



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397
610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616
TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

January 26, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, January 26, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matthew Glennon chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Norman Blatt
Percy Dougherty
Karen Duerholz
Armand Greco
Michael Hefele
Kent Herman
Benjamin Howells
Kenneth McClain
Stephen Repasch
Donna Wright

Northampton County

Becky Bradley
Gordon Campbell
John Cusick
John Diacogiannis
Liesel Dreisbach
Charles Fraust
Matthew Glennon
Robert Lammi
Ross Marcus
Thomas J. Nolan

Members absent: Steven Glickman, Edward Hozza, Earl Lynn, Ray O'Connell, Virginia Savage, Karen Dolan, Charles Elliott, George F. Gemmel, Darlene Heller, Terry Lee, Ronald W. Lutes, Jeffrey Manzi and Michael Reph

Staff present: Michael Kaiser, Olev Taremäe, Joe Gurinko, Dave Berryman, Sue Rockwell, Chris Dimenichi

Public Present: None

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

MINUTES

After a brief review, the minutes of the December 15, 2011 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Greco. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Mr. Kaiser provided a list of LVPC website hits for October 1 – December 31, 2011. We had 77,648 hits during that period of time. We had close to 20,000 hits on our model development and environmental ordinance regulations. We had about 8,800 hits on our Comprehensive Plan also. Mr. Kaiser said he hopes the website will continue to generate interest in the future.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Committee

Subdivision-Land Development of Regional Significance – Allentown Arena – City of Allentown

Mr. Berryman said there is a copy of the review letter sent to the City of Allentown regarding the Allentown Arena in the agenda attachments. The letter was sent January 9 in advance of their planning commission meeting on January 10. Our letter acknowledged that the comments are subject to ratification by this Commission. The project qualifies as a development of regional significance according to our Comprehensive Plan. This project is generally consistent with the goals and policies of the Plan.

We looked at the traffic study submitted with the project. We concurred overall with the study, but there were two things we thought they should look at more closely. One was coordination with Whitehall Township. The traffic study showed 53% of the trips coming through the Rt. 22/ MacArthur Road interchange. Whitehall Township is currently doing a traffic study of that corridor. PennDOT is also doing work on a project to upgrade the interchange. The city has forwarded a copy of their traffic study to PennDOT and Whitehall Township for review. This satisfies that one concern. Second, the traffic study showed 10% of the trips were going to be by bus or pedestrian traffic. We thought there should be an evaluation of similar sized arenas in similar sized cities to see if that is a reasonable number. We haven't received any feedback on that comment. Other than that, we found the project to be consistent with our policies. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to ratify the letter. Mr. Repasch seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Hefele abstaining.

Sustainability Grant

Mr. Kaiser said progress is being made on this project. There is a handout with the agenda attachments that summarizes the LVPC work program and costs. First, we are updating our housing study. We are doing a Jobs/Housing Balance Study. The purpose of the study is to determine how the location of jobs and housing, especially for low income people in the area, match up and the connections between them. We are trying to make sure the jobs being created are accessible to people who need them. We have an Energy Conservation Element and a Climate Change Element in our plan. We will have a lot of public participation. There will also be a public opinion survey on the internet. We have to devise some methods of measuring the progress of these things. This is a HUD requirement of the whole program. Mr. Kaiser briefly reviewed the handout materials. The contract should be ready by mid-April. Mr. Lammi made a motion to proceed with this program as outlined. Mr. Greco seconded the motion, and the motion carried. Mr. Kaiser we will be updating the Commission on the progress of this work.

Review of PPL Power Line Location and Correspondence

Ms. Dreisbach said there are letters in the agenda attachments written by the LVPC in 2008 and 2010 on this proposal. There are also some maps showing potential routes. Mr. Glennon said back in 2008 and again in 2010, a tall, high voltage power line was being fast tracked that would run from the Susquehanna to Roseland, N.J. One of the potential routes they were looking at was through the northern tier of Lehigh and Northampton counties. We were against that route and we submitted those comments to the Public Utility Commission. The Public Utility Commission in Pennsylvania and New Jersey has agreed on a route now. It goes through the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. They have been reviewing the environmental impact statements on the path of this high tension line through the park for over a year. It will be covering an existing right-of-way. They will have to widen it by 50 feet in some places, and the line will be much higher. It will have a visual impact certainly through the park. The park system basically has to approve it or they will probably have to go back to Route C, which would be back through Northampton County. This is why we thought we had a stake in this. Mr. Glennon said part of the park is in Northampton County below the Delaware Water Gap. PPL has put \$30 million on the table to purchase land that the Park Service may be interested in acquiring as a way to mitigate where the line will go through. If it doesn't go through the park, it will run through Northampton County and impact more people. It would still cross the Appalachian Trail and the Delaware River only further south. Mr. Glennon would like to hear a motion to authorize the staff to propose a letter to the National Park Service supporting the right-of-way through the park. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to write a letter to the National Park Service supporting the right-of-way. Mr. Greco asked if the support of the land purchase to mitigate the impacts should be part of the recommendation. Mr. Glennon said yes, that can be included in the letter. Ms. Dreisbach amended the motion to include a statement of support for the proposed purchase of land. Mr. Kaiser asked if our previous letters should be attached. The Commission members responded yes. Ms. Wright seconded the motion. The motion passed with Mr. Diacogiannis abstaining.

Project Reviews

Ms. Dreisbach said there are six summary sheet items on page 11 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve items 1, 2 and 6 and ratify items 3, 4 and 5. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion passed with Mr. Cusick, Mr. Marcus and Ms. Bradley abstaining from items 4 and 5.

Environment Committee

Status Report on Floodplain Mapping in Northampton County

Ms. Rockwell said back in December the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) released copies of preliminary floodplain mapping for Northampton County to the county and all of the municipalities in the county. Ms. Rockwell briefly reviewed the schedule for the mapping. Municipalities will have opportunities to comment on the technical and non-technical aspects of the mapping and flood study. FEMA has scheduled a public meeting for February 21 to review the mapping and study. After the meeting, a 90 day appeals period will begin. FEMA will address the comments and appeals and issue a final determination. The municipalities will then have six months to revise their existing ordinances before the flood mapping will go into effect. Ms. Rockwell reviewed some of the changes to the mapping. We compared the current flood mapping and preliminary flood mapping to see what changes were made. We created a map that shows floodplains that are on the current mapping, but no longer on the preliminary mapping, and floodplains that do not appear on the current mapping, but have been added to the preliminary mapping. When the preliminary mapping

becomes effective, any development in the newly added floodplains will have to purchase flood insurance. Municipalities will have to do public outreach to notify property owners that could be affected by the changes. Ms. Rockwell said we are currently looking at some of the technical aspects of the mapping and study and may have comments later.

Transportation Committee

Presentation on 2013 Unified Planning Work Program

Mr. Gurinko said each year we submit a Draft Planning Work Program for transportation planning that we intend to do in the next state fiscal year. The program runs from July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013. There are two components to the work program. One is a base program where we get funds allocated to the area and LVPC through a formula. Then there is a special studies component. Mr. Gurinko reviewed the handout material titled Draft 2012-2013 LVPC Unified Planning Work Program.

The base program is funded 80% by the federal government, 10% by the state, and the LVPC matches with 10%. There are five tasks handled under the base program. They include administration of the contract; public information; surveillance, which includes traffic counts, looking at physical characteristics of highway sample segments and a lot of data development; system planning; and Transportation Improvement Program development and maintenance.

On the special studies side, PennDOT has money set aside that is competitive on a statewide basis for special projects. We are proposing to submit two special studies under next years work program. The first is ongoing: the Local Technical Assistance Program or LTAP coordination. We hold LTAP training classes in this office. They enable Lehigh Valley municipalities to be trained locally in things like road maintenance, bridge inspections, etc. that are of interest to local municipalities. We propose to continue that effort. There is a \$25,000 cost that is 100% funded by the Federal Highway Administration.

The second item we are proposing to submit for a special study is a continuation of the Local Asset Inventory/Linking Planning and NEPA Implementation. PennDOT is requesting that data be collected on certain portions of the local (non state-owned) road and bridge network. The LVPC will continue to focus its efforts on collecting data on locally owned bridges between 8 and 20 feet in length. We have located about 310-320 bridges in this category and field viewed about two thirds of them. This information will go into PennDOT's database and will be used to help identify needs. State funding is available for bridges of these types. The Linking Planning and NEPA project will create a standardized set of information for each new project coming into the system. The LVPC will work with District 5 staff to evaluate new projects proposed and compile environmental information to better define the scope of improvement, cost and length of time to implementation at the front end of the project rather than at the end. The purpose of this process is to reduce project delays. Mr. Herman made a motion to approve the 2013 Unified Planning Work Program. Mr. Greco seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Presentation on Major Lehigh Valley Projects in Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Gurinko said we are really hurting for money for transportation capital projects. There is little money at the federal or state level. There are proposals for additional money at both levels, but no action has been taken. The Federal transportation legislation expired September 30, 2009 and has

yet to be reauthorized. However, there is still a lot going on in the Lehigh Valley that is coming to fruition. Mr. Gurinko presented a power point presentation on the following projects:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Start Date</u>
I-78 & Rt. 412 Interchange	\$45 million	2012
American Parkway Project	\$48 million	2012
Rt. 145 (MacArthur Rd.) & 7 th Street Interchange	\$18 million	2012
Rt. 22 Bridge over the Lehigh River	\$33 million	2014
Fullerton Avenue Reconfiguration	\$28 million	2014
Claussville Rd. at Rt. 100 Safety Project	\$3.3 million	2012
MacArthur Road Safety Project	\$11.1 million	2012
Tilghman Street Bridge	\$24.7 million	On the TIP
Coplay/Northampton Bridge	\$17 million	On the TIP
8 th Street Bridge	\$31.5 million	On the TIP

Mr. Gurinko said the overall story is we need a lot more money, but there is a lot of expensive work that will be done in the Lehigh Valley in the next few years.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Duerholz asked if there has been any discussion about updating the website. Mr. Kaiser said we have been talking to Mr. Lammi about that. There will be some changes, but it will not be an extensive update. Ms. Duerholz said it was a little cumbersome, and she has gotten a lot of errors. Mr. Kaiser said some additional work was done on the site recently. Mr. Lammi noted that the work is done in-house. Mr. Kaiser said our staff is down to 15 people and time is limited for this work.

In other new business, Mr. Dougherty reported that the Lehigh County Commissioners met last night and reappointed Mr. Herman to the board.

CORRESPONDENCE – None

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Presentation on LVPC Comprehensive Plan for Lehigh and Northampton Counties

Mr. Kaiser said our Comprehensive Plan has been updated about five times since the 1960s. The latest version was updated in 2005. Usually a five to ten year period is a good renewal time for this type of document. We try to have a concise and logical progression for how the plan is written. The plan is also based in part on comments from our Public Opinion Surveys. Some of the issues identified in the latest survey include traffic congestion, especially on Rt. 22, the preservation of natural resources, redevelopment of the old industrial cities, revitalization and renewal of Brownfield sites, and people are interested in the expansion of transit and development of parks and recreational facilities. The things people like about the Lehigh Valley are beginning to disappear. This is a planning, social and political problem that needs to be addressed. It is especially difficult to address this when there is not enough money to work with. We have to keep in mind the natural resource base that people treasure in the area.

Mr. Kaiser gave a power point presentation on the topics covered in the Comprehensive Plan. He described how we developed the natural resources plan and land use plan. Also, from our perspective, we need to look at the connection between land use and transportation. The two have to mesh. We only support highway capacity improvements in areas where we want to see urban growth. We support safety, intersection improvements and a variety of road improvements elsewhere, but not capacity improvements. Mr. Repasch asked if there is a way to measure the success of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Kaiser said we can measure success in many ways. We can look at the land use proposed in different areas. We can look at how much acreage is going into things other than what we recommend. How much agricultural land is being saved is another way to measure success. We can measure it by the amount of park land and open space we save and the progress of stream improvement. Metrics will be an important part of the Sustainability Grant work program.

Mr. Dougherty said compared to other states we are doomed to failure because our plan is only relatively consistent with local comprehensive plans. They do not have to follow our plan. We can't have really good metrics if our plan doesn't have "teeth". Mr. Kaiser said there are a lot of things we need to consider in this planning program. We want to get back to the idea of why we are here and what does it really mean to do a comprehensive plan. How do you measure it, what are the variables that go into it and how do you make it better? And most importantly, how do you attract the political will to make changes at the local level?

Mr. Nolan made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397

610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616

TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

February 23, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, February 23, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matthew Glennon chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Norman Blatt
Karen Duerholz
Steven Glickman
Armand Greco
Kent Herman
Benjamin Howells
Edward Hozza
Earl Lynn
Stephen Repasch
Virginia Savage
Donna Wright

Northampton County

Becky Bradley
Gordon Campbell
John Cusick
John Diacogiannis
Karen Dolan
Liesel Dreisbach
Charles Elliott
Charles Fraust
George Gemmel
Matthew Glennon
Ross Marcus
Thomas Nolan

Members absent: Percy Dougherty, Michael Hefele, Kenneth McClain, Ray O'Connell, Darlene Heller, Bob Lammi, Terry Lee, Jeffrey Manzi and Michael Reph

Staff present: Michael Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Olev Taremäe, Tom Edinger, Sue Rockwell, Dave Berryman

Public Present: None

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

MINUTES

After a brief review, the minutes of the January 26, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Greco. Mr. Howells seconded the motion, and the motion carried with Mr. Elliott, Mr. Gemmel, Mr. Glickman, Mr. Hozza and Ms. Dolan abstaining.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Committee

Review of Housing Chapter – Lehigh Valley Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Kaiser said we recently started reviewing some of the key chapters in our Comprehensive Plan. We have a lot of census data we are working with. We are also working on new forecasts of population, collecting employment data and updating the travel model. Tonight we are going to cover the housing section. The staff has been involved quite deeply in housing lately because of the Federal Sustainability program which has a big housing component. There is a lot of concern about inequities in housing. This problem exists across the country. The counties are also involved in housing now because they are updating their consolidated plans which are the guidelines for their block grant program. Fair housing issues and assessments of the impediments to fair housing are part of the work they have to do at the county level.

Mr. Taremäe said the housing section of the Comprehensive Plan discusses a number of housing issues. A copy of the section was provided to Commission members. Mr. Taremäe said the housing section is organized by six themes. The first has to do with affordable housing. We are talking about affordability through all income levels. We also take a look at the housing needs of the disadvantaged population. These include the handicapped, the elderly, the mentally ill, minority groups, households with a female head and one person households. They have specialized housing needs. The third theme is fair housing. When you get CDBG money from the Federal government, you must take proactive steps to have a program that promotes fair housing. This ties into some of the efforts by the counties and in the sustainability work. The fourth theme is social and economic opportunity. The goal is to provide housing in a wide choice of locations which maximize the social and economic opportunities for everyone. In order to have economic opportunity, you have to have access to jobs. This also ties into sustainability. The fifth theme has to do with decent and suitable houses. We are talking about the condition of the housing. The last theme has to do with the house within the context of the neighborhood community. The Planning Commission policy talks about high quality neighborhoods. They don't have to be expensive neighborhoods. You can have high quality neighborhoods at more modest economic levels. We're talking about good design and adequate services. Let us also focus on the connection between the housing policies and other sections of the plan. Housing is fully integrated with the other aspects of the plan. Mr. Taremäe said there are four categories that describe this. The first category has to do with the land use plan. Where is the housing located? In urban or rural areas? We also have a range of recommendations for appropriate densities. The next category has to do with environmental and natural features. This has to do with the relation to the quality of the ground itself. Is it a floodplain or a wetland? How does it deal with nuisances like highway and airplane noises? The third category is infrastructure. The plan has a strong connection between development and adequate infrastructure such as roads, utilities, sewer or water and stormwater. The last category has to do with transportation. Where is the housing unit relative to where people need to go? Also, is transit service available? We like to see travel distances minimized. Mr. Kaiser said we will probably do a re-write on this chapter after we do some of the other work we have.

Status Report – Lehigh Valley Sustainability Grant

Mr. Reese said the Lehigh Valley has made application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for some funding through their Sustainable Communities Grant program. The application was funded, and we, the Lehigh Valley, will be receiving \$3.4 million over the next three years from HUD to do a variety of work. The basic element of work is to create and begin to implement a Regional Plan for Sustainable Development. We have argued we already have such a thing in our Comprehensive Plan and it goes at least 90% of the way to creating a Regional Plan for Sustainable Development. HUD agreed. By agreeing, it allowed a portion of the money to flow to the cities for catalytic projects. So 40% of this overall funding ends up for projects important to the three cities to begin to display and implement sustainability principles. The Lehigh Valley got this grant, not the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. In fact, it was a consortium of organizations that got the grant. The lead applicant of the consortium is LVEDC. Other organizations included are LVPC, LANta, CACLV, Renew LV and the three cities. The lead applicant must execute a contract with HUD so they bring all of the \$3.4 million into the Lehigh Valley. As of February 1, 2012 LVEDC has a contract with HUD to implement the program. LVEDC will contract with each of the other entities receiving money. We now have a draft agreement from LVEDC and over the next couple of months we will make sure it meets our requirements and then sign on to do the work. The work will extend over a three year period.

One of the surprises we learned about is there is a housing component we were unaware of when the application was submitted. HUD requires the grantee to create a Fair Housing Equity Assessment (FHEA). We reviewed all these details with the Comprehensive Planning Committee. HUD has defined exactly what is to be included. Representatives from the two counties, the three cities and the Planning Commission met yesterday, and the direction established was to pursue a full regional analysis of impediments under this grant. This meets the FHEA requirement and provides a document required for the cities and counties under their CDBG programs. Since this is a surprise, this work was not scoped out and there is no funding source under this grant. There will have to be some funding identified. The counties and the cities have not asked us to work on this regional analysis. We will be creating and updating the Affordable Housing Report for the two counties. We will keep you updated on this new requirement. Mr. Marcus asked who would be doing the work. Mr. Reese said the work will be done by a consultant. Mr. Herman asked if once you create policy, will there be an enforcement mechanism? Ms. Bradley said they will hold back our CDBG money. We really don't know what HUD is going to come at us with year after year. Mr. Elliott asked if the analysis will look at zoning ordinances, land use restrictions and minimum lot sizes in terms of impediments. Mr. Reese said it's supposed to. Ms. Bradley said if you are in an entitlement community or you are one of the two counties you have to have a consolidated plan in place that addresses some of those issues. A lot of it is already done at least for the three cities and generally for the two counties.

Project Reviews

Ms. Dreisbach said there are five summary sheet items on page 7 of the agenda attachments. Since the Committee meeting, North Whitehall withdrew their submission and one was added from Palmer Township. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Howells seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Bradley and Mr. Elliott abstaining from item 4.

Environment Committee

Act 97 Review – Transfer Station Permit Modification – McAuliffe Hauling and Recycling – Lehigh Township

Mr. Taremäe said McAuliffe Hauling owns and operates a transfer station where they take waste out of filled trucks and pack it into larger trucks. It is located in the northern part of Lehigh Township on Blue Mountain. Presently they are allowed to take a maximum of 100 tons a day. They want a permit modification to increase that to 300 tons a day. We saw that permit application in April 2011. The review letter written at that time indicated that the proposal was inconsistent with the County Comprehensive Plan because of the Blue Mountain issues and environmental issues. Further, we suggested DEP require certain analyses as set forth in their procedures.

What we have here now is a revised application. Previously, the proposal involved an existing cluster of buildings and a single driveway coming off of Timberline Road. The Township was concerned about the adequacy of this access relative to the increased truck traffic. They have modified this proposal so the existing driveway becomes a one way only. They will loop around and a new access road will be constructed to the east. Further, there would be areas around the buildings that are currently unpaved to become paved. The Environment Committee voted to pass on to the Commission the draft review letter with the agenda materials having a title on the top that reads "Review Letter as Approved by the Environment Committee". It indicates that, number one, there should be some sort of stormwater analysis done due to the increased amount of pavement on the site, and number two, it refers to the earlier comments we made. On further consideration, we have drafted an alternate review letter that is also with the agenda materials. The difference between the two letters is in the third paragraph. The third paragraph in the alternate letter indicates that, given the fact that no buildings will be changed and there will be limited areas of woodlands disturbed in order to build the new road, we do not find it to conflict with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Taremäe said they are removing two existing houses. There are some areas that are hard-packed or already graveled that will become paved. If they would be doing further expansion, then we would have concerns about the site development. Mr. Glickman asked if there was concern about traffic. Mr. Taremäe said when the original application was received there was a traffic study. Mr. Gurinko looked at the study, and from a capacity perspective, he didn't feel there was a problem. Ms. Dolan asked how they can increase their volume without improving Timberline Road, which is a narrow country road. Mr. Taremäe said there are two issues being raised here. One deals with the geometrics of the road and the other is volume of traffic. He can't address the geometrics of the road. Mr. Taremäe said he could provide the data on trips per day. Also, the traffic study was reviewed by the Township engineer.

Mr. Glickman asked what the difference was between the two letters. Mr. Taremäe said one letter says it does conflict with the County Comprehensive Plan and the other says it doesn't. Mr. Kaiser said it is a question of what you're directing the comment at. The particular site work they are talking about does not conflict with the Comprehensive Plan. If they move into some of the surrounding areas, that's where the concern would be, and we kept that in the letter. Mr. Repasch said the consistency is just for this particular application. Mr. Elliott asked how the site improvement, which would increase capacity, would not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Elliott asked how the Commission could comment last April that this use is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, but now takes the position that site improvements intended to facilitate the expansion of that use would now be consistent. Mr. Kaiser said the current application is for an improvement on a particular site. From the perspective of that site plan, we don't have a problem. Our problem is if they go beyond that site plan. Mr. Kaiser said we also speak to the issue of the

surrounding woodland. We want that area protected. Mr. Elliott recommended the removal of the second sentence in the third paragraph of the alternate letter that says the permit amendment does not conflict with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Kaiser said we can take out that sentence. Mr. Repasch made a motion for the letter to be approved with the recommended change. Mr. Greco seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Gemmel opposed.

Project Reviews

Mr. Repasch said there are three summary sheet items on pages 8 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Wright seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Transportation Committee

Traffic Safety in the Lehigh Valley 2006 – 2010

A handout titled “A Status of Crash Facts and Traffic Safety in the Lehigh Valley 2006 to 2010” was provided to Commission members. Mr. Edinger said we prepared the traffic safety report using PennDOT crash data from 2006 to 2010. The report was e-mailed to Commission members. Mr. Edinger said we looked at different crash characteristics in Lehigh and Northampton counties. The crash tabulations in the report are for all highways in the Lehigh Valley. We compared the number of crashes in the Lehigh Valley to Pennsylvania crash statistics and other PennDOT reports. Mr. Edinger explained the different types of crashes and discussed the severity of crashes and fatality rates. We mapped out the high priority crash corridors and intersections. We work with PennDOT to help identify future safety projects. As part of the report, we provide general recommendations to mitigate safety issues. Mr. Edinger briefly discussed the recommendations. LVTS approved the report last month and it is on our website. Ms. Duerholz asked what helped with the decrease of accidents. Mr. Edinger said we think some of the safety improvements and enforcement has helped. The vehicles themselves are safer. All of those things help with safety.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS - None

CORRESPONDENCE – None

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Mr. Kaiser said we have been very busy and are presently doing some staff recruiting. This is necessary because of the added work due to the HUD grant and the normal growth of work in the office.

Ms. Wright made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Lynn seconded the motion. Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397
610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616
TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

March 29, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, March 29, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matthew Glennon chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Norman Blatt
Percy Dougherty
Steven Glickman
Michael Hefele
Kent Herman
Ben Howells
Edward Hozza
Earl Lynn
Christina Morgan
Stephen Repasch
Donna Wright

Northampton County

Gordon Campbell
John Cusick
John Diacogiannis
Liesel Dreisbach
Charles Fraust
George Gemmel
Matthew Glennon
Bob Lammi
Terry Lee
Ross Marcus
Thomas Nolan
Michael Reph

Members absent: Karen Duerholz, Armand Greco, Kenneth McClain, Ray O'Connell, Virginia Savage, Becky Bradley, Karen Dolan, Charles Elliott, Darlene Heller and Jeffrey Manzi

Staff present: Michael Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Olev Taremäe, Dave Berryman and Sue Rockwell

Public Present: Eve Metzger and Bruce Lawrence, Bethlehem Apparatus Company; Lisa Scheller

Mr. Glennon welcomed Christina (Tori) Morgan as a new member of the Commission.

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

MINUTES

After a brief review, the minutes of the February 23, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Lynn. Mr. Howells seconded the motion, and the motion carried with Mr. Lammi and Ms. Morgan abstaining.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Committee

2011 Subdivision and Building Activity Report

Mr. Kaiser said we do this report every year on the subdivision activity in both counties. Mr. Berryman said this report is the annual summary of all the subdivision data we have collected throughout the year. In previous years we saw a lot of plans. The last couple of years it has really dropped off. Due to the current housing market, subdivision and land development activity has also dropped off. On page 10 you will see the total number of lots approved by Lehigh Valley municipalities. This is the number of lots that make it through the municipal planning process to the preliminary and final plan stage. The last decade we had thousands of those lots coming through the municipal planning process. Today, we have only 442 lots, which is a 37½ % drop off from last year which was 700 lots. To get a historic perspective of how low subdivision activity is, the graph on page 23 shows subdivision activity over the past 25 years. You won't find any year that has subdivision activity that low. This tells you how severe the housing problem is today. In 2011 most of the projects we saw were projects that had lagged in the system for years. We aren't seeing new interest, especially in residential projects. So far 2012 activity remains very light.

Mr. Herman asked if there is any data on lots that were approved in prior years that are still in inventory. Mr. Berryman said no. Based on anecdotal information we believe there are a lot, but we don't keep track of that information. Mr. Glickman asked if the Commission ever tallies the subdivisions we review as not consistent with our Comprehensive Plan relative to the number that were approved. Mr. Berryman said we did that a few years ago, but that information is not in this report. Mr. Taremae said he thinks 90% or more of the residential lots were consistent. Ms. Dreisbach moved for the Commission to approve the release of this report. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Project Reviews

Ms. Dreisbach said there are eight summary sheet items on pages 6-7 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Kaiser said we reviewed the Allentown Arena project at the Comprehensive Planning Committee meeting on Tuesday. It is not on the LVPC agenda but the Committee ratified the writing of a letter that staff had previously done. There were no issues raised in the letter. We need to include the letter in the motion. Ms. Dreisbach amended her motion to include the Allentown letter. Mr. Lynn seconded the motion. The motion carried with abstentions by Ms. Wright on No. 4, Mr. Diacogiannis on Nos. 3, 4 and 5, and Mr. Hefele on the Allentown letter.

Environment Committee

Act 537 Review – Sewage Facilities Plan Supplement – Lower Macungie Township

Ms. Rockwell said the Township is proposing to do two things with the plan supplement. One

is to update the Township's public sewer service area boundary and the other is to adopt a sewage management program/ ordinance that will require the regular inspection and maintenance of all on-lot sewage systems in the Township. We do not have any issues with the adoption of the sewage management program. It will help ensure the proper functioning of these systems over the long term. The sewer service area boundary update reflects development that occurred over the years and recent zoning amendments in the western part of the Township (west of Route 100) that would now allow for urban development. Previous zoning in this area was Agricultural Protection.

We reviewed the zoning amendments in 2010 and there is a review letter on pages 9-10 of the agenda attachments. We found the proposed rezoning to be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan land use recommendations. The county plan recommends this area for Farmland Preservation. Therefore, as indicated in the draft review letter on page 8, the proposed expansion of the public sewer service area boundary to include this area is also inconsistent with the county plan. Mr. Dougherty asked, since the Court of Common Pleas declared these zoning changes illegal, how does that play into the review? Mr. Kaiser said we are dealing with the planning issues not the legal issues of the situation. Mr. Dougherty said the only reason he brought it up is that the judge agreed with the recommendation of the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission that it should remain agricultural. Mr. Kaiser said we try to stay consistent with our review comments. Mr. Repasch moved to approve the review letter. Mr. Glickman seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Morgan abstaining.

Project Reviews

Mr. Repasch said there are three summary sheet items on page 11 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Lee seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Transportation Committee - None

OLD BUSINESS

Status Report on Sustainability Project

Mr. Reese said, by way of background, the Lehigh Valley received a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development for \$3.4 million over the next three years to create a Regional Plan for Sustainable Development. We have argued we already have such a thing in our Comprehensive Plan and that it goes most of the way to creating a Regional Plan for Sustainable Development, and HUD agreed. We will be building from what we have already created with the Regional Comprehensive Plan. There are nine organizations that will be receiving funding under this proposal. The lead applicant is Lehigh Valley Economic Development Corporation (LVEDC). They are going to be managing the entire process. They are going to be responsible to HUD for everything that is done by all of the partners. LVEDC will also be working on the creation of an Economic Development Plan for the region as part of this HUD funding.

We are going to be receiving part of this money. The elements we are going to be working on are an update of our Affordable Housing Plan created in 2007. We are going to create a jobs/housing balance. It basically has to do with identifying where people live, where they work and any complications that arise because they are not right next to each other. Whether that means additional traffic or certain people can't get or compete for those jobs because they can't get there in a timely way, we will look at these issues. We are also going to fill in two gaps in the Regional Comprehensive Plan with energy and climate components. LANTA is going to be creating a Transit Enhancement Plan. There is also a fresh food plan that is going to be created. It was originally in our work program.

However, we didn't receive all the money we applied for and we had to take out the fresh food plan. The plan will get picked up by an organization called Buy Fresh, Buy Local that is organized out of the Nurture Nature Center in Easton. In addition to that, one of the main benefits of having HUD agree that we are most of the way there with the Comprehensive Plan in terms of their Regional Plan for Sustainable Development is that we are able to begin actually working on elements of implementation. The implementation elements are called catalytic projects. Each of the three cities has received funding under this program for a catalytic project. The City of Allentown has identified their catalytic project as the Little Lehigh Creek Industrial Corridor. The City of Bethlehem will have the Eastern Gateway project in South Bethlehem. The City of Easton project is the 13th Street Corridor.

Mr. Reese said there is a single contract with the granting agency (HUD). LVEDC needs to hold a contract with HUD as the lead applicant. LVEDC entered into that agreement with HUD as of February 2, 2012. In turn, LVEDC needs to have a contract with all of the entities that will be performing tasks under this program and receiving funds. The Planning Commission has received and reviewed the draft contract with LVEDC. We included our insurance broker and auditor in the review process. Mr. Herman provided us with some legal assistance also. We provided some detailed comments back to LVEDC, and we understand that within the next several days we will receive an amended proposal from them on the contract. Hopefully, by the next meeting of the Executive Committee we will be able to sign the agreement and begin the work.

Mr. Reese said we need to engage the community the best we can through the entire course of this project. HUD is very particular that there is very generous outreach associated with this. The purpose of Envision Lehigh Valley will be the public participation interface or the outreach interface associated with all of this work. Through Renew Lehigh Valley, there will likely be a website devoted to that purpose. People will be able to comment on the website information.

Ms. Dreisbach asked if this proposed website and other aspects of Envision Lehigh Valley will replace the plan for CACLV to provide outreach to under-represented audiences. Mr. Reese said CACLV will be working to reach marginalized populations who don't have the opportunities for their voices to be heard. Those voices need to have some meaning in the decision making process. A great deal of what we do in terms of public outreach will be associated with reaching those populations, and CACLV does that. Mr. Kaiser said LVEDC is referring to this whole effort as Envision Lehigh Valley. Mr. Cusick said a lot of focus has been on the three cities. He asked how we will reach out to the smaller municipalities. Mr. Reese said the CACLV effort will be directed solely at the three cities. The rest of the public outreach will be directed to all of the municipalities. Mr. Cusick asked what the process will be. Mr. Kaiser said we will go to the Council of Governments, we will arrange meetings with the municipalities in the counties. Mr. Cusick said the smaller boroughs don't have the ability or funding to be involved on a regular basis, and he wants them to have opportunities to make comments. Mr. Kaiser said that is our intention. Mr. Howells asked about outreach to the media. Mr. Reese said that it was discussed, but nothing has been done yet partly because LVEDC is the only one who has a contract. Many things have yet to be decided and finalized.

NEW BUSINESS

Update of LVPC 2012 Budget Based on Sustainability Grant

Mr. Kaiser said we developed and adopted a budget in December before we had all of the numbers from LVEDC. Since then, we have finalized our budget with LVEDC. Mr. Kaiser said there is a brief memo on page 12 regarding our total contract which amounts to \$742,500. Out of this total, \$148,500 will be our 20% match, \$160,000 will be spent on consultants and \$434,000 will be available

for staff expenses. Page 13 shows the budget approved in December and the proposed amended budget. The new budget includes \$66,963 in revenues in 2012 for the sustainability project. The other part of the budget being amended is an expense item for HUD consultants. We expect to spend \$58,000 in 2012. Because we are getting additional monies, our drawdown from our reserves will be less in 2012 than we predicted previously. There are no other changes in the budget. These are all changes regarding the HUD contract, and we would like to get approval for the amended budget. Mr. Dougherty asked if any projects had to be dropped because of the \$148,500 match coming from the county monies. Mr. Kaiser said there were none. Mr. Dougherty said if there is anything else you want to be done this may be a good justification to go to the counties to ask for more money. Mr. Kaiser said for 2012 we are fine, but we may need to look into that later. Mr. Howells made a motion to approve the budget. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Morgan abstaining.

Mr. Glennon said we had a notice from PennDOT regarding April construction at Rt. 22 and MacArthur Road. This will run through December 2013. There is a website where you can access a web cam and other information about the project. The website is www.145-22int.com. Also, we had an opening on the Executive Committee. Mr. Lammi has agreed to serve. Mr. Herman made a motion to approve his membership. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion. The motion carried.

CORRESPONDENCE – None

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Status Report – Northampton County Consolidated Plan

Mr. Kaiser said we will be hiring one additional staff member and possibly two more in the future. The second thing is a brief report for a project we are working on in Northampton County. It is the Consolidated Plan project which is a federal requirement necessary for agencies administering block grant funds. Northampton County administers block grant funds that go to municipalities other than Easton and Bethlehem. The topics are wide ranging and include housing needs, homelessness, senior citizen issues, anti-poverty strategies, etc. Mr. Taremae has done 29 interviews with people who run local programs through different agencies. Mr. Kaiser said he read through the interviews and there are a great deal of issues that need to be addressed. We have gone over some of this information with the LVPC committees. You will be hearing more about this in the future. We are working to get a draft of this work to Northampton County.

Mr. Dougherty made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Lynn seconded the motion. Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397
610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616
TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

April 26, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, April 26, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Kent Herman chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Norman Blatt
Percy Dougherty
Steven Glickman
Michael Hefele
Kent Herman
Ben Howells
Edward Hozza
Earl Lynn
Kenneth McClain
Christina Morgan
Stephen Repasch
Virginia Savage
Donna Wright

Northampton County

Becky Bradley
Gordon Campbell
John Cusick
John Diacogiannis
Karen Dolan
Liesel Dreisbach
Charles Elliott
Charles Fraust
Darlene Heller
Bob Lammi
Ross Marcus
Thomas J. Nolan

Members absent: Karen Duerholz, Armand Greco, Ray O'Connell, George Gemmel, Matthew Glennon, Terry Lee, Jeffrey Manzi and Michael Reph

Staff present: Michael Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Olev Taremäe, Joe Gurinko, Sue Rockwell and Travis Bartholomew

Public Present: None

Mr. Kaiser said Mr. Taremae will be retiring at the end of May. He has been on the staff since June 1973. Mr. Taremae has written more reports on housing, zoning and comprehensive plans than anyone on the staff. He has been Chief Planner of our Comprehensive Planning section. Mr. Kaiser said Olev also is an excellent musician, train expert and traveler. He will be missed by the staff and we wish him well.

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR***MINUTES***

After a brief review, the minutes of the March 29, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Dougherty. Mr. Lynn seconded the motion, and the motion carried with Mr. McClain abstaining.

COMMITTEE REPORTS***Comprehensive Planning Committee******Updated Population Projections 2010-2040***

Mr. Reese said the population projections are something we maintain and update periodically. They are built into our Comprehensive Plan. We use them for a variety of work that we do here. They are one of the building blocks we need to run our traffic model. The last time we updated these projections was after the release of the 2005 estimates of population. We found at that time we were slightly off course in terms of where our projections were heading. We made a mid-decade correction in that data. Since that time we have the information from the 2010 Census, and it is time to make another slight correction. We are also adding ten years to the projection to the year 2040. Tonight, we are interested in the Commission releasing this information.

Mr. Bartholomew said there are three main components that allow us to project the population in the future. The first component is births (fertility rate by cohort). The second component is deaths (survival rate by cohort). The third component is migration (the number of people who move into and out of the Valley). This data comes from the U. S. Census or Penn State Data Center. Fertility data is expressed as the number of births per female. The survival data is expressed as the percentage of people that will survive to the next five year cohort. Mr. Bartholomew reviewed some graphs of migration data. The data goes back to the 1950's. We use this data to help project migration in 2020, 2030, etc. Up through the end of the 1990's, migration was pretty static in Lehigh County, around 5,000 or so per 5 year period. For 2000 through 2005, migration spiked a lot to about 15,000 persons. Migration has actually stayed that high through 2010. It is not entirely clear if that is a permanent trend or whether it will stay at about 15,000 or go down. We won't know until we keep updating this model in the future. Northampton County is not the same story. They also had a large spike of migration in 2005 but their migration in 2010 came down a little bit more. Our migration projection didn't change as much as Lehigh County since the last time we ran the model.

Migration trends in Northampton County show many people are bringing their families to live in Northampton County. The other big trend is college students. There is a strong in-migration to attend college. A lot of these students then leave the county when they have completed college. In Lehigh County, they also have families migrating in, but the parents may be younger. They also have the same migration pattern for college, but there are more males than females migrating in. There is also a fairly strong in-migration of men over 60 years old.

Mr. Bartholomew said the population increase for the Lehigh Valley is projected to be about 35% by 2040. Over the last 30 years there was a 30% increase, but a lot of this increase happened over the last ten years. The population of Northampton County will increase by a larger percentage than Lehigh

County due to migration. It is closer to New York and New Jersey. Lehigh County population will increase due to a higher birth rate.

The final projection data showing each five year age group is shown in the chart on page 6 of the handout. The 70-74 and 75+ age groups are expected to double by 2040. There is also a significant increase in the number of young people in the Valley. The 15-19 age group will become the second largest age group behind the 75+ age group in 2025. Mr. Bartholomew reviewed a chart that shows a comparison of our previous projections versus our proposed projections. The Lehigh County numbers have gotten higher than our previous projections based on both the higher migration rates and also revised fertility rates from Penn State Data Center, which also increased.

Ms. Morgan asked what the cause was for the migration spike in 2005 as shown on pages 2-3 of the handout. Mr. Bartholomew said it is not entirely clear what the source of that was. Mr. Kaiser said migration growth in the area was heavily influenced by Hispanic population growth. About 69% of the change in population was due to Hispanic migration. Mr. Kaiser said that has changed growth in the country as a whole. Mr. Campbell asked if there was any attempt to consider the capacity of the Valley to absorb this growth. Mr. Kaiser said that is the next step. The principal reason for doing these regional county forecasts is to provide a context for growth and its effect on transportation in the area. The next step is to take the growth figures at the county level and turn them into growth figures at the municipal and traffic analysis zone level. This is a very difficult job to do. One subdivision in a small municipality can radically change the population. Mr. Kaiser said we are also interested in the housing issue. Population growth affects nearly every element of infrastructure that we try to plan. When we got to 2004 and 2005, we realized the forecasts we had at that time weren't working. We changed the forecast and it is working better. Ms. Dreisbach asked if we could add another cohort or two for older population groups over 75. Mr. Bartholomew said that is how the data is currently presented by the Census Bureau. If the Census Bureau starts breaking it into additional groups, we can change the groups. Ms. Dolan asked if, in the regional planning community in the country, there is a discussion of looking at some of these forecasts in terms of changes that might occur due to changes of climate in different areas. Mr. Kaiser said he has not seen that analysis. He said we are going to be doing some work on climate in the later stages of the HUD sustainability program. There are a lot of impacts of climate change, mostly the ecological impact of climate change. Mr. Campbell asked if we have compared this modeling technique with what is used by other planning commissions. Mr. Kaiser said this modeling technique is a classic technique used by forecasters all around the world. The tough variable is migration and trying to figure out why migration is happening. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the report and release it to the public. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. Mr. Glickman said once we get beyond 2010 our growth is generally projected as linear. Other types of graphs he has seen show some sort of variation in percentage that gives you some leeway in your projection. Mr. Kaiser said it is possible to play with scenarios and build a range of potentials. Mr. Kaiser asked if the Commission wanted staff to look at other possibilities. Mr. Glickman said yes. The projections could be more stable over the long haul. Mr. Kaiser said we can look at other scenarios and bring the information back to the Commission. Mr. Elliott asked where we get the migration data. Mr. Reese said it comes from two sources. The Census data gives you the total amount of people who have migrated. The Penn State Data Center does some additional analysis of data. We use both sources. Mr. Gurinko asked for clarification from the Commission. If we are going to look at different scenarios, would the projections presented tonight be our official forecasts? Can we move forward with these projections for the travel model? Mr. Kaiser said yes. Mr. Glickman said that is his thinking also. Later we can build a range around the projections knowing there will be variations, that we are within the top and bottom percentages. Mr. Herman called for the vote. The motion carried.

Mr. Dougherty asked how much you can trust this information. Mr. Reese said obviously from the data points you can't feel especially comfortable with any line you might draw through the data. Lehigh County would be the most striking example of that. When you have a forty year history that establishes one trend and a ten year history that has a completely different trend, mathematically that is a poor fit. But that is all we have.

Project Reviews

Ms. Dreisbach said there are seven summary sheet items on pages 6-7 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Lynn seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Environment Committee

Project Reviews

Mr. Repasch said there is one summary sheet item on page 8 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Transportation Committee

TIP Projects under Construction in 2012

Mr. Gurinko said there are 41 projects going out to construction this year. We prepared a map, as shown on the board, that lists all 41 projects. There are projects that have already started, projects going to construction in 2012 and projects that will start in the fall of 2012. The colors on the map indicate when the projects are expected to be completed. We hope to provide a smaller version of the map to Commission members once it is created.

There are 29 bridges going to construction in this schedule. There are three major resurfacing jobs and three safety projects. Mr. Gurinko discussed some of the larger projects. The first project is the interchange of Rt. 22 and MacArthur Road. This project will start in the summer of 2012. It is projected to end in the first half of 2013. Also, the American Parkway Bridge over the Lehigh River will start shortly and is projected to be completed in 2014. Another project is the Rt. 412 improvements from I-78 north and east to the Minsi Trail Bridge. That project has already started and is scheduled to be completed in 2015. The Rt. 33 and Rt. 512 interchange is scheduled to start in the fall of 2012. It is scheduled to be completed in the first half of 2013. There is a safety project at the intersection of Rt. 100 and Claussville Road. This project has already started. It is scheduled to be done in the fall/winter of this year. A couple of the projects are already done and a few more will be completed in the spring of 2012. Mr. Glickman asked how feasible is it to make this map public. Mr. Gurinko said it is very feasible. He plans to present it at LVTS on Monday, and PennDOT is also interested in getting a copy of the map. Mr. Glickman said he thinks we should have it on our website.

OLD BUSINESS*Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project*

Mr. Reese said there are two primary things we have concerned ourselves with in the past month regarding the sustainability project. They both have to do with contracts between the organizations that are going to be doing this work. The first part is our contract with LVEDC. LVEDC is the lead agency; they are the only agency actually contracting with HUD. Everyone else that is receiving funding under this grant will have to have an agreement with LVEDC to carry out that work. The contract will specify the amount of money we will receive, specific tasks we do, how we do the invoicing, how we get paid, and many other things as well. We have presented feedback on our draft contract to LVEDC in the last couple of weeks. We need to get this signed soon because we can't start charging to this until we have a signed contract. We have been doing a fair amount of work already. We hope to sign the agreement in the next week or so.

The second agreement is a requirement of HUD. There is no single entity allowed to work with HUD under this program. A consortium is required, and they specify the parties to be associated with the consortium. We have an 11 member consortium that is associated with this whole process. One of HUD's requirements is that the consortium must have a specific agreement between the parties that explains how we are all going to work together. The key thing is we are our own independent organization and what we are proposing to include in the agreement is to retain that authority. For example, we are responsible for the creation and maintenance of the Comprehensive Plan for the two counties. No one else has the responsibility or authority to create such a document. The end of this whole process is going to be an update of this document even though there will be many funded partners working on individual pieces of it. For example, LVEDC will recreate a Regional Economic Development Plan. When we are finished, we are going to incorporate, as this group decides is appropriate, the components of that Regional Economic Plan into this document. It is our job to decide what from that effort will be incorporated into our Comprehensive Plan. A key part of this consortium agreement is to retain our individual responsibility and authority in this process while still agreeing to work together as a consortium towards an improved end. The consortium is a group that has no legal authority. It is going to be an advisory body to all the parties. For example, LVEDC holds the contract with HUD, and they are responsible fiscally for everything that is done. They are also responsible for all the technical products that are done. This consortium will meet and provide guidance to LVEDC as issues come up. In the end, LVEDC is responsible for making those final decisions as they may be required to carry out the contract and meet their agreement with HUD.

Similarly, we have products we need to create under this work program. We are going to update our affordable housing assessment, create a climate plan, an energy plan and jobs/housing balance plan. These are our technical products to create. We are, however, going to provide that information to the consortium members and they can give us advice as well. In the end, we want the agreement to say that we have the final responsibility for all the information in the plan. We agree to work together, but we are not giving away our individual authority over the Comprehensive Plan.

NEW BUSINESS***2012 Municipal Profiles Report/ 2012 Lehigh Valley Profile & Trends***

Mr. Kaiser said we have a new Municipal Profiles report for 2012. The report was mailed to each Commission member. This report contains basic data for each municipality. The data will be changing as we go forward with our forecasts. It is also on our website. We also have a new Lehigh Valley Profile and Trends report for 2012. Most of the data and maps have been updated. The report will be updated when additional data is available. It is also on our website. Mr. Cusick asked if the report reflects the new Lehigh County assessments. Mr. Kaiser said we don't have that data. The report will be updated when we get this information.

CORRESPONDENCE – None***EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT***

Mr. Kaiser said he and Mr. Reese are learning about HUD issues right now. Also, we're thinking to have other members of the Commission present their projects and ideas to the Commission so we can be made aware of what is happening in the Valley.

Ms. Wright made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Lynn seconded the motion. Mr. Herman adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397
610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616
TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

May 31, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, May 31, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matthew Glennon chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Norman Blatt
Percy Dougherty
Steven Glickman
Armand Greco
Michael Hefele
Kent Herman
Ben Howells
Edward Hozza
Christina Morgan
Stephen Repasch
Donna Wright

Northampton County

Gordon Campbell
John Cusick
Liesel Dreisbach
Charles Fraust
Matthew Glennon
Darlene Heller
Bob Lammi
Terry Lee
Ross Marcus

Members absent: Karen Duerholz, Earl Lynn, Kenneth McClain, Ray O'Connell, Virginia Savage, Becky Bradley, John Diacogiannis, Karen Dolan, Charles Elliott, George Gemmel, Jeffrey Manzi, Thomas Nolan and Michael Reph

Staff present: Michael Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Joe Gurinko, Dave Berryman and Sue Rockwell

Public Present: Nevin J. Miller, III

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

MINUTES

After a brief review, the minutes of the April 26, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Hefele. Mr. Howells seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Committee

City of Bethlehem-Draft Zoning Ordinance

Mr. Berryman said we previously reviewed a draft zoning ordinance for the City last year. They made some revisions to the ordinance and it was resubmitted for another review this month. A copy of our draft letter is attached to the agenda on page 7. The majority of changes they made are matters of local concern. There are no new significant issues with the current draft ordinance. Comments in the letter we sent last year remain relevant. A copy of our previous review letter is also attached to the agenda on pages 8-10. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the draft letter. Mr. Lee seconded the motion. The motion carried.

City of Bethlehem – Zoning Amendment – Buffer Areas for Treatment Facilities

Mr. Berryman said the City of Bethlehem received about five applications for treatment facilities throughout the City over the last couple of months. In response to those applications, City Council has proposed a 1,000 foot buffer between these treatment facilities and land uses like schools, day cares, residential areas, colleges and universities. These facilities are drug and alcohol treatment types of facilities. This type of buffer regulation is heavily litigated not only in Pennsylvania, but throughout the United States. In terms of policy regarding our County Comprehensive Plan, we don't have anything specific to this issue. We don't comment on the legality of a buffer in this case. We find it as a matter of local concern. We do suggest that the City confer with their solicitor on the issue of buffer requirements. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the letter. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried.

City of Allentown – Curative Amendment – Hospitals in the I-2 Zoning District

Mr. Berryman said this is an unusual situation of a curative amendment in the City. We usually see curative amendments from the townships. In regards to this project, the applicant proposes to turn the Agere Building next to Coca-Cola Park in Allentown into a hospital. The applicant alleges the City does not provide enough land or space for hospitals, and it is looking to cure the ordinance by allowing hospitals as a use in the Industrial District. As a second part of that cure, an alternative proposal is an overlay to allow hospitals as a use in this zoning district. The cure and the proposed overlay are generally matters of local concern. Hospitals are a type of use we would find appropriate for a city or urban area. The City has four hospitals now. In terms of the County Comprehensive Plan, the hospital would be consistent in an urban area. We would support this redevelopment of the building. It is up to the City to determine if this is an appropriate use in this area. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the letter. Mr. Howells seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Hefele abstaining. Mr. Cusick asked if parking was taken into consideration in our review. Mr. Berryman said no; we looked at it only in terms of the cure and overlay proposal. There is a great deal of parking at the site, however. Mr. Hefele said there is also a proposal of shared parking with the baseball park.

Salisbury Township – Draft Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Berryman said the Township is updating their Comprehensive Plan. Their draft Comprehensive Plan has a lot of environmental regulations. They put a lot of mapping and a lot of focus on protecting natural features. Our review letter finds the Comprehensive Plan generally consistent with

the county plan. In terms of this review, there is one area of interest. Lehigh Valley Hospital's campus is in Salisbury Township and it is a sprawling campus. In the past whenever the hospital wanted to do something on their property, they had to go to the Zoning Hearing Board because it is located in an R-3 residential district. The neighborhood has been affected by the development of the hospital. The Township has proposed to make a hospital overlay zone which would allow the hospital to develop on the site without going to the Zoning Hearing Board. It is a two tier overlay. The first tier covers the main campus as you see it today. The second tier, which is closer to the neighborhood, will allow the hospital to build buildings up to three stories in height. This is the most controversial issue because, when you have a large hospital with a residential subdivision directly adjacent to it, it is going to be very hard to make everyone happy. The overlays propose a rather extensive array of buffering requirements including heightened landscape buffers which are berms planted with trees to protect against noise that is generated by the hospital. This proposal is to get the hospital out of the special exception process every time they want to do something. It also allows the neighborhood some berming and landscaping they currently wouldn't have in the zoning and subdivision ordinances. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the draft letter. Mr. Lee seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Palmer Township – Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Overlay Districts – Route 33 Interchange Areas

Mr. Berryman said there is a proposed zoning change in Palmer Township. There is an interchange that is going to be constructed in Palmer. Last year we reviewed Township Comprehensive Plan amendments that would basically facilitate development in the entire area of the Rt. 33 interchange. We are currently reviewing the zoning amendments that would create overlay districts to facilitate use of that land into a variety of transportation and retail uses. Using the comments the Commission sent to the Township last year regarding the Comprehensive Plan amendments, we found the zoning amendments also to be consistent with the county plan. Mr. Berryman said the zoning uses that are being proposed are urban in nature. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the letter. Ms. Wright seconded the motion.

Mr. Glickman asked, since there is such a large change in land use like this, would we consider recommending they create an official map to direct this development in some planning fashion. Ms. Wright said there was a map shown at the Committee showing continuation of the roads and the intersection. Mr. Berryman said the map shown at the Committee showed specific zoning districts and preliminary layout of the roads. It didn't show land developments. The map was not an official map. Mr. Lammi said the Township is considering creating an official map for that area and some other areas of the Township. Mr. Glickman called for the vote. The motion carried with Mr. Lammi abstaining.

Reviews

Ms. Dreisbach said there are six summary sheet items on pages 17-18 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Wright seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Lammi abstaining on item #2.

Environment Committee - None

Transportation Committee

Status of Key Projects from Draft 2013 TIP

Mr. Gurinko said we are in the process of updating our Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which is a four year high priority highway, bridge and transit program for the Lehigh Valley. We

update this program every two years. We are out for public review at the current time. We have a public meeting scheduled for June 6th. We anticipate adoption in mid-July. The current TIP covers the years 2013-2016. The highway, bridge and transit element has a total value of \$304,847,000. It is a significant amount of federal, state and local money over the next four years. Of the total, 42% goes to bridges, 39% to highways and 19% to transit.

Focusing on the highway and bridge side, if you look at investment by project type on the handout, you will find 34 projects that are maintenance projects. This represents 62% of the budget. Another 15% goes to safety. This represents 16 projects. Five projects are capacity projects that represent about 14% of the investment. Most of the capacity projects are projects you have been hearing about over the years. They have actually started now. Two of the major projects underway in 2012 include the American Parkway project and also the Rt. 412 project. We have \$23 million in the draft TIP going to the completion of the American Parkway project. Construction should be started in the fall.

The Lehigh Street Corridor is a study the Planning Commission staff did last year. This will upgrade signals on Lehigh Street in Allentown. This project is going to construction during this TIP. There are two Rt. 22 sections listed on the handout. The first one is the Rt. 22/MacArthur Road interchange. The construction of this will start very shortly. Rt. 22 Section 400 Phase 2 is work at the Fullerton interchange at Rt. 22. The Rt. 145 safety project in Whitehall Township is ongoing and should be completed by Federal Fiscal Year 2013. The Rt. 222 Schantz Road/Rt. 863 Triangle Safety Project is another project the Planning Commission staff studied and is scheduled to be completed in this time frame. The Northampton Street Corridor in Easton is a project that is similar to the Lehigh Street Corridor in Allentown. It upgrades signals to enhance traffic flow along that corridor and also improves timing plans. This work was also done by Planning Commission staff as well as several other safety projects listed in the handout. The planning efforts of our Transportation staff over the last year have resulted in a number of projects in the draft TIP. The Rt. 412 project in South Bethlehem is underway. There is a lot of grading and clearing work going on. The Rt. 412 connector will provide a connector road between Riverside Drive and Rt. 412. Ms. Dreisbach asked about the D&L Trail Sections listed. Mr. Gurinko said there are four sections for trail development. He said the significance of this is, once these four sections are done, the D&L Trail through the Lehigh Valley will be complete and open to the public.

Mr. Gurinko said we have a number of very high cost bridge repairs in the Lehigh Valley. The Rt. 22 Bridge over the Lehigh River is a high priority and is fully funded under this TIP. It is scheduled for completion in this time frame. The Coplay-Northampton Bridge, 8th Street Bridge and the Tilghman Street viaduct are all high priority bridges that don't get construction completed. Some go to construction during this time frame, but they are expensive projects so they won't be completed until 2017 and 2018. The Northampton County Lynn Avenue Bridge is about a \$5 million bridge in the City of Bethlehem. The Messinger Bridge in Bangor Borough is more than \$7.5 million. Mr. Gurinko said the bridge needs are many and funding is very limited. But overall, a lot of progress is being made.

On the transit side, LANta has a program to purchase 80 vans and mini buses over this four year period for replacement vehicles, as well as seven hybrid transit buses each year as part of their capital program. We are out to public review right now. We are having a public meeting at 10:00 a.m. on June 6th in the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission Conference Room. There is another meeting at 5:30 p.m. at the District 5 office the same day. Our public review period closes on June 25th and the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study will consider adoption on July 18th.

OLD BUSINESS***Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project***

Mr. Reese said it was more than a year ago when the LVPC staff began work to create the application to HUD under the Sustainable Communities Grant Program. We received the funding and have been working with all the other organizations getting a contract to actually do the work over a three year period. Mr. Reese said we are under contract as of May 18 and will be able to start receiving some money and getting some work done. Initially we are going to be working on the housing work. This will include an update of our Affordable Housing Study created in 2007. We will also update a Housing Data Report created in 2009. We are going to do a Jobs/Housing Balance. This report will essentially identify where the jobs are and where people live. We need to find out if there is enough housing where people work so they don't have complications with long commutes and so forth. There is also an element of transit associated with that. For those people who have fewer choices, such as lack of an automobile, they can only get to that job possibly from the use of transit. If there is no transit available to get to that job, that is going to be a complication. In the next few months you can expect to hear about housing issues. We will be creating RFP's to get consultants to help with that work.

The second part of this is that, in addition to having a contract with LVEDC, all of the parties in this consortium that HUD has prescribed must have an agreement between themselves. That defines how we will work together. Mr. Reese said he believes we are the only ones who have signed this agreement. HUD is reviewing the final agreement. This is not official yet but we have signed our version. Mr. Lee asked if LVEDC signed it. Mr. Reese said no, they are waiting to hear from HUD. Mr. Repasch asked if we can still start receiving money without this agreement. Mr. Reese said yes.

NEW BUSINESS - None***CORRESPONDENCE – None******EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT***

Mr. Kaiser said Mr. Taremae is officially retired. Mr. Berryman has been promoted to Chief Planner of the Comprehensive Planning Department. Mr. Kaiser said we are going to be covering a number of things coming into the office in the next couple of months. We have hired a housing expert. She will be attending our next meeting. We have a specific project in mind for her. We will be updating a housing data report we prepared a couple of years ago. She will be working with Mr. Reese and Mr. Berryman on other aspects of our housing program also. We are also working on population, household and employment forecasts. We hope to bring some of this data to you in the next few months.

Mr. Dougherty made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and Ms. Wright seconded the motion. Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397
610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616
TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

June 28, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, June 28, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matthew Glennon chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Norman Blatt
Percy Dougherty
Steven Glickman
Kent Herman
Ben Howells
Edward Hozza
Kenneth McClain
Stephen Repasch

Northampton County

Gordon Campbell
John Cusick
Liesel Dreisbach
Charles Elliott
Charles Fraust
Matthew Glennon
Darlene Heller
Bob Lammi
Terry Lee
Ross Marcus
Thomas Nolan

Members absent: Karen Duerholz, Armand Greco, Michael Hefele, Earl Lynn, Christina Morgan, Ray O'Connell, Virginia Savage, Donna Wright, Becky Bradley, John Diacogiannis, Karen Dolan, George Gemmel, Jeffrey Manzi, and Michael Reph

Staff present: Michael Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Dave Berryman and Ngozi Obi

Public Present: None

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

MINUTES

After a brief review, the minutes of the May 31, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Lammi. Mr. Repasch seconded the motion, and the motion carried with Mr. Nolan, Mr. Elliot and Mr. McClain abstaining.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Committee

Devine School Land Development – Borough of Macungie

Mr. Berryman said the developer would like to build a day care center. It will be a relatively small, one story building on a small portion of a five acre tract in the Borough of Macungie. This site is adjacent to the Borough Park. The property was formerly used as a lumberyard, which was demolished and the property was put up for sale. We support the redevelopment of former commercial sites. The issue we have is that the project is adjacent to a high quality coldwater stream that is a tributary of the Swabia Creek and it bisects the property and the Borough Park. In 2010, the State passed riparian buffer regulations that would require this developer to put a 150 foot buffer between any development and the creek. The LVPC created guide/model regulations for riparian buffers three years ago. We support riparian buffers along a creek like this. Our guideline for buffers not covered under State regulations is 75 feet and 150 feet for those that are. The property itself is about 150 feet wide. So if the buffer was put in, you could not develop the property. We acknowledged that in our review letter on pages 9-10 of the agenda attachments, and what we would like to see here is that the Borough, DEP and the developer try to come to a compromise. We would also like to see a sketch plan for the development of the entire property. The developer is currently proposing a 25 foot buffer around the building. The applicant's engineer is discussing this buffer issue with DEP. Mr. Berryman said the existing buffer is not in good shape. Mr. Glickman asked if DEP could put a halt to development of this property if they choose. Mr. Berryman said that since the law was passed in 2010, he is not aware of any challenges to it by a developer. The buffer requirement is in the State regulations and this is something a developer will have to work around. DEP does have some discretion regarding this issue though. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the letter. Mr. Repasch seconded the motion, and the motion carried. Mr. Dougherty said how we approach this could taint our future approach to what's happening in Easton, Allentown and other urban areas. This is precedent setting. Mr. Berryman said we discussed the redevelopment issues of the cities extensively in our riparian buffer and floodplain guides. Since the State law passed, we haven't seen this issue until now.

Staff Report on Official Maps

Mr. Berryman said you have at your place a handbook on official maps prepared by PennDOT and the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. When subdivision and land development activity is low it is a good time to review, update and implement ordinances and plans. Comprehensive plans are outstanding planning tools, but as far as implementing them, most municipalities are unsure how to do it. In 1988 the State amended the Municipalities Planning Code to allow for official maps. They are maps that are approved by ordinance at the municipal level and they are a legal document. It allows a municipality to plan public improvements for the future. Since 1988 there have been 65 municipalities in Pennsylvania that have taken advantage of that. The only county that has an official map is Lehigh County. Of the municipalities that have an official map, 11 of them are in the Lehigh Valley. The real power of the official map is you can include all sorts of improvements and projects that municipalities would like to do in the future. Mr. Berryman showed some examples of maps from local municipalities including South Whitehall, East Allen, Bushkill, Hanover (N), Upper Saucon and Upper Milford townships. Once these types of improvements are on a plan, the municipality can decide if they want to make improvements in the future. When the municipality receives a land development or subdivision plan from a developer and it's on a property that the municipality wants to put a road or park on, the municipality has one year to decide what they are going to do. They can buy the property from the

developer, enter into an agreement with the developer or proceed with eminent domain. They can also choose to do nothing. The official map provides the municipality with a road map for future elected officials to use if they want to have greenways, a road network, etc. In terms of the overall effectiveness of the official map, it is not what you put on the map. It is that it gives the municipality one year to make a decision on what they want to do with the property or negotiate with the developer. The cost of preparing an official map depends on how much detail the municipality wants to have on it. In regards to official maps in Pennsylvania, the use of eminent domain is really the last resort. Mr. Berryman said what is shown on the official map is just ideas about what they want. It is basically a wish list on paper.

Reviews

Ms. Dreisbach said there are seven summary sheet items on pages 11-12 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Nolan abstaining on the Bethlehem Township review.

Environment Committee

Mr. Repasch said there are two summary sheet items on page 13 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Transportation Committee – None

OLD BUSINESS

Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project

Mr. Reese said we have a signed contract with the Lehigh Valley Economic Development Corporation for this project. The first part of our effort has been to put together an RFP for consulting assistance on two major items under our work program. The first major item is to update our Housing Affordability Study created by the LVPC in 2007. The second item is the creation of a Jobs/Housing Balance Study which we have never done before. We are going to rely on ideas from the consultant on how to create this study. The announcement of the RFP will appear tomorrow in The Morning Call, a national website for the APA and an RFP national website. We expect to receive responses or questions in the near future. The deadline for responses is August 1, 2012. We hope to have a consultant under contract to do this work in September.

At your place is a sheet titled Envision Lehigh Valley. This is the first public participation event associated with the three year grant. Renew LV is responsible for a great deal of the public participation process and they, along with LVEDC, are in charge of events of this type. It will be held on July 11, 2012. There are two sessions. Again, this is the beginning of the public participation in this process. There are a lot of partners involved and there will be a lot of public participation.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Kaiser introduced Ms. Ngozi Obi as a new staff member. She will be helping us with our housing planning work which is coming up under the new federal grant. She has a Masters Degree in Planning from Rutgers University. She has experience working with the State of New Jersey on housing programs and housing issues. Mr. Kaiser said she will be a great asset with our housing work.

CORRESPONDENCE – None***EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT***

Mr. Kaiser said we are experiencing the return of the “Multi-Generational Family Household”. This term refers to the number of people living under one roof in one household. The Census Bureau projected the average household size to fall at the beginning of the decade to 2.53 persons per household, but it actually went up to 2.63. Our forecasts for 2010 were also off. We forecasted 2.43 persons per household for Lehigh County and 2.47 for Northampton County. The actual numbers were 2.54 for Lehigh County and 2.53 for Northampton County. For the most part family size has gone down for the last 100 years or so. Now we have a deep recession that has created larger household situations due to young adults moving in with parents or roommates. A lot of people graduating from college are not moving into their own household because they can't afford it. Also we have immigration of people who tend to have larger families. The economists and demographers don't really know where this trend is going in future years or what it may do to real estate markets. People are going to have to start thinking about the types of houses that will sell in this type of environment. It's also an interesting planning problem. Mr. Lee said he wonders if in the future, retirees, who don't have enough money set aside and need a place to live, may have to move in with their children, providing the children with extra income that they need. Mr. Kaiser said if you look at the demographics, the big growth components are going to be people over 65. There is a huge spike in that population and a dip in people in their 40s and 50s. There probably will be a lot of parents moving in with their kids. Mr. Kaiser said we are probably going to see a lot of changes in the types of development being built in the future.

Mr. Dougherty made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397
610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616
TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

July 26, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, July 26, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matthew Glennon chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Percy Dougherty
Karen Duerholz
Steven Glickman
Kent Herman
Ben Howells
Christina Morgan

Northampton County

Becky Bradley
Gordon Campbell
John Cusick
John Diacogiannis
Liesel Dreisbach
Charles Fraust
George Gemmel
Matthew Glennon
Darlene Heller
Terry Lee
Ross Marcus
Thomas Nolan

Members absent: Norman Blatt, Armand Greco, Michael Hefele, Edward Hozza, Earl Lynn, Kenneth McClain, Stephen Repasch, Virginia Savage, Donna Wright, Karen Dolan, Charles Elliott, Bob Lammi, Jeffrey Manzi and Michael Reph

Staff present: Michael Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Joe Gurinko, Dave Berryman and Sue Rockwell

Public Present: None

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

MINUTES

After a brief review, the minutes of the June 28, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Ms. Dreisbach. Mr. Howells seconded the motion, and the motion carried with Ms. Morgan, Mr. Nolan and Mr. Diacogiannis abstaining.

COMMITTEE REPORTS***Comprehensive Planning Committee****Reviews*

Ms. Dreisbach said there are four summary sheet items on pages 5 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Howells seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Diacogiannis abstaining on item #4.

Environment Committee - None***Transportation Committee******Moving America Toward Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21)***

Mr. Gurinko said new federal legislation was passed on July 6th. Over the past few years we have been talking about the lack of transportation funding at both the federal and state level. On July 6th the President signed the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act which is commonly referred to as MAP-21. Typically, transportation acts last six years. This is only a two year act. It will cover federal fiscal years 2013 and 2014. MAP-21 has a cost of \$105 billion. The \$105 billion is split into \$80 billion for highways and \$21 billion for transit. The rest goes to motor carrier safety and highway safety. Pennsylvania received about \$1.6 billion annually under the previous act. They anticipate getting about 1.6 billion again under this act with a small amount for inflation. We don't know how much will be allocated to the Lehigh Valley yet. The Lehigh Valley Transportation Study just adopted the updated 2013 – 2016 Transportation Improvement Program. We don't anticipate having to revisit that program because of the passage of MAP-21.

MAP-21 made a concerted effort to take 105 to 110 existing highway programs and consolidate a lot of them. Mr. Gurinko said it is his understanding that they managed to decrease them to about two-thirds. Program consolidation allows transportation officials to have funds that are a little more flexible. The core programs of safety, congestion mitigation, and metropolitan planning are pretty much unchanged. One of the things this did was to extend the ability of the federal government to collect the gas tax through 2016. This is important because a couple of the continuing resolutions had to do the same thing or the federal government would have lost that ability to collect gas tax. Without the gas tax, the program would not happen because there would be no money to do anything. While MAP-21 only extends through the end of federal fiscal year 2014, the federal government can still collect gas taxes to 2016. The gas tax will not fund the entire \$105 billion over the two years. There will have to be some transfers from other funds within the federal budget.

MAP-21 will again take a shot at environmental streamlining. Also, there are no earmarks in this law. Under MAP-21 performance measures will be introduced. Congress is proposing performance

measures that will look at things like system maintenance, congestion, and safety and having to show improvement in those areas. Typically, regulations don't come out until two years after an act has passed which will put us at the end of this act. Mr. Herman asked if the act will cause any material change in the funding or function of the Commission. Mr. Gurinko said that it will not. Metropolitan planning was left largely unchanged.

2012 Transportation Improvement Program Adoption and Status Report on Transportation Projects

Mr. Gurinko said the 2013 TIP was just adopted by the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study. The TIP represents the highest priority highway, bridge and transit projects that use federal and/or state funding for implementation. It has a total value of about \$307 million over a four year period. The bridge program is the highest funded at 43%, highways at 38% and transit at 19%. Highways represent about \$118 million over the four years, bridges just over \$129 million and transit about \$60 million. On the highway side you will see capacity is about 30% of the projects in the upcoming TIP, safety is 31%, and maintenance is 22%. When you factor bridges into it, which is almost all maintenance, you will find the highway and bridge elements combined get about 62% of the funding for maintenance. This has been PennDOT's focus over the last decade and certainly the Lehigh Valley has its share of maintenance problems. The other significant area is safety projects which make up about 15% of the funding. That is higher than usual.

Mr. Gurinko said there is a list of projects provided to Commission members. Mr. Gurinko gave a status report on some of the major projects including the Rt. 22/MacArthur Road interchange, Rt. 412, American Parkway, various maintenance projects and safety projects. Mr. Glennon asked, with the 60% of funding going toward maintenance projects, are we keeping up with or falling behind on maintenance needs. Mr. Gurinko said we are probably falling behind overall. At the end of the current TIP and into the next, some of the large capacity projects like American Parkway and Rt. 412 came to fruition. Mr. Gurinko said that is why capacity makes up 30% of the program. He said with the next TIP update we will be looking at an even higher percentage of maintenance. There is just not enough money to start with to be able to keep up with what the infrastructure needs are, not only in Pennsylvania but across the country. Mr. Cusick asked why LANta hybrid buses are listed under highway rather than transit. Mr. Gurinko said within transportation funding you can flex funds from highway to transit. This is using congestion mitigation air quality funds. The fact that you are going from a diesel powered bus to a hybrid powered bus provides air quality benefits so it is eligible for those types of funds. Mr. Glickman asked about the \$16 million for the congestion mitigation air quality reserve. Mr. Gurinko said the reason it is so high is because it was supposed to go to American Parkway. At the last minute we heard from the Federal Highway Administration that American Parkway was not eligible for CMAQ funds. These funds are being repositioned. They will have projects attached to them through a process within the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study.

OLD BUSINESS

Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project

Mr. Reese said we have a contract with LVEDC and have begun our work program. The first elements of the work program are housing related. We are going to be updating a report we created in 2007 on housing affordability. We have a second data report that we will also update under this program that updated some of the actual information within the Housing Affordability Study. The key part of the data report update will be 2008 – 2012 housing sales data that we will use to provide some trend information over a 5 year period. We are going to have a consultant working for us on the housing

affordability update and also on the jobs/housing balance. We have an RFP that went out the end of June and we have an August 1st deadline for proposals. Hopefully we can select a consultant soon and the work can begin sometime in September. We also are working with LVEDC on putting together some of the metrics or indicators associated with the program. HUD has labeled some of these things as flagship indicators. The good news is you only have to collect the data once. We are very fortunate to have a summer intern that has a lot of expertise in this area and he is extracting all of this data from HUD databases. We have promised LVEDC to collect this data on behalf of the entire grant. We should be able to give this information to LVEDC by tomorrow. It has to be submitted to HUD by the end of the month. We can then move on to some of the indicators that we are actually trying to do something about within the context of the study. We have a variety of studies we will be performing. We mentioned the housing study, a climate study and an energy plan we are also creating as part of the larger grant. LVEDC is responsible for an economic development plan and a fresh food plan and LANta is responsible for a transportation enhancement plan. HUD is requiring we find ways to measure the overall success of this program and we will be working to create those metrics over the next few months.

Update on Floodplain Maps for Northampton County

Ms. Rockwell provided a handout titled Northampton County Preliminary Floodplain Maps. Ms. Rockwell said FEMA had prepared the preliminary maps and provided copies to the county and municipalities in December. They held a community meeting in February to review the maps with the municipalities. Both the county and all the municipalities will have the opportunity to provide comments on the technical and non-technical aspects related to the mapping. A 30 day comment period for the non-technical aspects began right after the February meeting. There is a 90 day appeals period for providing comments on the technical aspects. That has not started yet and they are looking for that to begin mid to late August. Once that ends FEMA will address the comments and appeals. Then FEMA will issue a letter of final determination. The municipalities will have 6 months to adopt an updated floodplain ordinance. Once that 6 month period is over the flood maps go into effect. FEMA leaves the responsibility to notify the property owners affected by these changes to the municipalities. We created a map that compares the current mapping dated 2001 versus the preliminary mapping. This map shows the areas that were removed from the current map and areas added to the preliminary map. Mr. Bartholomew is currently looking at some of the technical aspects. We may have comments at a later time and will bring them to the Commission.

NEW BUSINESS

Review of 2010 Lehigh Valley Employment Data

Mr. Kaiser said we have employment data through 2010. We need to have employment and population forecasts for our travel model. Our forecasts will go out to 2040. We have an econometric model we are using for the forecasts. Mr. Berryman will discuss the data through 2010. Mr. Berryman briefly discussed various employment tables provided to Commission members. The first table described total full time and part time jobs by industry from 2001-2010. We started with 2001 in a lot of these charts because the federal government changed the way it classified employment in 2000. To develop economic projections you need historical data over the last decade. This last decade started with a recession and ended with one. Unfortunately every successive recession has less and less jobs coming out of it during the recovery. We ended the decade with a 7.7% gain in employment overall between 2001 and 2010.

The next table describes a comparison of job gain/loss by industry for the Lehigh Valley and the United States from 2001-2010. Mr. Berryman said the Lehigh Valley had a 7.7% gain, but in the 1990s we had a 12.1% gain, and during the 1980s it was even greater. The United States ended up with a 4.6% gain between 2001-2010. When we look at jobs we are not just looking at private employment. We are also looking at farm employment, and state and local government employment. In this area, government employment is a big provider of jobs. During the previous decade, United States employment grew 19.5%. Jobs have dropped off significantly. Mr. Kaiser said manufacturing employment is down significantly both locally and nationwide. Mr. Berryman said locally the major increase in employment is in healthcare. We also added a lot of jobs in local government, arts, entertainment and recreation, and management of enterprises and companies which jumped from 3,000 to 9,000 jobs in a matter of a decade.

The next chart describes the comparison of employment market share by industry in the Lehigh Valley and the United States in 2010. Mr. Berryman said the market share is greater locally in some industries than in the United States. For example, in the United States, healthcare jobs accounted for 10.6% of the economy. In the Lehigh Valley, it is 14.8%. Transportation, retail, wholesale, recreation, education services and even manufacturing have more of the market share than the national average.

Mr. Berryman said the last chart shows the change in the number of jobs by industry segment in the Lehigh Valley. This chart shows a dissection of the local economy for 2001-2010. It shows the specific parts of each industry that lost and gained jobs. Mr. Berryman briefly discussed the changes. Mr. Kaiser said we have the same data for both counties and there are differences. Each county has its own strengths and weaknesses when it comes to jobs. Mr. Glennon asked if our healthcare trend is in line with the national health care trend. Mr. Berryman said it is a national trend, but the Lehigh Valley demographics are going to strongly cater to the healthcare industry. Our population is aging quickly. Mr. Kaiser said we have a lot of capability for analysis and we will be discussing this topic more in the future. We will be discussing this with LVEDC through the sustainability program. We've been working on county forecasts. The next thing we are working on is how to distribute growth throughout the Lehigh Valley. Mr. Lee said one of the tables shows our local government has grown four times the national average. Mr. Berryman said we have 62 local governments that employ many people. In this area local government is a big employment center. As the population increases so does local government employment. Mr. Berryman said public school employment is included in these figures. This will be described in the report. Mr. Berryman said again this is data up to 2010. A lot has happened with employment since then, and the model was built to run off a lot of updated data sources.

CORRESPONDENCE

Response to LVPC Review of the Devine School Development in Macungie Borough

Mr. Berryman said we did a review last month for the Devine School, a proposed day care in Macungie. We received a response letter from Newton Engineering, the applicant's engineer. Their letter is on page 6 and our previous review letter is on page 8 of the agenda attachments. They are looking for support for the project. The Devine's operate day care centers. They have one building at the top of the property, and in our letter we indicated we wanted to see a balanced plan that would look at the full five acre property. Mr. Berryman said he doesn't see an issue with that recommendation. We didn't say it was inconsistent. Mr. Herman asked if this may become a tool in discussions with DEP. Mr. Berryman said DEP could use our letter against the property owner if they wanted to. Newton Engineering is looking for a very specific letter of support from the LVPC. Mr. Berryman thinks our review letter covered our

comments well. Mr. Kaiser said we suggested they compromise. The state standard on riparian buffers is 150 feet. Mr. Lee said it sounds like Newton Engineering is trying to get a waiver from DEP but DEP doesn't have a process in place at this time. We are not a part of that decision. Mr. Berryman talked to the Borough engineer and Newton Engineering. DEP is saying a 150 foot riparian buffer is needed and the applicant is saying we can't do it on this property. The property is only 150 feet wide. Mr. Kaiser said in our letter we support a revised plan with input from the Borough, DEP, and the applicant that would show an overall redevelopment plan of the entire site that provides a balance of riparian buffer and redevelopment of the property. We are not sure whether we need to respond to the applicant's engineer except to tell them what we covered in the previous letter.

Mr. Dougherty thinks this project is one of the most important projects that has come before the Commission in a long time. This is going to set a bad precedent if a site that has been used previously cannot be reused. If we allow this to continue, Allentown is going to lose all of its parks because they are going to have to put in a riparian buffer. Mr. Kaiser said this is a DEP requirement and he doesn't think there is anything else we can say. Mr. Dougherty said it is an underutilized property and should be redeveloped. Mr. Lee said he would hate for DEP to turn down a request for a waiver because of our letter. Ms. Heller said she thinks the letter gives the impression we don't support the project when we really do. Mr. Berryman said one of the things we discussed when we wrote this letter was that the applicant tried to get the disturbance under one acre. The buffer requirement kicks in at one acre. The applicant submitted a plan that showed .956 acres. Mr. Berryman said if you have a five acre property you could keep coming in with .956 acres and never have to establish a riparian buffer. That was why we commented on having a plan for the whole property. Mr. Lee said they can't meet the riparian buffer requirement and there is no provision to provide relief for the requirement. Mr. Berryman said DEP has to compromise if they want some development there. When we wrote the letter we tried to consider all of this and compromise with both. Mr. Lee suggested we might write a letter acknowledging this is a difficult project and we understand what the DEP requirement is, but we are not involved in that. Both Mr. Lee and Mr. Dougherty could support a 25 foot buffer for this particular project. Mr. Kaiser said he would not have a problem with such a letter. Mr. Dougherty said it has to be in the context that this is an urban redevelopment site. Mr. Berryman noted his concerns about this setting a precedent. Mr. Lee made a motion to respond to the letter acknowledging some of their concerns and suggesting a 25 foot buffer is a reasonable compromise. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion.

Ms. Dreisbach said we should reference in the letter that we recognize the state has a riparian buffer requirement. Ms. Morgan said we should also state that with this particular project the applicant cannot meet those requirements. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Kaiser said staff would write a letter that suggests a compromise be worked out for this particular situation. Mr. Glennon called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT – None

Mr. Dougherty made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Glickman seconded the motion. Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397
610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616
TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

August 30, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, August 30, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matthew Glennon chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Norman Blatt
Percy Dougherty
Karen Duerholz
Armand Greco
Michael Hefele
Kent Herman
Ben Howells
Edward Hozza
Christina Morgan
Stephen Repasch
Donna Wright

Northampton County

Becky Bradley
Gordon Campbell
John Cusick
John Diacogiannis
Karen Dolan
Liesel Dreisbach
George Gemmel
Matthew Glennon
Ross Marcus
Michael Reph

Members absent: Steven Glickman, Earl Lynn, Kenneth McClain, Virginia Savage, Lisa Scheller, Charles Elliott, Charles Fraust, Darlene Heller, Bob Lammi, Terry Lee, Jeffrey Manzi and Thomas J. Nolan.

Staff present: Michael Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Joe Gurinko, Dave Berryman, Sue Rockwell and Ngozi Obi.

Public Present: Samuel Donato, IESI Bethlehem Landfill

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

MINUTES

After a brief review, the minutes of the July 26, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Dougherty. Ms. Morgan seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

COMMITTEE REPORTS***Comprehensive Planning Committee******Bethlehem Township – Zoning Amendment – Jails/Prisons in Agricultural District***

Mr. Berryman stated that Bethlehem Township proposes to amend their zoning ordinance to allow prisons and jails, publicly and privately operated, as a conditional use in their Agricultural District on minimum lot sizes of ten acres. The Township ordinance was found to be exclusionary relative to prisons as the result of a recent Commonwealth Court decision. Mr. Berryman said most of the Township is recommended for urban development in the county comprehensive plan with a small portion recommended for farmland preservation. Our first finding of inconsistency is we don't want to see prisons on farmland preservation land. Within this small strip of agricultural land there are twelve lots which are ten acres or more. So in theory a prison could be located almost anywhere in the farmland preservation area which would be inconsistent with the county plan. The second issue deals with compatibility of land uses. We don't want to see prisons being located next to residential areas. We think allowing the prisons will put them in conflict with residential districts that have already been established. We offer two solutions. The first solution is to create a specific institutional district that will allow jails and prisons. This way you will have a specific district that will keep prisons in one area of the Township. The other alternative is to allow it as a conditional use in an already existing industrial district. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the review letter. Mr. Greco seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Marcus and Mr. Cusick abstaining.

Williams Township – Zoning/SALDO Amendments – Repeal of Conservation Subdivision Regulations

Mr. Berryman said Williams Township wants to repeal their conservation subdivision ordinance they approved in 2007. We would like to encourage them to work towards an ordinance that includes provisions and goals towards natural resource protection. We recommend they look at our model ordinance. Our review letter basically reflects that approach. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the letter. Mr. Howells seconded the motion. Mr. Cusick said a lot of time and effort was put into this ordinance by the Township when it was originally drafted. He said an election has taken place since then and the decision to repeal it seems to be purely political. Mr. Cusick doesn't support the repeal. It was a good ordinance with a lot of thought put into it. Mr. Dougherty isn't sure if the letter goes far enough. He thinks the language in the letter needs to be stronger. Maybe we could add the word "strongly" in front of the word "supports". Mr. Berryman said there are different approaches between the Township ordinance and the LVPC model ordinance. We wanted our model to have a different approach than the Natural Land Trust approach that Williams Township used. Their approach is a little more aggressive than ours. The Natural Land Trust approach doesn't give you a credit for steep slopes and floodplains. Our model credits that as open space. We also don't require the developer to give the municipality open space and also pay recreation fees. The LVPC model is also density neutral. With the Natural Land Trust approach you are losing lots to do conservation design. Mr. Kaiser said we supported the Township ordinance when they first passed it. We just had a different approach to preserve open space. Mr. Dougherty said he would still like to add the extra language to the letter. Ms. Dreisbach amended the motion to add the word strongly to the letter. Mr. Howells seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Reviews

Ms. Dreisbach said there are five summary sheet items on page 9 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Bradley seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Morgan abstaining on item #3 and Mr. Diacogiannis abstaining on item #5.

Environment Committee

Status Report on Lehigh River Fish Passage Feasibility Study

Mr. Kaiser said he and Ms. Bradley have attended meetings on the matter of restoring the Lehigh River to its original state. A handout describing the project was provided to Commission members. Mr. Kaiser said this particular study does not cover the Allentown Dam. It deals with the Easton Dam and the Chain Dam. The Easton Dam is owned by the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and the Chain Dam is owned by the City of Easton. The study considers taking the dams out and restoring the river to a fresh water river and getting shad back in the river. According to the report the feasibility project is necessary to fully explore these fish passage alternatives while maintaining the primary service of the dams – providing a stable source of water to the historic navigation canal systems. Mr. Kaiser said there are two conflicting elements here. We want to support elements that remind us of the history and culture of the area and also serve today as recreational enterprises. At the same time, we are trying to preserve the natural resources of the area. This is a situation where the two things we agree with are in conflict with each other. Also, they represent a major alteration in structures that have been there for a very long time. This study tries to decide how you retain the recreational and historical values and still make changes in the river environment for the purposes of restoring natural resources.

Mr. Kaiser said the Wildlands Conservancy is the lead agency on this study and their engineering consultant is KCI. They have had a series of meetings to explore different ways of dealing with this problem. They are only dealing with two of the dams – Easton Dam and Chain Dam. The alternatives they are looking at are partial removal of the dams to see if by taking out parts of the dams they can still keep water in the canal but provide for more of an environment where the shad can swim upstream. The experience they have had on building fish ladders on several of these dams is that the ladders haven't worked, and the American shad are not rebounding in the Lehigh River. Even if they take the dams out, the fish can't get past the Allentown Dam. The meetings he has attended on the study are very engineering oriented. There are some complex engineering problems in dealing with the water in the river, with the structures in the river to retain the water and how you change that environment to accomplish those goals. Mr. Kaiser said as far as he knows they have not gotten to the cost element or to the question of who is going to pay for the infrastructure. The study is to be completed at the end of the year.

There are still a variety of issues to be resolved. Some of the key questions that need to be answered are who pays, who maintains and who operates the pumps? Mr. Kaiser said he thinks it will come to us at some time for comment. Mr. Kaiser said he will have some people who are more informed on the feasibility study speak at future Commission meetings. Ms. Bradley said this study was not initiated by the dam owners. Also, there has been no discussion about the study with the Easton City Council or Planning Commission which is very concerning. She learned at their last meeting that to keep water in the Hugh Moore Canal after removing the Chain Dam, it would take 8.8 miles of pipe 42-48 inches in diameter and pumps running twenty four hours a day. They are only looking at fish passage and nothing else. The study doesn't address other issues. She said it is something that Easton as a community is very concerned about. She said those dams shaped the City of Easton. They also helped shape the other cities and municipalities along the waterway. Mr. Greco asked who is funding the study. Mr. Kaiser said

Wildlands Conservancy got a grant through DCNR. Mr. Kaiser said the cost of this enterprise is an important part of the equation that needs to be addressed. Mr. Glennon said this proposal will probably die under the financial weight of it. He said fish ladders have not worked anywhere. The cultural benefits of the dams will probably trump the fishery benefits. Mr. Kaiser said he will bring this back for discussion at future meetings.

Reviews

Ms. Wright said there are five summary sheet items on page 10 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Wright made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Howells seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Morgan abstaining on item #5.

Transportation Committee

Memorandum of Understanding between LVTS, LVPC and LANTA

Mr. Gurinko said Lehigh Northampton Transportation Authority goes through a triennial review with the Federal Transit Administration to make sure that LANTA is following all of the federal requirements and regulations. One of the areas which LANTA was not in compliance was having a Memorandum of Understanding that outlines transit planning responsibilities in the Lehigh Valley. We had this spelled out but not in a form the Federal Transit Administration wanted. LANTA has produced this draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on pages 11-13 of the agenda that outlines responsibilities as they exist today. We have a long standing coordination role with LANTA. This documents that relationship and also the role of the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study in the process. The important thing is this will not change the way we do business with LANTA or with the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study. The Transportation Committee recommends to the full Commission the adoption of the MOU and entering into this MOU. Mr. Greco made a motion to approve the adoption of the Memorandum of Understanding. Mr. Howells seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Reviews

Mr. Herman said there are two summary sheet items on page 14 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Gemmel made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Greco seconded the motion. The motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project

Mr. Reese said there are three parts to the status report this month. The first part is we are working on hiring a consultant to do the housing work. The two parts of the housing work are updating the Housing Affordability Study created in 2007 and creating a Jobs/Housing balance which we have never done before. We issued an RFP and received six proposals. The staff selected the top two. We are looking at references and other considerations to make the final selection. We want to have a consultant under contract by the end of September. This is a requirement under our HUD work program. The second part is at the staff level we are working on updating a report on Housing in the Lehigh Valley. It was an assessment of housing sales data for 2008. We are going to update that information for the years 2009-2012. We are working through the county assessment sales data through those years that we have to date. So instead of a one year snapshot, we will have a five year trend. The third part is we are now under contract and we've invoiced and gotten paid.

NEW BUSINESS – None

CORRESPONDENCE - None

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT – None

Mr. Dougherty made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397
610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616
TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

September 27, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, September 27, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matthew Glennon chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Norman Blatt
Steven Glickman
Armand Greco
Michael Hefele
Kent Herman
Edward Hozza
Stephen Repasch
Virginia Savage
Donna Wright

Northampton County

Gordon Campbell
John Cusick
John Diacogiannis
Charles Elliott
Charles Fraust
George F. Gemmel
Robert Lammi
Ross Marcus

Members absent: Percy Dougherty, Karen Duerholz, Ben Howells, Earl Lynn, Kenneth McClain, Christina Morgan, Lisa Scheller, Becky Bradley, Karen Dolan, Darlene Heller, Terry Lee, Jeffrey Manzi, Thomas J. Nolan and Michael Reph.

Staff present: Michael Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Joe Gurinko, Dave Berryman and Sue Rockwell.

Public Present: None

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

MINUTES

After a brief review, the minutes of the August 30, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Lammi. Mr. Greco seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Elliott abstaining.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Committee - Reviews

Ms. Dreisbach said there are two summary sheet items on page 6 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Wright seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Environment Committee - Reviews

Mr. Repasch said there are two summary sheet items on page 7 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Wright seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Transportation Committee - Status Report on LANta's Enhanced Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Study

Mr. Greco said the Enhanced Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Study is focused on ways of trying to bring the transit system up to the next level of service. A primary goal is to join in with the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission and others in trying to meet our regional land use plans. LANta also wants to begin making the system more attractive to a broader number of people. This project builds on their new route system structure. The structuring defines the most important corridors. The Enhanced Bus Study is looking at those corridors and how they can be made more desirable by enhancing the service, making it faster and creating a more frequent operation that hopefully will attract new riders. There are four study corridors. Mr. Greco identified the corridors on a map. They are also listed on the handout. These are the most heavily traveled routes in the system. Each one of these corridors carries at least 3,000 trips a day.

Mr. Greco said the land use element along the corridors has zoning in place that supports densely developed communities that will enhance the probability that people will use transit. There are also some potential areas where there could be transit oriented development. This type of development could enhance the density along the corridors. Our consultants are looking through all of those elements. Mr. Greco said they are also in the process of evaluating the criteria their advisory committee and board have established to determine which corridor is the best corridor to study in detail. Mr. Greco said there are pieces of these corridors they can be looking at to determine if they can make the service better and grow the system in the future. The likely action scenario is express buses, better facilities, shelters, benches and signage along the way. He expects a decision on which corridor they would like to move forward on within a month. Their board is meeting some time in October in a workshop session to go through that process.

As far as enhanced bus service, this would be buses every 15 or 20 minutes during the peak, or maybe all day long every 30 minutes. This is at least twice the level of service in place today. The focus is, if you have more service, it is more likely people will use it as an alternative. This is part of the overall strategic plan - a plan designed to enhance the operation of the system long term. We want to really bring the level of service in our community to what you might expect in a populated area such as ours within the context of what is feasible financially. Mr. Glennon asked if there have been advances over the last two years in diesel technology in buses and also with the use of natural gas. Is natural gas a fuel in the future for buses? Mr. Greco said within two years diesel hybrids will make up about 25% of their fleet. It is very much a clean diesel alternative. Mr. Greco said they are beginning a feasibility study, probably next year, to assess what it would cost to go to a natural gas operation. To some extent the biggest expense in that is the capital expense to prepare their facilities. Mr. Elliott asked if, in determining which corridor will be a priority corridor, they just considered existing population or will they look at projected population. Mr. Greco said they are doing all their projections based on work the LVPC is doing. LANta is looking at 5-10 years. Mr. Kaiser said we're currently projecting population growth at smaller levels of geography. This data is used in our travel model. The model can also split out the transit part of it from the motor vehicle part. We are also working on allocating projected employment to the smaller levels of geography. This is an important part of the traffic

generation that you need to know for the travel model to work. Mr. Cusick said he doesn't see the airport listed as a major generator. Mr. Greco said it is not a high generator of transit trips right now.

OLD BUSINESS - Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project - Public Participation Projects

Mr. Reese said we have a HUD Sustainability Grant that includes updating a Housing Affordability Study created in 2007 and creating a Jobs/Housing Balance Study we never had before. We have selected a consultant to help with this work, RKG Associates from Alexandria, Va. We still need to move through the contracting process. We have a draft contract, we need to discuss it with them and hopefully they will sign the contract in the near future. In addition to that, we are updating a report we created in 2009 looking at sales data from the county assessment offices. At the time it was done, we were using 2008 data from the two counties. We are going to update the report by looking at 2009-2012 data and combining it with the original report to create a five year trend of that information. Those are the things we are actively working on.

In addition, Mr. Reese brought the Commission's attention to the handout on Envision Lehigh Valley. Envision Lehigh Valley is the name associated with the public outreach for the HUD Sustainability program. These outreach meetings are being held to get general information out to people in a variety of communities throughout October and November. There will be additional meetings scheduled. These are general outreach meetings organized by LVEDC, Renew Lehigh Valley, CACLV and also assistance from the Lehigh Valley Research Consortium. Mr. Reese said we may not be at these meetings. We need to work on the technical aspects we are under contract to perform. We will not be providing staff for all of these meetings. We are going to have a very long slate of our own meetings dealing with the housing issues and the energy and climate issues associated with our work program. We will be staffing all of them throughout the process. Mr. Repasch asked if there is anything new the Commission members could learn if they attend the Envision Lehigh Valley meetings. Mr. Reese said he is not sure. We have covered the subject matter during previous LVPC meetings, but there will be discussion from the public you may want to hear. We will receive all of the feedback from these meetings to use as we can in our program. The most interesting part of this whole process is that it leads to this Commission adopting an amended version of the Comprehensive Plan.

NEW BUSINESS – None

CORRESPONDENCE - None

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Kaiser said a great deal of staff time is being spent on modeling work. Also, we had our budget hearing in Lehigh County and everything went well. He said Mr. Reese covered the major parts of the Sustainability Project and we will be doing a lot of work on it over the next three years.

Mr. Glickman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Wright seconded the motion. Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397
610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616
TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

October 25, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, October 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matthew Glennon chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Norman Blatt
Percy Dougherty
Steven Glickman
Kent Herman
Ben Howells
Edward Hozza
Christina Morgan
Lisa Scheller
Donna Wright

Northampton County

Gordon Campbell
John Cusick
Liesel Dreisbach
Charles Elliott
Charles Fraust
Matthew Glennon
Robert Lammi
Terry Lee
Ross Marcus
Michael Reph

Members absent: Karen Duerholz, Armand Greco, Michael Hefele, Earl Lynn, Kenneth McClain, Stephen Repasch, Virginia Savage, Becky Bradley, John Diacogiannis, Karen Dolan, George Gemmel, Darlene Heller, Jeffrey Manzi and Thomas J. Nolan.

Staff present: Michael Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Dave Berryman, Sue Rockwell and Travis Bartholomew.

Public Present: None

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

MINUTES

After a brief review, the minutes of the September 27, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Cusick. Mr. Elliott seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Morgan abstaining.

Mr. Kaiser said over the next two or three months we will be presenting some studies regarding planning forecasts for the future. We presented our population forecasts which show we are looking at a couple hundred thousand more people in the Valley over the next thirty years. Mr. Berryman has been working on employment forecasts at the county and regional level. We have other forecasts that will come out of our economic model that will deal with forecasts of gross regional product and all the economic variables that go with a growing economy. A secondary issue is, when you have a regional forecast, for the purpose of transportation planning you have to break it down into small components. The problem is to try and link up where people are traveling from and where they are traveling to. In the course of doing that we will be showing you forecasts of population growth. Secondly, we are going to take the employment data and we are going to be distributing that over the two county area.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Committee

Lehigh Valley Employment Forecast

Mr. Berryman said tonight we are looking at employment forecasts for our region through 2040. The employment forecast is taken from a model that looks at the entire economy. The model has economic data for the Lehigh Valley from 1990 to the year 2040. Mr. Berryman said this data shows what types of jobs we will have locally based on our historic, demographic and economic trends. Mr. Berryman said all of the data presented tonight is in the report provided to each Commission member.

The model has three geographies – Lehigh County, Northampton County and the United States. Over the last decade, job growth in the Valley was 7.7% and we outpaced the national job growth of 4.6%. The last decade started with one recession and ended with another. We added a lot of jobs in the middle then lost a lot at the end of the decade. The model was calibrated to our population projections released earlier this year. The graph starts with a 2010 base and shows future employment and labor force projections. There are going to be two phenomena occurring over the next 10 – 15 years. The retirement of the baby boomer generation (born between 1946-1964) is the first phenomenon that will occur locally and nationally. The second is the Lehigh Valley will continue to add a lot of people to the population. The growth rate is going to be greater than it was the last two decades. The baby boomers comprise 28% of the United States population - the largest group in history. Our work force is getting older. From 2000-2010, we saw people 55 and older in the labor force increase from 32.4% to 42.2%. The people in this age group are going to grow by 12 million people. The age group following it is a much smaller group, about 700,000. As the baby boomers move into retirement about 10,000 will reach age 65 everyday for the next 20 years and the labor participation rate will go down. These jobs will have to be filled by workers from a far smaller age group.

Up to 2040 there will be a great increase in jobs in the health care sector. The demand for health care will be driven by the baby boomer generation. We are also going to be gaining jobs in almost every industry - construction, professional and technical services, administrative and waste services, and state and local government employees including school teachers. Technical and mechanical advancements are replacing people on farms. Also, federal military and civilian, utilities and manufacturing sectors will lose jobs. The model projects the loss of 704 manufacturing jobs in our area.

The first reason for the loss of manufacturing jobs in the United States is foreign competition. The second reason is we may not have enough people who know how to “make things”. For example, we may have a shortage of welders and people who can read blueprints and put things together. If we don’t have skilled workers, we will not be able to manufacture things in the United States. A recent article in The

Morning Call reported that by 2020 there will be a shortage of a million skilled and manufacturing workers. It is a big issue and it is going to be a bigger issue because manufacturing, along with a lot of other industries, relies heavily on baby boomer employees right now. As they retire we will need people to replace these employees. If we want to change the projected negative situation, we are going to have to get skilled employees somewhere to at least break even. Mr. Herman asked if we should be sharing this information with the schools and colleges. Mr. Berryman said that was discussed at the Committee meeting. We are already seeing the symptoms of this situation. He showed a list of headlines in national newspapers. Companies that actually manufacture things don't have enough workers for production now. We don't have the training programs needed for these positions.

Mr. Berryman showed a chart of how future employment will break down between Lehigh and Northampton County. There will be about 131,000 new jobs through 2040. There are a lot of similarities between the two counties. Health care will be the big employment generator in both counties. Mr. Berryman reviewed some of the changes and how they compare with the United States. Our area mostly follows national trends. The labor force in the Lehigh Valley is predicted to grow as will the population. However, the labor force growth rate over the next decade (2020-2030) will go down from the last decade – from 14.9% to 10.7%. This 2020 – 2030 decade is when most of the baby boomers are projected to retire. You will have massive retirements in a variety of industries. Employers nationwide are starting to pay attention to this. They have to start figuring out how to find employees to fill these positions.

Mr. Kaiser said we would like to have authorization to release the data so we can share it with others. Mr. Dougherty made a motion to release the data. Ms. Morgan seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Reviews

TMs. Dreisbach said there are five summary sheet items on page 4 of the agenda attachments. Ms.

Ms. Dreisbach said there are five summary sheet items on page 4 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Wright abstaining on Item No. 1.

Environment Committee

Report on 2012 Rainfall and Stream Flow

Mr. Bartholomew said 2012 was a much more normal year than 2011 as far as precipitation. From the Allentown gage at the airport, the average annual rainfall over the record, which goes back to the 1940s, is about 45 inches. Last year we had about 72 inches of rainfall which was the wettest year on record. Average rainfall for the first 9 months of the year is about 34 inches. In 2011 during this time period, we had about 58 inches. In 2012 we had a little less than 31 inches which is what you would expect from a normal year. Mr. Bartholomew said, in addition to the larger volume last year, we had more intense events. Hurricane Irene gave us the largest 24 hours of rainfall in 2011 which was about 5 inches. This year the largest we had was about 2 inches back in April. Last year we had a lot of heavy events of 1, 2, 3 and 5 inches. Hurricane Lee was 7 ½ inches over four days. This year we had seven events by the end of September of 1 inch or more. Last year we had 16 events, more than twice as many days where it rained at least an inch.

Mr. Bartholomew reviewed the 2011 and 2012 average daily stream discharges from January to September on the Lehigh (at Bethlehem) and Delaware (at Belvidere) rivers and the Little Lehigh, Monocacy and Jordan creeks. Discharges from last year were all higher than this year by at least a factor of 2. Mr. Bartholomew also showed this data on charts comparing it with the average daily discharge based

on the period of record at each stream gage. He also reviewed the impacts of Hurricanes Irene and Lee from last year at each of the five locations. Regarding Hurricane Sandy, we may have a better idea by Sunday or Monday of how much we may get in our area. Mr. Bartholomew said this type of information can help municipal officials estimate how much damage could be expected during similar storm events.

Mr. Kaiser said over the past 20 years we have done a lot of stormwater management work in the area under Act 167. Much of the data that is relevant to that has to do with the data Travis is discussing today. We spent a lot of staff hours and published many reports on the whole topic of stormwater. It is a big issue and water management in general is a big issue. Mr. Herman asked if we can look at this data ten years from now and see some trends. Mr. Bartholomew said that is a really short time period. It's really hard to tell if these extreme events are part of a long term trend. The data can be really skewed due to back to back extreme events.

Transportation Committee - None

OLD BUSINESS

Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project

Mr. Reese said we have a few items we are primarily responsible for as part of the Sustainability grant. They mostly have to do with housing. We had a Housing Affordability Study we created in 2007 we are going to update. Another report created in 2009 provided housing sales data for the Lehigh Valley. We are going to update that report. We are also going to do a report for the first time on Jobs/Housing Balance. This will look at the relationship between where people work, where they live and how they get to work. One of the main things we have to do with that is hire a consultant to help us with that work. We have negotiated a contract with RKG Associates from Alexandria, Virginia. They have a lot of experience dealing with the public in a variety of settings. We have two key contact people who are very good with this type of work. The contract has to be approved by HUD. We have forwarded the contract to LVEDC. They will forward it to HUD and hopefully we will get a quick turn around on approval of the contract. The consultant is ready to go and hopefully can schedule kick-off activities by mid-November.

We are working on a portion of that work in-house including the Housing Sales Data Report created in 2009. Ms. Obi of our staff has been working on this report. She has been collecting the housing sales data from 2009-2012 for the two counties. We are going to create a five year trend report on the housing sales data. We have to wait until the end of 2012 to get all the data. We will provide that to the consultant for further processing and analysis in the Housing Affordability and Jobs/Housing Balance studies. One of the next things we need to do is to create a Housing Committee. A part of this grant is to do a very significant amount of outreach. We are going to do that through public meetings and the Housing Committee. We will have the counties and cities represented along with the housing authorities and other interested persons in the public and private sectors to help us understand how to formulate an Affordable Housing Plan. We will be working on this over the next several weeks and hopefully convene that group by mid-November when the consultant is on board.

Also there are public outreach meetings being held throughout the two counties under the title Envision Lehigh Valley. LVEDC, Renew LV and CACLV are handling the general public outreach side of the grant. They are going to have twenty meetings from the start of October to the end of November. The purpose of these meetings is to do general outreach and education to try to get the public aware of what is going on and to try and get them involved. For us, this process ends with an amended Comprehensive Plan to bring back to this board. The intention is that it will meet the test of what HUD calls a Regional Plan for Sustainable Development.

Mr. Elliott asked if the employment forecast will impact the Jobs/Housing Balance in terms of our study. We know all these jobs are likely to happen, but we don't know where in the Valley. Mr. Kaiser said what will affect the Jobs/Housing Balance is the work that follows this. The next problem is how you distribute future employment across the Valley. This will play an important role in the work we have coming up. Mr. Glickman said our population forecasts show a couple hundred thousand more people in the area. He asked if we know where they will be living. Mr. Kaiser said we are working on that now and the answer is yes. It's complicated to deal with. We've looked at zoning ordinances, our Comprehensive Plan, and our model. We'll probably be bringing this to the Commission next month.

NEW BUSINESS – None

CORRESPONDENCE - None

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT - None

Mr. Dougherty made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397
610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616
TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

November 29, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, November 29, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matthew Glennon chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Percy Dougherty
Steven Glickman
Armand Greco
Kent Herman
Ben Howells
Edward Hozza
Kenneth McClain
Christina Morgan
Stephen Repasch
Virginia Savage
Donna Wright

Northampton County

Gordon Campbell
John Cusick
John Diacogiannis
Liesel Dreisbach
Charles Elliott
Charles Fraust
George Gemmel
Matthew Glennon
Ross Marcus
Thomas Nolan

Members absent: Norman Blatt, Karen Duerholz, Michael Hefele, Earl Lynn, Lisa Scheller, Becky Bradley, Karen Dolan, Darlene Heller, Robert Lammi, Terry Lee, Jeffrey Manzi and Michael Reph.

Staff present: Geoffrey Reese and Sue Rockwell

Public Present: Jonathan Raser, TetraTech

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

MINUTES

After a brief review, the minutes of the October 25, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Dougherty. Ms. Dreisbach seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. McClain, Mr. Nolan and Mr. Gemmel abstaining.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Committee

Review of Rehrig Penn Logistics Land Development Situation – Borough of Glendon (County SALDO Application)

Mr. Reese said this is a very minor land development in the Borough of Glendon. Glendon is one of those small boroughs that does not have its own subdivision ordinance so this Planning Commission administers the county SALDO on behalf of the Borough. This Commission has approval authority regarding land development and subdivisions in the Borough. This is a very minor addition to an existing manufacturing facility building and parking lot. All they are proposing is a small gravel parking lot on the north side of the building, a couple of storage silos on the east side of the building, and some outdoor equipment on the south side.

m

We reviewed this project last December. The Commission issued a conditional approval letter. There were several conditions that had to be met. The standard process is that those conditions have to be met within a year unless the applicant requests an extension. The applicant has not come in for an extension. In normal circumstances, in December this year this would be disapproved because conditions have not been met. However, there are extenuating circumstances affecting this plan, and that is a change to state law. Mr. Reese said that there are several documents related to this project with the agenda packet that he will review. The first document is the September 2012 letter sent to the applicant stating that they have until December 15, 2012 to meet the conditions of approval. The next document is an April 2012 memo from Mr. Taremae stating the conditions of approval, some of which were met and some were still outstanding. Next is the original commission conditional approval letter dated December 15, 2011. It grants final approval to the plans subject to agreement of the conditions described in the letter. We have included a summary of the new state law that affects this plan. The new law is an amendment to the Permit Extension Act. Mr. Reese said basically this law extends any types of approvals through July 1, 2016. This means that even though the applicant has not asked for an extension or satisfied all of the conditions, he has through July 1, 2016 to satisfy all the conditions and receive his approval under the process. This is the case for every municipality in Pennsylvania. The reason for the law is that there were a lot of land development plans on the books at the municipal level that were not proceeding due to the downturn in the economy. The extension will give them to 2016 to proceed without having to start the process all over again.

uWe are not required to send a letter about this unless the applicant requests such a letter, and they have

We are not required to send a letter about this unless the applicant requests such a letter, and they have not done so. However, we felt it would be appropriate to send a letter to Mr. Reibman stating that this new state law applies to his situation. He will have until July 1, 2016 to comply. We have included a copy of the proposed letter for your review. We are looking for Commission approval to send the letter. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the letter. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Elliott abstaining.

Reviews

Ms. Dreisbach said there are four summary sheet items on page 6 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Wright seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Elliott abstaining on Item No. 3.

Environment Committee

Draft Lehigh Valley Hazard Mitigation Plan

Mr. Repasch said in 2005 the LVPC began working with the Lehigh and Northampton County Emergency Management Agencies to prepare the region's first Hazard Mitigation Plan. The plan addressed only the natural hazards that could impact the Valley, not man-made hazards. All 62 municipalities participated in and adopted the plan. By having an adopted plan in place, a participating municipality could be eligible to receive mitigation funding. The plan was approved by FEMA in April 2007. To maintain funding eligibility, the plan must be updated every five years. The two counties secured a grant to update the plan and hired a consultant – Tetra Tech – to do the work. Jonathan Raser from Tetra Tech presented the draft plan at the October Environment Committee meeting and is here tonight to present the draft plan update to the full Commission.

Mr. Raser provided a power point presentation. He explained to the Commission what hazard mitigation means and why mitigation plans are important. The reason for updating a plan is that a community's risks and vulnerabilities change over time and new projects are identified. To obtain mitigation funding, a plan has to be in place and projects have to be specifically identified in the plan to show the project has been well thought out, that you looked at your risks and identified the best, most cost effective solution alternative. Mr. Reese said, regarding the 2006 plan, we knew that was one of the shortcomings of the plan. We didn't have the time or resources to develop well-defined projects. They were more problem statements rather than engineered solutions. We had an opportunity where \$1 million was made available to the Valley through work by Congressman Dent's office as follow up on the original plan. It took years for any of that money to flow to municipalities because of the difference between a problem statement and actual solutions that are ready to go. That is something that has to be refined so as funding becomes available, you have to be ready to use it. Mr. Raser said that was the case with many original plans. A lot of the projects were more general in nature. He reviewed the different types of funding programs available.

Mr. Raser said with the plan update, in addition to natural hazards, they looked at man-made hazards that could impact the region and he reviewed a list of all the hazards in the plan. FEMA doesn't require a plan to include man-made hazards, but they encourage it. The most important part of the update is the mitigation strategies. He explained the different types of actions that can be considered by a municipality. With the update, each county and municipality has their own chapter or annex. Each annex includes risks, vulnerabilities, capabilities and strategies specific to the jurisdiction. They have had mostly good participation on the creation of the annexes. They have provided assistance to municipalities as much as possible, but they are supposed to be completed by the municipality. About 20% of municipalities have not provided any information.

The next step is to provide a draft of the plan (minus the annexes) to PEMA and FEMA for a pre-review next Wednesday. By the end of the year, they would like to finalize the plan and submit it to FEMA for final review and approval. It is important to get this done because a number of municipalities have submitted applications for mitigation funding for Hurricanes Irene and Lee, but the current plan has expired. The counties have to decide what to do about those municipalities that are not participating. They can sign on at a later time if they want to.

Mr. Howells asked if a community that does not participate in the updated plan harms the region. Mr. Raser said it does not harm the region's ability to get a plan. He said this is a multi-jurisdictional plan. It covers the counties and municipalities. We generally do multi-jurisdictional plans because of the efficiency in the planning process. He said the Lehigh Valley will likely have a plan that will include the two counties and a large percentage of the municipalities. The ones that don't participate will be dropped, but that won't affect the ones that do participate. Ms. Morgan asked if Commission members could get a copy of the presentation. Mr. Raser said yes. Mr. Repasch asked what role this mitigation plan plays in the sustainability project as it relates to climate change. Mr. Raser said they did include climate change considerations in this plan, not as a hazard in itself, but as an exacerbating factor with things like flooding because of increased rainfall. Mr. Reese said under the sustainability project we will have a climate change plan, but we don't know what the elements of that will be yet. We are doing background research on that now to see what we might add to our Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Elliott asked if the 75% federal, 25% local match was applicable to all the different types of mitigation actions. Mr. Raser said yes, but there are some activities that will be self-funded like public education. Many of the initiatives in the plan might be self-funded. Mr. Raser said they tried to point out the projects that are grant eligible that can be funded and are cost effective. Mr. Elliott asked if there is a funding cycle. Mr. Raser said congressionally funded grants are available every year. The funding cycle opens up in June and closes around December. The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) is a disaster driven grant program. Every time there is a declared disaster, an HMGP grant pool opens up. The announcement of available funds is about six months after the disaster. Then you have six months to apply for funds and the state has six months to approve it. Mr. Herman asked if funding is competitive. Mr. Raser said it is competitive in the sense that if you only have \$10 million of HMGP money available in the state and there is \$30 million in projects, obviously they can't fund them all. Generally after a declared disaster the state asks for a letter of intent from the communities that want to submit an application for a project. The state evaluates them and looks at which ones would be cost effective. If they think it's fundable, the community will be asked to fill out an application. Mr. Elliott asked if only municipalities can apply or for example, can a public utility apply. Mr. Raser said public utilities can apply but they generally apply through the municipality where their facility is located. The law is written that a utility or authority is actually a local government, as are school districts and any type of junior taxing authorities. Mr. Dougherty asked if you have a municipality that won't put any money into purchasing flood prone properties is there any way around that. Mr. Raser said it's not mandated that a community provide the 25% match to purchase a property. He said it's reasonable to expect a homeowner to put up the match if they are elevating their home. But when it comes to acquisitions, it is hard to find an owner who is willing to take \$.75 on the \$1.00 for the purchase of their property. The state might have some type of open space funding that could be used for that purpose.

Reviews

Mr. Repasch said there are three summary sheet items on page 7 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Howells seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Transportation Committee - None

OLD BUSINESS

Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project

Mr. Reese said we now have a consultant for the project, RKG Associates from Alexandria, Virginia, under contract. They are going to come three or four days at a time to make as many contacts with people and committees as they can. They were up here on November 14 – 16 and met with a variety of people including Mr. Glennon, Mr. Herman, Ms. Savage and Mr. Marcus. They also met with Ms.

Feinberg and Ms. Sywensky from the county offices, the three city planning directors, and Alan Jennings from CACLV. They spent a lot of time touring the Lehigh Valley. They are coming back December 17 – 19. We plan on having them talk to more of the housing advocates and infrastructure people. We will schedule as many meetings as we can during that period. We are also going to continue to work on updating the housing data report that was created in 2009. The report will include four more years of data, 2009-2012. Hopefully in January we will have all of the data and can begin an analysis of the trends.

In addition, LVEDC, Renew LV and CACLV have held about 20 meetings for public participation and outreach throughout the Lehigh Valley to get the basic message out about the program. Also, the Commission and five other funded partners under this grant have agreed to participate jointly to purchase some advertising. Starting tomorrow on the Express Times' Lehigh Valley Live website there will be an ad for Envision Lehigh Valley. We want to make sure as many people as possible learn what this project is about and how to access information. Mr. Repasch asked how the meetings are being attended. Mr. Reese said they vary, some have had low attendance and some have had a good response.

NEW BUSINESS

Review of 2013 LVPC and Committee Meeting Schedule

Mr. Glennon said a copy of the proposed 2013 meeting schedule is included in the agenda packet. He asked Commission members to approve the meeting schedule. Mr. Wright made a motion to approve the schedule. Ms. Savage seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Election of Officers

Mr. Glennon said he understands the chair, vice chair and treasurer positions often run as two year appointments, but an election is still done annually. He asked Commission members if they wanted to appoint a nominating committee and vote on officers in December. Ms. Wright said she didn't see the need to have a nominating committee and made motion to elect the same slate of officers for next year with Matt Glennon as chair, Kent Herman as vice chair and Liesel Dreisbach as treasurer. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion. The motion carried.

CORRESPONDENCE - None

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Reese said we have a travel model that we maintain for the entire Lehigh Valley that estimates traffic volumes on all the main roadways. One of the things we need to have for this model for a variety of purposes is updated population and employment data at the small geography level. We have at the Commission level reviewed and approved the regional population and employment projections through 2040. We need to take those regional projections and boil them down to a much finer level – the traffic analysis zone. There are 473 of them in the two counties. We are working on this and will be bringing them to you in the next few months.

Mr. Repasch made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director



LEHIGH VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310, ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109-9397
610-264-4544 FAX 610-264-2616
TOLL FREE 888-627-8808

December 20, 2012

MINUTES

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, December 20, 2012 at 11:00 a.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matthew Glennon chaired the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Lehigh County

Norman Blatt
Percy Dougherty
Steven Glickman
Armand Greco
Michael Hefele
Kent Herman
Ben Howells
Edward Hozza
Kenneth McClain
Christina Morgan
Stephen Repasch
Virginia Savage
Lisa Scheller
Donna Wright

Northampton County

Becky Bradley
Gordon Campbell
John Diacogiannis
Liesel Dreisbach
Charles Elliott
Charles Fraust
George Gemmel
Matthew Glennon
Darlene Heller
Bob Lammi
Terry Lee
Ross Marcus
Thomas Nolan

Members absent: Karen Duerholz, Earl Lynn, John Cusick, Karen Dolan, Jeffrey Manzi and Michael Reph.

Staff present: Mike Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Joe Gurinko, David Berryman, Sue Rockwell, David Manhardt, Lynette Romig, Teresa Mackey, Travis Bartholomew and Ngozi Obi

Public Present: None

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

MINUTES

After a brief review, the minutes of the November 29, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Dougherty. Ms. Morgan seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Lammi abstaining.

COMMITTEE REPORTS***Comprehensive Planning Committee******DTE Allentown Waste to Energy Plant – Subdivision of Regional Significance***

Mr. Berryman said this project is considered a land use of regional significance according to the County Comprehensive Plan because it is a solid waste facility and power plant. The proposal is to take sewage and trash and generate energy combining those two products. The County Comprehensive Plan does not have policies that anticipate these types of energy uses. When we look at these projects we generally look at where they are being sited and whether the location is appropriate. That is the focus of our review letter. In this case, the City of Allentown is proposing this project to be located directly adjacent to the Allentown Sewer Plant. This is a very suitable location. As with previous power projects, we have not commented on how they operate. We leave that decision to the state. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the letter. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion.

Mr. Hozza asked if the plant is designed to accept additional municipal waste from other municipalities. Mr. Berryman said he is not sure. Mr. Hefele said he thinks there are provisions to accept other waste if the city's sources do not generate enough. Mr. Dougherty said we should be encouraging regionalization. Mr. Hozza said the reason he asked the question is that the landfill charge is starting to exceed their collection charge. If we could eliminate the landfill charge by taking it to a facility such as this, garbage rates would drop significantly. Mr. Glennon called for the vote. The motion carried with Mr. Hefele and Ms. Morgan abstaining.

Review of 2012 Subdivision Activity

Mr. Berryman said on pages 7 and 8 of the agenda attachments there are two graphs that are published yearly in the Annual Subdivision Activity Report. These graphs show we haven't yet reached the bottom of subdivision activity in the Lehigh Valley. We will probably finish the year with a lower amount of plans than last year. We only received about 358 plans this year. The second graph on page 8 shows the number of lots approved by the municipality. These are lots where the municipality signed the plans, we signed the plans, and they are ready for recording at the county. We are not sure if these lots will be built or not. This shows the level of activity is lower than previous years.

2012 Comprehensive Planning Committee Report

Ms. Dreisbach said the Committee report on pages 9-11 outlines the work we have done this year. Mr. Berryman said we have had some staff changes during the year. Mr. Taremae retired and Ms. Obi was hired. The Comprehensive Planning department does a variety of tasks. We hold and run workshops. We write documents regarding environmental issues, housing, etc. and even consolidated plans.

Reviews

Ms. Dreisbach said there are seven summary sheet items on page 12 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Lee seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Nolan abstaining on Item No. 1.

Environment Committee

2012 Environment Committee Report

Mr. Repasch presented the Committee report on pages 13-16 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Kaiser said we spent a lot of time working with municipalities and groups who were interested in land and environmental preservation. The Lehigh Valley Greenways Organization is part of that, and both counties are involved in open space projects. There is a lot of interest in open space preservation. Mr. Reese introduced David Manhardt who is our new GIS manager.

Transportation Committee

2012 Transportation Committee Report

Mr. Herman said the Transportation Committee met today and Mr. McClain will be the new chair for the year 2013. Mr. Gurinko said on pages 17-19 of the agenda attachments we have a number of items we discussed with the Committee. The demographic forecasts were important to the Committee because they serve as the basis for our regional travel model. Mr. Gurinko said we updated the year 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program. The travel model development will continue into 2013. Also, 41 construction projects were started this year. The real point of the rest of the report is focusing on major jobs in 2013. We have a very aggressive schedule for 2013. Mr. Herman said at the Committee level we approved staff sending a letter to PennDOT acknowledging PennDOT's efforts to obtain funding for completion of these much needed projects.

OLD BUSINESS

Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project

Mr. Reese said the Lehigh Valley has received money from HUD to work on issues related to sustainability. The final product is an update of our Comprehensive Plan. There are 11 consortium members involved, many of which have received grant money. LVEDC is the lead organization and contractor with HUD. One of the main things we accomplished with our application to HUD was that they agreed we were pretty close to having a regional sustainability plan already with our Comprehensive Plan. This made way for the funding of the three city projects. Mr. Reese briefly described the city projects. One of the activities continuing to go on is LVEDC and Renew Lehigh Valley have spearheaded the Envision Lehigh Valley process which is starting out with a series of public meetings beginning in October. The purpose of the meetings is to get the basic information out to the community about this project and begin to receive public input. Additional meetings will be scheduled in the future. We have been funded to work on a climate plan, an energy plan and housing plan.

Ms. Obi said we are actively working on the housing components of the HUD Sustainability grant. There are two parts being done by our consultant, RKG Associates from Alexandria, VA. They are working on an update of the Affordable Housing Assessment of the Lehigh Valley 2007 report and completing a Jobs/Housing Balance Study. Their first visit to the Lehigh Valley was in November, during

which they met with LVPC officers, county level staff, the planning directors of the three cities and Alan Jennings. They went on guided tours of the Lehigh Valley and its urban core. Their second visit consisted of census data training, interviews with local housing authorities and community and economic directors, and additional site tours over a three day period. They will return again in January. Their work is tentatively scheduled for completion by mid-2014.

Ms. Obi said she is working on updating the Housing in the Lehigh Valley-2008 report. The updated report will focus on housing trends from 2008-2012 in the valley. The target completion date for this report is April 2013.

NEW BUSINESS

Approval of 2013 LVPC Budget

Mr. Kaiser said the draft budget and memo are on pages 20-22 of the agenda attachments. The budget was presented to the Executive Committee, reviewed by them and recommended for approval. It is a \$2.1 million budget for 2013. It is a cash budget. The key revenue sources are \$850,000 from both counties in 2013. The second largest source of income is \$775,000 from PennDOT for various studies. We have a part of a one time grant from HUD in the amount of \$250,789 for next year. We have a specialized grant to update our Natural Resources Plan map from DCNR and PennDOT. Those are the key revenue sources. We have \$1.5 million to cover staff expenses and \$297,000 for consultant and supplemental expenses. We have consultants working on affordable housing, the travel model and the natural area inventory. Our general office expenses are \$171,000. Our current lease expires at the end of June 2013. We are negotiating with our landlord on a new 10 year lease with a favorable rental rate. Mr. Kaiser said the Executive Committee and I are asking for approval of the budget. Mr. Howells made a motion to approve the 2013 LVPC Budget. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Approval of 2013 LVPC Action Plan

Mr. Kaiser said the Action Plan is on pages 23-25 of the agenda attachments. He briefly reviewed some of the action items. The Administrative section deals with budgeting and staff recruitment. Under the Comprehensive Planning section, we have the HUD Sustainability project that includes the housing plan, the climate plan and energy plan; and work on recreation and open space. Under the Environment section, work will continue on the Natural Heritage Inventory Update. Our GIS continues to need updating. The Transportation section includes many varied transportation projects that need to be completed including updating the travel model. Mr. Greco made a motion to approve the 2013 LVPC Action Plan. Mr. Glickman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Ms. Wright made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,
Kathleen Sauerzopf for
Michael N. Kaiser
Executive Director