



# West Pikeland Township

ATTENDING BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	ATTENDING TOWNSHIP PERSONNEL
Thomas J. McLewee Jr., Chairman	Joan Blatcher, Township Manager
Noreen Vigilante, Vice Chairman	Tom Goggin, Chief of Police
Steven F. Costa, Supervisor	Dorene Guistwhite, Township Treasurer
Harold M. Hallman III, Supervisor	Jennifer Wachsmuth, Township Secretary
Bryan Maher, Supervisor	Melissa Rheinstadter, Solicitor
	Dan Daley, Engineer

Mr. McLewee called the meeting to order on May 18, 2026 at 7:30 PM and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Mr. McLewee reported that executive sessions were held on May 14, 2026 and May 18, 2026 regarding real estate.

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Ms. Vigilante made a motion to approve May 18, 2026 Board of Supervisors agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Costa. Mr. Hallman, Mr. Maher, Mr. McLewee, Ms. Vigilante and Mr. Costa voted yea and the motion passed unanimously.

### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Mr. Costa made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 4, 2026 Board of Supervisors meeting, and thanked Ms. Wachsmuth for her efforts in capturing the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Maher. Mr. Hallman, Mr. Maher, Mr. McLewee, and Mr. Costa voted yea. Ms. Vigilante abstained from the vote as she was not present for the meeting. The motion passed with 4 in favor and 1 abstention.

### **REPORTS**

#### *Police:*

Chief Goggin shared with the Supervisors that there were 210 incidents reported to the police department during month of April 2026. Fraud/online crime seems to be the consistent reportable incident.

- 147 Traffic Stops
- 105 Citations
- 2 Non-Reportable Accidents (no towing, no injuries)
- 1 Reportable Accidents
- 1 DUI

~The two new police cars are currently being upfit for service with installation of computer equipment and other specialized components for safety and functionality. These cars will be white, with a more traditional appearance, reflecting the township values.

~Hosted Autism Awareness Advocate Alex Mann. Mr. Mann shares suggestions on how to best interact with special needs residents.

~Received new Portable Radios for the force. Attended Motorola Training for new system.

*Treasurer Report/Approval of Bills:*

Ms. Guistwhite reviewed the written report provided to the Board. Mr. Costa made a motion to approve the bills. Ms. Vigilante seconded the motion. Ms. Vigilante, Mr. Maher, Mr. McLewee, and Mr. Costa voted yea. Mr. Hallman abstained specifically as to the bill to check number 10897 in the amount of \$136.05 which was a payment to reimburse Mr. Hallman for expenses he incurred related to the 2026 PSATS Conference. Otherwise the motion passed unanimously.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

a. Discussion on Establishment of a Real Estate & Financial Advisory Committee

Ms. Blatcher reported that at the last Board of Supervisors meeting Mr. Costa requested that agenda be amended to include a discussion around the creation of a Real Estate and Financial Advisory Board. As Ms. Vigilante was not in attendance, the topic was tabled to be discussed at this meeting.

Mr. Hallman made a motion to approve the establishment of a Real Estate and Financial Advisory Committee. Mr. Costa seconded the motion.

Mr. Costa thanked all in attendance for being here tonight. Acknowledged that we have several advisory committees in place currently and recognize the value that they bring. Transparency and involvement are the goal of the committee. Big transactions would benefit from the resources available in our community. A liaison of sorts to project manage on big important financial decisions. Residents with Business Acumen, Engineering degrees, Project Management experience, etc. – we could benefit from their expertise. No voting rights would be assigned to the committee.

Mr. Maher asked what information the committee would be privy of. Real estate transactions typically require details that remain rather close to the vest. Mr. Costa said that is something to discuss and determine as we define the committee.

Mr. Maher asked the Township Solicitor, Ms. Rheinstadter what is necessary to proceed before voting on the formation of the committee. Ms. Rheinstadter stated that a resolution would be the correct next step. Mr. Maher clarified that the resolution should include what we would share with the committee, when it would be shared – establishing structure around the expectations.

Ms. Rheinstadter confirmed that a vote to move forward would initiate her firm to create the resolution, establishing specifics such as the number of committee members, the number of different expertise/skill set intended, how often they would meet, and other general definitions surrounding the committee's formation.

Ms. Vigilante pointed out that we as a township complete a major real estate transaction once every 20 years. Other than that, it's Open Space that conducts such purchases. We also have a

Land Trust committee in place. Why form another committee? We also employ and hire experts for their direction and advice on major investments – Why add an extra layer by adding a committee?

Mr. Costa stated that the committee is in effort for transparency, allowing the residents to be involved and participate. Ms. Vigilante noted that meetings like this are how transparency is accomplished. Mr. Costa also noted that like our other committees, we rely on their expertise to make good decisions and feels this is no different. Ms. Vigilante noted that since these transactions are so few and far between, it doesn't seem appropriate to establish a committee. Mr. Costa said that they could remain in an advisory capacity for financials in the future, monitoring, auditing, etc.

Mr. Hallman stated that this is a major purchase that the township has not made in many years.

Mr. McLewee also acknowledged that we hire the experts we need when we need them – we pay them for their advice and input on transactions such as this.

Ms. Vigilante noted that we are well along in this process of considering the acquisition, formation of a committee now may cause undo delays.

Mr. Costa didn't feel as if we had a timeline on this process. Ms. Vigilante disagreed as it is a real estate transaction that if delayed too long would cause the seller to move on. Mr. Hallman stated that if the seller needs to move on to let him.

Mr. Maher asked that as we infrequently deliberate real estate transactions, would the committee have other objectives as well? Mr. Costa said they could continue to serve as needed, even if that means meeting once per year or once per five years.

Mr. McLewee countered that as supervisors, isn't that what an elected official is responsible for?

There was response from the residents in attendance but not delved into at this time.

Mr. Maher suggested that we get some text on establishing the committee so that we have something of substance to deliberate and decide on. Mr. Costa agreed.

Mr. McLewee asked if the board was ready to proceed with the motion for establishment of a Real Estate and Financial Advisory committee. Mr. Maher countered that it should be a vote for the creation of a Resolution defining the parameters of a Advisory Committee, not a vote for the establishment of a committee still undefined.

With the solicitor's input, Mr. Costa made a motion to authorize the solicitor's office to prepare a resolution for the establishment of a Real Estate and Financial Advisory Committee. Mr. Hallman seconded the motion. Mr. Hallman, Mr. Maher and Mr. Costa voted yea, Mr. McLewee and Ms. Vigilante voted nay. The motion passed with a 3-2 vote.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### a. Addendum to April 20, 2026 Minutes (B. Maher's Abstention)

Ms. Blatcher reported that at the April 20, 2026 Board of Supervisors meeting, Mr. Maher abstained from voting on a payment reimbursing him for costs associated with a mailer. The minutes failed to document this abstention and have been amended as such.

Mr. Costa made a motion to approve the amended minutes from April 20, 2026. Ms. Vigilante seconded the motion. Mr. Hallman, Mr. Maher, Mr. McLewee, Ms. Vigilante and Mr. Costa voted yea and the motion passed unanimously.

### b. Overview of Police Station Renovation Options and Presentation on potential Real Estate Opportunity

Mr. McLewee stated that before we begin new business item b, he wanted to clarify his past history with Mr. Miller, the owner of the property at 1001 Kimberton Road. In 1989, Mr. McLewee and Mr. Miller worked for the same company in different departments and different locations. Mr. McLewee did not report to Mr. Miller. Upon Mr. McLewee's departure from the company, any and all contact ceased. Mr. McLewee stated that he has not, nor will not receive any compensation if the real estate transaction moves forward. No such compensation was ever offered.

Ms. Blatcher started the presentation with a quick introduction – she began her role as Township manager approximately 6 weeks ago. Ms. Blatcher outlined the format for the meeting: Presentation, Q&A Session, Public Comment. Each speaker was limited to 3 minutes to allow everyone a turn. Index cards were available for submitting questions as well. Attendees were advised the township staff is in office and available Monday – Thursday, 9am to 4pm.

A member of the audience asked if the questions asked tonight would become part of the public record. Ms. Blatcher confirmed that they would.

Ms. Blatcher shared that the presentation contains high level information regarding the Police and Administration building options for our township. It is not intended to provide every detail or provide all financial elements. The motivation for the possible change is because the current police facility is insufficient to house our future full-time police and support staff. Additionally, it faces ongoing septic issues and lacks the components necessary for future accreditation. The current facility poses certain safety risks for the officers and detainees.

Ms. Blatcher acknowledged that our township is small and experiences relatively low crime but noted that the FBI reports that smaller townships (less than 11,000 residents) face an unproportionately higher risk of officer assault and officer fatalities. In a town such as ours, where we generally know our neighbors and feel a minimal risk of harm, it is important to remember that our police force is also dealing with individuals traveling through West Pikeland.

There are three options under consideration for our Police Building. Option one: demolish and rebuild in the current location on Art School Road. Conversations around this option began in December 2025 shortly after it was voted on to keep the West Pikeland Police force. Option two: build a new freestanding 2 story building in the space earmarked for municipal use at Walnut Lane Park. These conversations began in January of 2026. The third option: 1001 Kimberton Road, a commercial property on Route 113. This real estate option came on the market in March. In the latter two options, the administration office is set to move with the Police, selling the current buildings and using those proceeds towards the new location. An image of the three locations was shared.

The opportunities available for staying on Art School Road are as follows: we own the land, and there is consistency with the location. Some of the challenges are Size limitations, sewer issues, the Historic compliance associated with the village, cost for temporary trailers to house the police for the duration of the rebuild, moving the police twice, cost to build and being bound to HYS in perpetuity. Extremely rough estimates for demolition, grading, retaining wall, new septic and well, site prep and building as well as the temporary station were shared.

Mr. Hallman asked to clarify about the septic, as the HYS provides the septic system for buildings in the village. Ms. Blatcher said that if we were to build on this site, the current system is insufficient for additional plumbing items. Mr. Tim Compton, Executive Director of Historic Yellow Springs, confirmed that the current system is compliant but can take on no additions. The owner initiating the additions to the system would bear the cost of the updates. We also have the option to put in our own system and come off of the HYS system.

The high and low-cost estimates to complete this option are between \$1,287,000 and \$1,552,000.

Option number two is constructing a new building on site at Walnut Lane Park. Some of the opportunities include we own the land, with good visibility on a major roadway, solar is an option, and we would be next to the Public Works facility. Challenges are the building site is near hard rock, and we would need a new septic and new well. Building here would change the park environment to a municipal campus environment, and the cost to build the building.

Conceptual cost estimates for this 3,600 sq ft police station and 3,600 administration building: low end – \$4,113,00, high end - \$4,509,000.

The final option is the building for sale at 1001 Kimberton Road. The opportunities with this location include better visibility with immediate access to a major roadway, Centralized location to create a municipal campus, the linking of two township owned properties, land conservation options, as well as the chance to connect trails to the Horseshoe Trail. Potential to offset expenses via rental opportunities, installation of solar panels for energy conservation, positive impact to the viewshed of Rte. 113 and controlling the potentially negative impact of alternative buyers. The challenges so far are the cost of purchase, the cost of renovation and the back lot of the property falls inside the 100-year floodplain, requiring remediation.

Schematics were shown to outline where the police and administration offices would be. Possible rental space available, allowing for a tenant to occupy.

Mr. Hallman asked about digging out the bank at Art School Road. Ms. Blatcher confirmed the building is currently 1600 square feet, digging out the bank would give us approximately 3000 sq feet for the police station.

Ms. Blatcher shared that the township owns the 2 properties on either side of the 1001 Kimberton location. Acquiring that land would allow trails to be added as well as tying into the Horseshoe trail. The plan would be to conserve the land and have a trail head with parking.

The pricing estimates for 1001 Kimberton Road are: low: \$5,373,200, high: \$5,698,800.

1001 Kimberton Road has the availability to utilize Solar panels, offsetting some costs and allowing the building to be net neutral with enhanced sustainability ratings – all things that contribute towards increasing our grant availabilities.

Ms. Blatcher shared a list of possible grant opportunities – not a fully flushed out list as not enough time was available pre-meeting to do so. There are three opportunities that we will apply for regardless of the location we choose to proceed with. Some of them have retroactive capabilities, so we can reimburse ourselves with those funds. There are two grant options that are only available if we proceed with 1001 Kimberton Road, as they are geared towards open space preservation.

For options two & three, Ms. Blatcher reviewed the bank loan option and noted the proceeds from the sale of 1645 and 1649 Art School Road would generate income.

Ms. Vigilante added that 1001 Kimberton Road has space in the building that we could rent out, gaining additional revenue.

Mr. Hallman pointed out that with rental options, our taxes would increase, unless we rent to a non-profit.

Mr. Maher emphasized that this is strictly informational, no vote on a path forward would be taken tonight.

Ms. Blatcher shared more on the process so far. Conversations regarding how to best set up our police force with a building that suits their needs began in late 2025. No decisions have been made and the investigations into the most appropriate, fiscally responsible option continue, including the newly available property in the township. The township is making the best effort to be transparent as possible without placing the possible acquisition at risk.

Ms. Teresa Wilson of Spring House Road expressed their apprehension about being kept in the loop and allowed the opportunity to advise the board.

Ms. Blatcher emphasized that we have Engineers, Architects, and Realtors, all engaged in an advisory capacity on behalf of the township, as well as seeking input from residents.

Mr. Hallman clarified that the township has not engaged with the assistance of a realtor.

Ms. Blatcher outlined the process for the Q&A session.

Mr. Costa suggested that questions taken tonight, either verbally or in written format, as well as questions submitted via email or the website be gathered and posted on the township's website. Ms. Blatcher advised that a Q&A compilation would be prepared.

Ms. Anna Jordan of Lower Pine Creek Road had a question for the Police Chief: Is the crime in our township mostly from inside the township or outside? Chief Goggin replied that it is often a toss-up, especially with DUI arrests. Regardless of the resident/non-resident nature of the individual, safety for them and safety for the officer is paramount. Chief shared some of the concerns of the current police station, as detainees and police staff are in very close proximity. Ms. Jordan pointed out the location and visibility of option two and three would seem to be an asset to the force. Chief Goggin agreed there would be benefit from the exposure.

Mr. Bill White of Art School Road recalled that Walnut Lane Park was purchased with the intention of a municipal campus, and we own that land - no new property acquisition needed. Noted that purchasing 1001 Kimberton takes away our tax earnings.

Ms. Blatcher shared that the tax earnings for 1001 Kimberton are approximately \$2000 annually.

Mr. White was in favor of keeping it on our tax rolls and raised concerns about the environmental aspect of a location used as a car dealership in the past.

Ms. Blatcher advised that environmental studies were completed in 2018 and reported acceptable results. This investigation was initiated by the current owner of 1001 Kimberton, and a favorable letter from the DEP was issued. If we were to proceed with 1001 Kimberton, additional environmental studies would be sought.

Mr. Costa shared that a new Phase 1 study had been authorized and was being initiated.

Mr. Hallman asked Ms. Blatcher whether the contract for the additional Phase 1 study that had been authorized by the BoS the preceding Thursday night had been executed. Ms. Blatcher responded no, not yet. Mr. Hallman pressed Ms. Blatcher for an explanation as to why it had not yet been done. Ms. Blatcher responded that, as discussed previously with the Supervisors, topics related to personnel and performance concerns should not be raised during open meetings. Mr. Hallman tried to continue the discussion, and Ms. Blatcher responded it would be discussed after the meeting so that she could continue with the presentation.

Mr. Costa reiterated that another phase 1 inspection was authorized and would be conducted to give the township peace of mind that the site remains safe.

Mr. Wayne Freese of Dogwood Lane asked if there were any plans to expand the 1001 Kimberton location, or if the renovations were all within the current footprint. Ms. Blatcher confirmed no expansion on the current building.

Dan Spaventa of Spring House Road requested details on the Letter of Intent, emphasizing procedural transparency and risk limitations regarding the LOI. He questioned timing of the subdivision of land and wants to ensure the separation of funds. He also requested we initiate mandatory dual appraisals. The 1001 Kimberton location was labeled Brownfield in 1987. As such, level one and two inspections will be required, and possibly more intense remediation since the site would be changing from a dealership to a municipal campus.

Mr. Spaventa requested that the LOI be posted on the website for resident review before execution. At this time, he submitted the rest of his questions in written form.

Ms. Blatcher reminded everyone that this is the time for questions so that we can possibly answer as much as possible.

Mr. Jeff Kern of Pikeland Road requested that the Board present a multi-year forecast for the 3 options. Requested it to include total purchase price, renovations, where the money will come from, proposed tax increases, loan term and details, grants, and timing. Also requested the why behind possibly buying new land instead of using the land we currently own. Noted our township current carries a significant debt, and he is looking for the forecast to determine if tax increases will be necessary in the future.

Mr. Rob Kocher of Hunt Club Lane thanked Joan for her time last week as they met to discuss the road and septic concerns of Pickering Estates. He requested that the board maintain deep concern for the status of the development's roads, as they are in need of updates. Ms. Blatcher confirmed that we are engaging with our engineers to proceed with the bid process to make the necessary updates. There is no other road improvement plans in the township at this stage in the process. Mr. Kocher raised concerns that the funding for his road improvements might be reallocated for the police or this renovation/construction endeavor.

Mr. Maher clarified that funds for roads come from liquid fuels or the general fund and acknowledged that the liquid fuels budget will not contain enough to pay for the necessary road improvements.

Mr. Hallman suggested that we have our engineer Dan Daley speak about the plans for Pickering Estates, but the Board decided that the focus of the Q&A session was on the possible real estate transaction.

Ms. Sue McElroy of Messner Road asked if there was a sense of urgency around the 1001 Kimberton location as there is rumored to be other interested buyers for that property. Asked how close the township was to submitting an offer and how much time did they have to do so.

Ms. Blatcher advised that we have not made any offer at this time. The next step is to create a letter of intent, complete with the requirements to be met prior to advancing with the transaction. There is a limited timeline to do so as the property is actively on the market.

Mr. Maher confirmed that there is a timeline attached to the next step of drafting an LOI.

Ms. McElroy closed with a vote to build at Walnut Lane. The environmental unknown of 1001 Kimberton Road concerns her, and any trail possibilities would be hindered by the wetland.

Mr. Maher stated that this current investigation into purchasing 1001 Kimberton was less than 2 months old. Much more will be needed before we can proceed with making a decision.

Ms. Vigilante noted that 1001 Kimberton Road has more grant opportunities than Walnut Lane Park, making it less expensive to renovate there as opposed to building at Walnut Lane.

Ms. Lisa LaCroix of Pikeland Road had a question about 1001 Kimberton Road zoning, wanting to know what might be put there based on its zoning, fearing another buyer might bring something unfavorable. Ms. Blatcher advised it is currently zoned light industrial, with a special exception being a car dealership, as the dealership was in place before we had the zoning code. Light Industrial does provide for a wide possibility to another buyer, and the township would have limited availability to place restrictions on them.

Mr. Ed Meltzer of Crimson Place noted the when the vote to keep the police force in West Pikeland was raised, there was no mention of the need for a new police station. Ms. Vigilante advised the need became apparent after the vote.

Mr. Charlie Knapp of Yellow Springs Road asked Ms. Blatcher if she had a favorite plan. She advised that she did not and reminded all that she holds no vote in the matter. He wanted to know if she felt pressure to pursue 1001 Kimberton from the board. Ms. Blatcher confirmed there was not, outside the due diligence requirements that come inherently with potential real estate purchases. Mr. Knapp closed with the fact that 1001 Kimberton Road was the only option on the table that requires a purchase – the other two options are already owned by the township.

Ms. Karin Corbitt of Parker Hill Lane asked if additional details would be shared regarding the cost estimates – more itemized breakdown with contingencies and assumptions, before decisions are made. Ms. Blatcher confirmed she will consult with our experts and stated that we have not purchased full out cost estimates on any of the options. Ms. Corbitt looks forward to reviewing the numbers so she can ascertain which option might be the most financially responsible way to accomplish the police upgrades we need. Ms. Blatcher recommended that she stop in the office and review all the available details.

Ms. Lorraine Huston of Art School Road suggested reconfiguring the space we have now for the police station. Ms. Vigilante pointed out that SALT Performing Arts has a 10-year lease for a good portion of the current building, and the Administration office upstairs is quite small. Switching the Administration and the Police Station would not gain us the space we need for them.

Mr. Rick Beam of Highview Dr pointed out that tonight's discussion focused on the cost of the 3 options, as opposed to focusing on what is best for the police. He suggested a benefit analysis would be helpful.

Ms. Carolyn Pulitta of Hunt Club Lane asked how much space is rented by SALT, and would we consider using the space we have to modify for the police? Ms. Blatcher didn't have square footage available, advised that it is the remainder of the building behind the meeting room wall. Ms. Vigilante advised that there are 8.5 years remaining on the 10-year lease with SALT, as well as a significant investment by them recently in the building to suit the theater's needs.

Mr. Leo Parsons of Nottingham Lane thanked the township for this information and acknowledged the strategic nature of a decision such as this. He thanked the Board for voting to keep the force and requested to hear more about the vision and the goal over details about funding and grants and trail conversations. Felt that would put the focus on what is really important.

Ms. Maryanne Parsons of Nottingham Lane wanted to piggyback on her husband's comments. Suggested focusing on the big picture, what we want for our community down the line and for the next 20 years - how we want to leave the township for our children and next generation. Asked how significant a difference would the tax dollars vary from option 1, 2 or 3.

Ms. Blatcher stated that whatever we do, the current plan is to remain tax neutral. There is no intention of raising taxes to fund any of the options. Ms. Blatcher advised that could change, of course, but that was the marching orders given to her by the Board.

Ms. Reagan Sarmento of Fairfield Lane commented that as a Behavioral Health professional, the current police station set up is terrifying. A detainee in a mental health crisis poses a significant risk to themselves and the police staff in the current location.

Mr. Maher, Ms. Vigilante, Mr. Costa and Mr. McLewee all agreed. Creating a safe, effective location for our police force to work in is paramount, regardless of which location we chose.

Mr. Gordon McElroy of Messner Road asked when the next public meeting will be held on this matter. Ms. Blatcher stated that time will be needed to gather the next level of detail to make the next public meeting worthwhile. She is focused on sharing robust, accurate information. Mr. McElroy requested that the presentation be put on the website.

Mr. Bob Warren of Dogwood Lane noted that the presentation was hard to see so he agrees that putting on the website is advisable. Inquired about any sunk costs – was any money spent and are they included in the estimates? Ms. Blatcher confirmed they are included. Mr. Warren suggested breaking them out for clarity, as well as detailing the increase between the low and the high estimates.

Ms. Carolyn Pullito requested that the current building at 1645 Art School Road be added as a possible location for the police station. Ms. Vigilante advised that was not possible for a multitude of reasons – 8.5 year lease with SALT, Historic Yellow Springs restrictions, etc.

Mr. Maher reminded all residents should continue to ask questions.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Carin Mifsud of Carolyn Drive expressed appreciation for the presentation and the information shared tonight. Acknowledged the amount of work that must have gone into preparing for this meeting.

Mr. McLewee reminded all present that each member of the board is also a township resident.

Mr. Bill White made a comment regarding adding items to the agenda post publication. He recalled that the previous board agreed to limit or restrict additions to the agenda (once published the Friday before the meeting) to only extremely time sensitive matters. This expectation should remain and no changes should be made to the agenda outside extreme circumstances.

Mr. Dan Iannucci of Parker Hill Lane stated he is not in favor of buying the property at 1001 Kimberton Road. Advised that any cost estimate we have gathered would ultimately be significantly higher because of the nature of the construction industry. In his opinion it would most certainly go over budget. Ms. Vigilante pointed out that his concerns apply to all three options on the table, not just 1001 Kimberton Road.

Mr. Rob Kocher of Hunt Club Lane mentioned that Kimberton Road property would be better used to collect taxes from a new owner than being bought by the township. He also wondered if we would even find a buyer interested in 1645 Art School Road. He acknowledged that we can't sell Walnut Lane, but if we could it would be more lucrative.

Ms. Vigilante advised that we have 2 interested buyers in the Art School building locations and confirmed that we are unable to sell Walnut Lane. Mr. Kocher mentioned that he was told the Walnut Lane Public Works buildings went over budget. Ms. Vigilante corrected him that the project came in under time and under budget.

Mr. Mike Leader of Oak Hill Road pointed out that it was highly inappropriate of a previous speaker tonight to throw out an exorbitant dollar amount in relation to the 1001 Kimberton property.

Ms. Karin Corbitt of Parker Hill Lane countered to Mr. Leader that the evening was full of numbers being shot off the hip. All are estimates, with lots of opportunity for fluctuations. In a non-financial perspective, she feels the current location of the township building is majestic and special. Proposed that the light industrial component of 1001 Kimberton is best suited for its location, and the township buildings are best suited to remain in the village.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The next Board of Supervisors meeting will be held on Monday, June 1<sup>st</sup> and Monday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2026 at 7:30 PM.

**ADJOURN**

Ms. Vigilante motioned to adjourn at 9:28 PM. Mr. Costa seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Wachsmuth  
Township Secretary