but I know that at the last planning commission this topic was discussed and Mr. Geyer made the same comments and my recollection was that Jim was going to work with Jim Zumborski on the issues that were raised to see whether or not a change could be made to fix this issue. I know that there was a long discussion about this, and right now it is in the Planning Commissions hands, they have not given anything back to you yet, because they do not have anything to look at. Mr. Kopp- I am hearing our Board say we agree it needs to have some looking into, because of the inconsistencies. Mr. Geyer- May I make another comment, eventually if they want to put a residential house there they will have to put that forty foot set back, before they can do commercial. It would make it a lot simpler if you just make it a fifteen-foot setback and be done with it. Mr. Kopp- whether it is a residential use in a commercial zone or not, you are saying. Mr. Geyer- Yes. Mr. Kopp- your case is that there is a house there that is being used as residential, but it is zoned commercial. Mr. Geyer- He has to do that forty-foot setback if he wants to do anything. That is not right because the residential. If you make it fifteen feet that would make it more standard and then everyone would be happy.

Mr. Kopp- Let the minutes reflect that this Board is directing the Planning Commission to look into correcting the inconsistencies of the setbacks in the commercial zones, Ok. Anything else Paul? Mr. Geyer- yes, the Land development plan, that is why Mike (Geyer) is here, when does it come into play. Mr. LeHew- they talked about this at the Planning Commission meeting as well. Mr Kopp- Mr. Knupp the letter that you addressed to us March 3, regarding the land development plan waivers, is that what Mr. Geyer is talking about. Mr. Knupp- No I do not think it is, the letter I addressed to you about Land Development waivers was whether or not there was a ninety-day requirement on the sketch plan kind of approach on a Land Development question before the Planning Commission. There is no ninety-day period, because it is not formalized as required by the Statue. Mr. Kopp- If it is just a sketch plan. Mr. Knupp- right, what Mr. Geyer is talking about is the application of the term Land Development. We had a long discussion about that at the Planning Commission and I think the Statue is pretty clear. If it is the intent of the Board to change that Statue, that is another issue. Mr. Kopp- The question, I think that Mike (Geyer) was addressing to us last meeting, was the fact of how detailed the description the Land Development was. Your argument was as long as it was an Auto related business you should not have to come back and say now it is going to be changed from a Stereo installation shop to a glass installation shop, right. That is what they are

questioning, do our Statutes address that? Mr. Knupp- it is not as simple as you just made it sound, Mr. Chairman. My recollection was that it was more than just a change, there is a change in the size of the operation, there is something about parking, and there were a few other things that you talked about, Mike, at the meeting that last planning meeting and I know His (mike) statement to the planning commission was, I guess I am going to have to go and get an engineer to work this out. How long will my next land development plan last before there is another change. We (the planning commission) said that is a hard question to answer. That is my recollection, Mr. LeHew might remember to, there was a long discussion about this that took about an hour at the planning commission. Mr. LeHew- I think the question Mike was raising, if I may, was that if he did and spent a lot of money doing a Land Development plan and then does not have the money to go and do that development. He may wait ten-fifteen years to do that Development plan, and the usage change, He did not want to spend all that money and then have to spend more to do a new development plan, because our Ordinance's had changed. That is what he is questioning. Mike Geyer- it was actually two questions, the other one was the actual terminology of the use of the building. Mr. Knupp- it really is answered in part by the Municipalities Planning code, which provides a five year period for the protection of a Land Development or a Sub-Division plan, where you have vested rights for that period of time. When went through that as well at the meeting, it is section five 'o eight of the MPC. Obviously, after the five-year period, if there is a new Ordinance that affects that land that can affect it after five years of a land development plan being submitted. That is something that we discussed also at the planning commission meeting. Mr. Kopp- so there was no resolution to that. Mr. Knupp- No, it was a lengthy discussion and I think we got to the point that we got to a point that it was wide open and it is, kind of like the sketch plan discussion, and the idea is to help the resident as much as possible. When it comes to the final issue, it is a business judgment by the landowner and that is where I think it was left, if I was stating it properly. Mr. Kopp- So, where do you see we are at with this Mike (Geyer)? Mike Geyer- I guess my interpretation is, I either kick out a renter or I draw up a plan. Mr. Kopp- is that what you got out of that meeting. Mike- yes that is what I got out of that meeting. Mr. Kopp- where you there Steve? Mr. Letavic- no I was not there. Mr. LeHew- not so much that, it was more about doing the plan, basically everyone was recommending doing the plan. Mr. Kopp- they were recommending doing a new land development plan. Mike- either that or adjusting the operation there. Mr. Kopp – Sir, your name? Mr. Daniel Angelo- Explain to me what is a land development plan and where did it establish from. Mr. Kopp- Ok, Mr. Knupp if you could take this one. Mr. Knupp- First of all, the section of the code is called sub-division and land development. Obviously, sub-division is pretty easy to describe, land development is described as: an improvement of one or more lots and it also discusses as part of that improvement allocation of land or space among perspective occupants and lease holds. So, if you are leasing land and you got use A and use B, you are technically required to come in and submit a land development plan to the Township, to show how you are using that land.

Leasing, of the land creates problems that I am sure you can appreciate, as you have parking vehicles coming in and out, storage of materials, a lot of issues. A land development plan is something that has to be submitted when you are using the land for some purpose as described in the Ordinance. I can not summarize it any better than that, I am sorry. Mr. Kopp- It is basically to protect the Township so that we know what is happening on properties, so that they met our Ordinance. Like when, Mr. Geyer was talking about the set-backs...Mr. Angelo- Sir I understand the set-backs and stuff, but the land developments started when you do multi, you know when I buy a farm and I want to sub-divide it and have a lot of houses. Mr. Kopp- that is a sub-division plan and land development both. Mr. Angelo- right, for instance I own a green house on 441, I have concrete forms sitting outside my building, and I do construction that is quite obvious. I use the garage for the greenhouse and my construction business, I am just a one man operation. And then Jim approached me, I am going to need a land development plan for this stuff sitting outside. That is not a land development program, they are concrete forms sitting there. Mr. Kopp- Ok, so you are saying...Mr. Angelo- see what I am saying is that it is getting abused by certain individuals and that is why I asked you what is land development. Did someone answer my question, which you did not mention what, actually, land development is. If you buy a building and let's say the guy sells cars there. I bought the building, I sell cars well I want to put windshields in cars, I am still using it for cars. Now I want to put an addition on this building to store the windshields in, is that a land development or is that a business that is growing or is it just something I need to store stuff in. That is not a land development, in my opinion. It means I need to put a building on my property for storage, if I met all your set-backs and all your criteria's, then I do not need an land development because I fit into your codes. You see what the difference is, is Jim's eyes you need a land development plan. Mr. Knupp- I think it is kind of unfair to be talking about him when he is not here. Mr. Kopp-Yeah. Mr. Angelo- and also I feel the neighbors be notified around there and then hear their piece. Instead of every time things go crazy, people say you need a land development. I think we should ask the neighbors what they want, they are the ones that live in this Township, they are the ones that pay the taxes. I mean we are a small community, we are not Harrisburg or anything. Land Development is abused to much. Mr. Kopp- well in absence of the Code Enforcement officer, it is not really fair to debate this, basically you understand where we are coming from. We have the Ordinance's on the books the land development plan shows us what is going on out there on those properties, so we know if it meets our Ordinance. Mr. Angelo- right, but if everything meets your Ordinance and you decide to put a little addition on your building, why do you have to go the whole nine yards and do the land development. You know the person is within the Ordinance and you tell your neighbors what you are going to do, I mean it does not need to go to the extreme of land development. Mr. LeHew- Mr. Chairman, I would recommend that Steve and when Jim comes back, they would meet with Mike and Paul, regarding their issues and see if they can come up with something that they can bring to the Board and then we can discuss

it. Mr. Kopp- has there been any discussion prior, have you discussed this with Mr. Foreman, Paul. Mr. LeHew- yeah they did the other night. Mr. Kopp- I meant with Steve. Mr. Paul Geyer- you really cannot discuss it with Mr. Foreman, he says this is the way that it is. Mr. Kopp – (to Mr. Letavic) would you be willing to meet with them. Mr. Letavic- absolutely. Mr. Geyer-the problem is that it was always there, we did not build on it. So, why do we need a land development plan, we have the parking right around there. If there was only one business in there that would not be a problem, it is because we have two separate businesses in there, we need a land development plan. It is the same type of work they are doing, they are fixing car's. Mr. Kopp- not to defend Mr. Foreman's actions, but the general public needs to understand. The Code Enforcement Officer works independent of the Board. He is hired by the Township to carry out the codes of this Township. We cannot tell him what to do. Mr. Geyer- I understand that, but the problem is he is not enforcing these codes correctly. Mr. Kopp- Ok, what we can do, when we have concerned citizen's we can ask our Manager to look into it. We cannot tell Mr. Foreman that you have to do this because we think it is wrong what you are doing. He works independently of us. Mr. Geyer- That is not your job. Mr. Kopp- that is not the job of the Planning commission. Mr. Geyer – but you are sitting on the top now, so if you decided to look for another Code Officer you could. Mr. Kopp- so the direction of the Board is to have the Manager meet with Mr. Foreman and address the issues of Mr. Angelo. Mr. Angelo- I do not have any issues, I never knew that Mr. Foreman was an independent contractor, and all that, it is really interesting what you just said. So who controls Mr. Foreman. Mr. Letavic- actually Mr. Foreman's interpretations of the Codes and His recommendations we do get. We do get to review them for what we believe is reasonableness. So, Mr. Foreman is not a Maverick out there all on His own, He does have to go by the Codes and the Ordinances of the Township. Typically, if He is unsure what those Codes mean or the interpretations of them, Mr. Foreman will seek legal Council on those things. I think relative to Mikes garage concern, I believe the real concern in that area started with Doctor Eddy saying I am going to the installation of electronic components in homes and in cars, that is it. I want to be fair about this because Jim is getting a black eye on this particular issue. We went down and talked to Dr. Eddy and it went from, like Ron said part of this Ordinance is so that we know what is going on and to protect people from, I move into an area and they used to sell cars there and I want to put an exotic dance club in there and that is still a commercial use of a building. Or instead of cars I want to put tractors in there and then along with the tractors, I am putting ATV's and these uses just continue to grow. In Dr. Eddy's case, He told us specifically I am putting electronic components in homes and cars and that is it. I went down there he engines torn out of cars, he had cars that he was doing bodywork, he had cars that did not run cars without license plates, it was not just installation of electronic components. I went back and talked to him and he had a horse in the back yard, then I went down and he had a new driveway on the side. I think all Jim's point was, if you are going to expand the use of this business, then you need to come

back to this Board and let them decide it that is still and applicable use and if the use is still congruent with your original application. That was his point there, as far as his use, because this is truly a case where it went from electronic installations and any reasonable person would say, putting doors and fenders and windows in cars in not electronic installation, it just is not. Mike Geyer- well in Doug's defense, which is small, he did say accessories too, which has been omitted from that actual waiver. Which was submitted in my letter that said accessories also, but I do agree that he is going deeper in work then what was actually stated. My question is not that we are looking for double the size of the business or anything like that, we can still limit him and interpret the Ordinances that say if you have junk sitting around or you have this amount of parking and the rest of it is not, that was never the intent to get bigger. The intent was the usage that was requested and the small change, as far as doing engines, it is still automotive oriented is what my point is. Whether it is electronic, accessories it is still automotive. He did not try and go in there and put businesses that have nothing to do with cars, it fits with the use that was originally requested. As far as limiting the size of his business, that was never his intent to increase the size of his business. If he wants to get into a thirty-car operation today, he needs to find a bigger building. Mr. Kopp- That facility would not accommodate that. Mr. Letavic – I think where Mr. Foreman's interpretation came, we worked this out with Jim. One of the concerns he had was it seemed like he moved in there and he went from this electronic, even if it is all automotive, to car sales, car repair, more and more, there is a boat out there, there is a horse out there and all Jim was saying was, wait if you are going to expand to all these different uses you may need to come back to this Board and go through the land development plan again. I do not believe Jim was out there acting out of control with this thing, I think he had a genuine concern, as I did. Because there were times when you could not turn around in the parking lot, the site distance was blocked out by the road, for any resident that came down Hertzler Road to 230 to turn, there was a van parked out there. We were trying to make sure that this business did not blossom into something that it was never intended to be, I think that was his point. Mr. Mike Geyer- Oh I understand that, I do not want junkyard down there as well. As you know the horse is gone and we are addressing situations as fast as he is developing them, but it is a frustrating thing. I do not really think he should get all the blame right now, and if we can do this is a way that we are all happy. Mr. Kopp- we understand that and we want to do things with reason, but you understand we also have to meet our regulations as well. Mr. Geyers- I do not have a problem with going down and slapping him and say, hey you are breaking the Ordinances of the Township. Mr. Letavic- I think he wanted to come forward then, we asked him to work with you to come forward then, if he was going to change the scope of work. And he said that is not my problem Steve that is Mike Geyers problem. I said whoa, come on now we are all working together on this, because I went down and worked with him on this and tried to be nice about, I said lets just get together and put this to bed. That was two to three weeks ago and I have not heard from him since. So, from my standpoint I was under the

impression that something was forth coming from him to you to us to look at the scope of work in that building. And when Jim gets back we will all sit down and come up with something that we can all live with and meets the Ordinance's. Mr. Mike Geyer- I think we should steer clear of communications without all parties, because I think that Dr. Eddy claimed that the middle there. When he is talking to you and then to me, I am getting a completely different story, but I think if we all got together as a complete group we could hammer this thing out and put it to bed, as well. Mr. Letavic – right and that is where we are today, so when Jim gets back I will have him set up a meeting with Dr. Eddy and we will sit down and hammer this out. Mr. Kopp- I think the Board is in agreement with that, Mike we want to get this resolved because it is in the best interest of both parties. And like you say, if you just take things back and forth with out everyone being together, that makes it hard to workout. We are not going to resolve anything if that does not happen. Mr. Geyer- I just do not want this to turn into a farce where I am ending up spending ten grand on something I might never need to do. Mr. Letavic- right and we do not want to see that either. When Jim gets back I will have him contact you and we will get a date and time and we will sit down with Dr. Eddy. Mr. Kopp- Next, over here sir. I am Paul of Paul's tackle shop- you all have to pass on route 230. Tuesday night after the meeting, after talking with the meeting I was out here in the hallway, speaking of your Code Enforcement Officer a shame he is not here, but he tells me I cannot do business in Londonderry this year. I do not meet the zoning setbacks, I have been there for three years and he has not come out. To me this is just old, I mean I have even come out here and talked to him, standing there in the office, when I put a bid on where Ben's bait is now and he never said anything to me. Every time I talk to him he never had any issues, now on Tuesday night, I came out here Wednesday and talked to him and he wants to fine me \$500 a day if I put my sign back up. Mr. Kopp- this is the same location you were operating at before. Mr. Paul of Paul's tackle shop- this is the same location. Mr. Kopp- had you originally met the criteria and Ordinances when you first started business. Mr. Paul- I did not get an occupancy permit, but I did call him to ask about the zoning, and he did call me back with the zoning of the property. Like I said it was here for years and he never stopped by. So, I do not have an occupancy permit, which I did not know that I needed. All I ever did was drive truck and construction, but he has never stopped out. Mr. Kopp- Ok, Steve are you appraised of this situation. Mr. Letavic- no, I will have to talk to Jim when he comes back. Mr. Kopp- this here again we have to let this workout between the Manager and the Code Enforcement Officer, we cannot give you any direction from this Board. We want to resolve this situation, and make sure everyone is meeting the code, that is our responsibility. Mr. Paul- he did say Tuesday night he has a complaint, which he never had before. As long as it is not one of my local neighbors, I do not see where it is a problem. Mr. Kopp- You fall into the same category as Mr. Geyer, of all those properties along 230, as you see the brown on the zoning map are commercial sites, mixed in with residential uses. That is what Mr. Geyers question was about the set backs between properties. When your property is

going to be a business and your neighbor is a residential, that is the same thing we talked about. Mr. Paul – there is no question on the set backs, but if there is commercial use in the middle of two residential, he wanted seventy feet set backs. That is one hundred forty feet, that street is not that wide. Mr. Kopp- right and that is the very thing that we started out with Mr. Geyers situation. That is why we have instructed the Planning Commission to look into this. There needs to be some kind of consistency and reasonable compromise. So, it is not going to help you to start selling bait when the trout season opens, but that is the best we can do right now. Mr. Paul- well I am going to sell bait. Mr. Knupp- that is correct , I am not sure what Mr. Foreman said and that is up to the Manager to find out what. Mr. Kopp- ok, Sam.

Mr. Sam Naples- Gave an update to the Board on the EMA training and more specifically the NIMS training. Also Mr. Naples stated that he is working with Mr. Letavic to get a time set up to train the supervisor's and Mr. Letavic' staff all at the same time. The IS 700 is the test that all those people will be looking to take. Mr. Naples also stated that it is important to get everyone that needs to be certified, certified for funding if a disaster should occur. Lastly, Mr. Naples asked for volunteers for EMA, it is not that hard just answering the telephone.

Mr. Kopp- Ok, if nothing else we will go into executive session to discuss some personnel issues and then come out and adjourn.

Mr. Kopp called the adjournment of the meeting Mr. LeHew made the motion and Mrs. Dale seconded, meeting Adjourned at 8:35 pm