



## **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 31, 2013*

### ***MINUTES***

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, January 31, 2013 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  
Kent Herman  
Edward Hozza  
Kenneth McClain  
Sara Pandl  
Virginia Savage  
Lisa Scheller  
Donna Wright

#### **Northampton County**

Christen Borso  
Gordon Campbell  
John Cusick  
John Diacogiannis  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Elliott  
Matthew Glennon  
Bob Lammi  
Kevin Lott  
Ross Marcus  
Thomas Nolan

***Members absent:*** Steven Glickman, Michael Hefele, Ben Howells, Christina Morgan, Stephen Repasch, Becky Bradley, Charles Fraust, George Gemmel, Darlene Heller, Michael Reph and Seth Vaughn.

***Staff present:*** Mike Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Joe Gurinko, David Berryman, Michael Donchez and Sue Rockwell.

***Public Present:*** Pam Pearson, Tatamy Borough

***COURTESY OF THE FLOOR***

Mr. Glennon welcomed new Commission members Kevin Lott, Christen Borso and Sara Pandl.

## ***MINUTES***

After a brief review, the minutes of the December 20, 2012 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Lammi. Mr. Greco seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Pandl abstaining.

## ***COMMITTEE REPORTS***

### ***Comprehensive Planning Committee***

#### ***Lehigh County SALDO Application – Celebration Fireworks/Horizon Builders – Borough of Slatington***

Mr. Berryman said Lehigh and Northampton counties have their own subdivision ordinances. They cover municipalities that do not have their own subdivision ordinances. In Northampton County, the ordinance covers the boroughs of West Easton, Chapman and Glendon, and in Lehigh County it covers the Borough of Slatington. This application is in the Borough of Slatington. The applicants came to the Comprehensive Planning meeting on Tuesday to discuss the feasibility plan with the Committee and also to ask for a combined preliminary/final plan submission. Mr. Berryman said the Commission's role is to approve, not approve or add comments to the staff letter and take action on the request for a combined preliminary/final plan. This project is in a very unpopulated part of Slatington. The project is located on an old quarry area and is about 35 acres. The applicant would like to relocate his fireworks business from Weisenberg Township to the Borough where he would store fireworks in magazines on the property. They also want to build a pole barn office/warehouse. We requested comments from the Borough and Washington Township. The Township did not provide comments. The Borough responded, but did not identify any issues. At this point we are not taking action on the plan, but we are providing comments on issues we think are significant and should be considered as part of a future application.

One of the main issues in our letter is about the type of septic system they propose to use. Given that this is a large quarry area and the business is only going to have one employee, the applicant is proposing a holding tank for the pole barn building. We are not sure if DEP will approve the long-term use of a holding tank, so we recommend the applicant obtain DEP approval prior to a future application. Mr. Berryman briefly reviewed the other comments in the letter.

Mr. Herman asked if the reason for the location of the storage facilities throughout the site is a safety issue. Mr. Berryman said yes. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives has their own setback regulations for fireworks magazines. The applicant needs a license and permit to store fireworks. Mr. Hozza asked if the Borough is requiring them to fence in the property. Mr. Berryman said no. The applicant received a use variance in 2012 for this use with no attached conditions. Fencing requirements are not addressed in the County SALDO. The Commission can add comments if they choose to. Ms. Scheller asked if the amount of traffic coming in and out of the site will create issues with 7<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Berryman said it wouldn't generate enough traffic to warrant a traffic study. Ms. Scheller said she is also concerned about fencing. Ms. Pandl asked if there is a provision for the fire department if there was an incident. Mr. Berryman said our review is limited to the County SALDO. The Borough of Slatington is responsible for fire safety issues. Mr. Elliott asked about the construction of the magazines. Mr. Berryman said they are ATF approved and made to contain and store the fireworks safely. The closest property owner is the owner of the property, Mr. Peter Papay. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the staff comments in the letter. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion.

Mr. Berryman said the applicant is requesting a combined preliminary/final plan. This means that the application would come back for review one more time. Since the nature of the project is of a small scale and no public improvements are proposed, staff recommends approval of the request. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the request for the combined preliminary/final plan. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried.

### *Municipal Population Projections*

Mr. Kaiser said we used a statistical model invented in the 1970's by Bruce Newling from Rutgers University. He came up with an idea of tracking population densities, growth and development. He discovered once geographic areas grow in density because of development, sooner or later they hit a density where they can't grow anymore. Mr. Kaiser said we did a lot of plotting of data and discovered there are several critical densities depending on where you're located. There were a lot of variables that went into this and a lot that the model didn't consider. One is when public sewer and water are expanded it increases development possibilities. This is what happened here in the 1960's. Public sewer and water were extended from Allentown to western Lehigh County to solve a pollution problem along Little Lehigh Creek from all the malfunctioning on-lot septic systems.

The economic development people said now we can put industrial development in western Lehigh County. This has happened in many other areas in the valley. The only way to protect farmland is not to build large sewer lines which will lead to development and the loss of farmland. Another factor is how zoning ordinances affect the intensity of development. We tried to assess how all these things will affect growth in the area. We also looked at renewal and development activities in the three cities. There are many possibilities for new growth even in the cities. All of this is summarized in the report we prepared. Another factor is where the counties have been buying development rights which means the properties will stay in farming for a while. There are about 20,000 acres in Lehigh County and about 12,000 in Northampton County in that program. We ran the model and checked it against the realities in our area. We made modifications to it and came up with the population forecasts.

We have had a major migration of people in the Lehigh Valley from New Jersey and New York over the last twenty years. A lot of growth in Allentown was caused by that. There is also a large growth in the Latino population. We made our forecasts based on all of these variables. We have a county wide forecast that calls for a 226,720 growth in people from 2010 to 2040 in our two county areas. We predict that in both of our counties the next 30 years will produce 77,000 more people than the previous 30 years did. In Lehigh County, our municipal population forecast shows Allentown's growth isn't finished. There will be a lot of growth in Lower Macungie, North Whitehall, Upper Macungie, Upper Saucon and Whitehall townships. In Northampton County, growth is expected in the City of Bethlehem, including the South Side. In Easton, the population increase will be due to their proximity to New Jersey and New York. Geography is a big factor in growth potential. Mr. Kaiser said we would like to release these population forecasts. This information is essential when doing transportation planning. A big part of travel in the area is the work trip (home to work and work to home). We have a travel model we are updating now and it will use this data to predict future travel patterns in the area. Mr. Glennon suggested making a motion to release this information before the discussion. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to release the municipal population projections. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion.

Mr. Cusick said obviously the largest impact is on Rt. 22. He asked where we are with that. Mr. Kaiser said we are in the middle of rebuilding the Rt. 22/MacArthur Road interchange. The recommendation is to widen Rt. 22 but there is no money to widen it. Mr. Gurinko said the Rt. 22/MacArthur Road interchange will be completed by the end of 2013. When that project is completed,

work will begin on the Rt. 22/Fullerton Avenue interchange and the replacement of the Lehigh River Bridge. Neither of these projects deal with capacity issues. The current situation at the state level is the Governor was supposed to come out with a statement last week on a proposed transportation funding enhancement package. That was delayed until February 5. We've read that the proposal is to raise \$1.9 billion annually by removing the cap on oil company franchise taxes. Mr. Gurinko said it has been estimated that this could raise the price of a gallon of gas ultimately by about \$.28. There is still a question of whether this will be phased over a number of years.

Mr. Cusick asked about the exits ramps at Rt. 248 and 13<sup>th</sup> Street in the Easton area. He said they are challenging exit ramps on and off Rt. 22. He asked if there is any chance of improvements being made there as well. Mr. Gurinko said not in the near future. There is another funding deadlock at the Federal level. Also, because of the great emphasis on maintenance of the existing network, there is very little to nothing at the State level that deals with new capacity. Mr. Gurinko said we recognize the needs, but there is not a lot on the near-future horizon as far as addressing those kinds of issues. Mr. Kaiser said we have been concentrating a great deal on maintenance at this time.

Mr. McClain asked if raising \$1.9 billion annually comes to fruition, what is the likelihood of getting funding to widen Rt. 22? Mr. Gurinko said the original Transportation Funding Advisory Commission proposal was to raise an additional \$2.5 billion per year. He's not sure with the reduced level of funding if capacity adding projects are still on the table. Mr. Kaiser thinks that the work will be done in small increments over a long period of time. Mr. Hozza said PennDOT and the consultants have assured him that the bridges at MacArthur, Fullerton and Lehigh River will accommodate a six lane Rt. 22. Mr. Glennon called for the vote on releasing the municipal population projections. The motion carried.

### *Reviews*

Ms. Dreisbach said there are seven summary sheet items on page 5 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Pandl abstaining.

### *Environment Committee*

Ms. Wright said there is one summary sheet item on page 6. Ms. Wright made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Greco seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Hozza abstaining.

### *Transportation Committee*

#### *Presentation on Draft 2014 Unified Planning Work Program*

Mr. Gurinko said there is a two page handout included in the agenda packet describing the Draft 2014 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The Transportation section largely is funded through PennDOT from working for the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study. We work for the Metropolitan Planning Organization under contract with PennDOT. The UPWP outlines transportation tasks that we plan to take on over the next state fiscal year which runs from July 1 to June 30. This particular UPWP will end June 30, 2014. The importance of this work is that as the responsibility of the Metropolitan Planning Organization is to set transportation planning project priorities and also make sure the area meets federal requirements to maintain its eligibility for Federal transportation funds.

This program is divided into two sections – base program and supplement funding. Under the base program this money comes to the LVPC by formula. Federal sources supply 80% of the funding – about \$600,000 from the Federal Highway Administration, another \$100,000 from the Federal Transit Administration. Another 10% of the program comes from PennDOT through the motor license fund. The remaining 10% is matched by the LVPC.

In terms of revenue streams, the PennDOT revenue stream is the second highest in the LVPC budget behind the county contributions. County contributions are important because that is used as matching money to leverage the other 90% of the PennDOT contract. If we didn't have that 10% match we would not have the program. This work also has an impact on state and federal transportation funding coming into the Lehigh Valley. If federal planning requirements completed under this contract were not met, the Lehigh Valley would not be eligible for the \$304 million worth of highway, bridge and transit projects in our current Transportation Improvement Program.

The base program is broken down into five tasks – administration, public information, surveillance, system planning and TIP development and maintenance. Mr. Gurinko briefly described each task. Supplemental planning funds are available from PennDOT on a statewide, competitive basis. This year we are proposing a continuation of our help to PennDOT with the Local Technical Assistance Program which provides training to local municipalities on transportation related issues. It has been a very successful program. We propose to continue that work at a cost of \$15,000 which is all Federal money. There is no local match required for that. Tonight, we are looking for approval to send this program to PennDOT for their consideration. Mr. McClain made a motion to submit this program to PennDOT for their approval. Mr. Herman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

## ***OLD BUSINESS***

### *Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project*

Mr. Reese gave a brief review on the HUD Sustainability Project for the new Commission members. This is a project that began in 2011 with an eleven member consortium of organizations that submitted a grant application and successfully competed nationally for some funding from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. The purpose of this funding is to work on issues relating to sustainability. Mr. Reese said eight of the partners, including the LVPC, are funded to work on various issues regarding sustainability. The LVPC will be working on energy and climate components that are currently not in the county comprehensive plan and work on housing issues. He briefly reviewed the issues the other partners are working on. Mr. Reese said the work we are doing on housing will be coordinated through a Housing Advisory Committee. He provided a list of the Committee members. The group first met last Thursday. The consultant we have working with us on the housing issues, RKG Associates from Virginia, has conducted interviews with those on the Committee and other stakeholders. Mr. Reese described the issues related to housing that we will be addressing in our work. The end product of all this work will be a strategic plan which will identify all the things that need to be done, who will be doing the work, what time frame, under what funding, and all the partnerships and collaborations that will be required. By the end of the year we will have a draft of the housing and jobs/housing plans.

### ***NEW BUSINESS - None***

### ***CORRESPONDENCE - None***

***EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT***

Mr. Kaiser said the recent Department of Labor Workforce News Release shows unemployment in the Lehigh Valley is currently 8.6%, which is high. There are only two other areas that are higher. One is Johnstown and the other is the Wilkes Barre/Scranton area. The state level unemployment rate is 7.9%. Mr. Kaiser gave the Commission members a handout on this information.

Mr. Greco 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 28, 2013*

### **MINUTES**

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, February 28, 2013 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  
Karen Duerholz  
Steve Glickman  
Michael Hefele  
Kent Herman  
Ben Howells  
Edward Hozza  
Kenneth McClain  
Christina Morgan  
Sara Pandl  
Stephen Repasch  
Lisa Scheller

##### **Northampton County**

Christen Borso  
Becky Bradley  
Gordon Campbell  
John Cusick  
John Diacogiannis  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Elliott  
Charles Fraust  
George Gemmel  
Darlene Heller  
Kevin Lott  
Ross Marcus  
Thomas Nolan  
Pamela Pearson  
Michael Reph

***Members absent:*** Armand Greco, Virginia Savage, Donna Wright, Matthew Glennon, Bob Lammi and Seth Vaughn.

***Staff present:*** Mike Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, David Berryman, David Manhardt, and Sue Rockwell.

***Public Present:*** None

### **COURTESY OF THE FLOOR**

Mr. Herman welcomed new Commission member Pamela Pearson to the Commission.

***MINUTES***

After a brief review, the minutes of the January 31, 2013 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Howells. Mr. Repasch seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Morgan and Mr. Glickman abstaining.

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

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

***Environment Committee***

Mr. Repasch said there are two summary sheet items on page 8. 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 over the past month we have been working on housing issues for the HUD Sustainability project. There are three aspects to this work. One of them is updating a report we created in 2007 on housing affordability. The second one is creating a new report regarding the balance between where jobs are located in the Valley and where people live in the Valley and whether there are any transportation issues associated with that. The third is a study to look at the housing sales data over a five year period from 2008 to 2012.

Our consultant, RKG Associates, is working on the housing affordability and housing balance issues. Since they are from Virginia, they schedule visits to the Lehigh Valley for three or four days at a time. Their last visit was in January. One of their main purposes for coming in January was to meet for the first time with the Housing Committee of about thirty people to basically explain what we are going to be doing. RKG will be back in late March or early April. They are taking a month off in February and collecting a variety of data regarding housing and the jobs/housing balance. They didn't feel the need to meet again until they have much more of that work done. At the next meeting they will have some preliminary results that they can present to the Housing Committee and will be able to get some feedback. The other part of it is the housing sales data report. Ms. Obi is working on this report. We are updating a report created in 2009 using sales data from 2008 for both Lehigh and Northampton counties. Under the HUD program, we will be developing trends over a five year period from 2008 to 2012. We have received all of the housing sales data from both counties for that time period. The data has been processed, and Ms. Obi is putting together individual chapters by year and then we will compare the years, including the five year trend. That report will be completed in draft in mid-April, and we then will bring it to the Commission. The main point is to get this information to the housing consultant as soon as possible so they can build it into the other two studies.

We are meeting with the consortium this coming Tuesday and we will be presenting the regional population forecasts as one of the building blocks of all of this work as well as the employment forecasts if they are finalized. Mr. Herman asked if the work is moving along our projected timeline. Mr. Reese said we are on schedule in terms of cost expenditures and the timeline. Mr. Elliott said that the snapshot from 2008 to 2012 is somewhat of an anomaly for housing. He asked how the consultant will factor that into the study. Mr. Reese said it's not the only anomalous time frame we've encountered in the area. We have prepared housing reports from 1999 and earlier that give us some historical perspective on the peaks and valleys. Mr. Glickman said he remembered as this grant was being written that there was a concern that an overseer from HUD would be directing where we are going. He wanted to know if this happened or have they been more hands off. Mr. Reese said we are somewhat insulated from that because LVEDC is the administrator of the grant. They have the direct contact with HUD on a monthly basis. Mr. Reese said one of the things HUD did early in the process was to apply a new requirement on LVEDC which is the creation of a Regional Analysis of Impediments. This was not part of this grant when it was originally prepared. The Analysis of Impediments is a separate study from work being done by LVPC. It is about a \$60,000-\$80,000 requirement that will help the Cities and the Counties meet Federal requirements for their CDBG programs. It was imposed by HUD early on. Mr. Herman asked who is doing that work. Mr. Reese said a consultant is doing this work.

## ***NEW BUSINESS***

### *Municipal Employment Projections*

Mr. Kaiser said we previously released the county employment forecasts and tonight we will discuss the municipal employment forecasts. We need more refined data for our travel model. Commission members were provided a handout explaining the methodology used to develop the forecasts. The travel demand model uses population and employment data to calculate the expected demand for transportation facilities. Mr. Kaiser said there are several factors that enter into where people locate places of employment in the area. One of the factors is available public sewer and water. Mr. Kaiser said public sewer and water availability define a very definite geography of development in the Lehigh Valley. In Lehigh County they built a sewer system out to western Lehigh County in the early 1970's. This has created a whole new employment center in that area. It was originally designed to take care of a sewage problem in the Ancient Oaks subdivision. The leadership in the area saw the possibilities in connection between sewage treatment and economic development. This created the growth in that area and it has been developing ever since. In Northampton County the construction of Rt. 33 has become important for employment development in Northampton County. Mr. Kaiser said the evolution of employment areas doesn't happen randomly.

Mr. Manhardt said once we got our base information on zoning and land use we did a two step process to allocate and distribute these employees through traffic analysis zones. We looked at three factors when doing the analysis. They are available space, zoning, and urban lands or sewer and water areas. To determine available space, we looked at vacant lands based on existing land use. Then we cut out undevelopable areas. They include agricultural easements, agricultural preservation zones, environmental protection zones, parks and preserved open space, steep slopes, hydrography and floodplains were all removed from the vacant land area. When these are removed, we are left with developable acreage. We took the developable acreage and categorized it by zoning. We did consider residential zoned properties to account for home based businesses as well as small businesses interspersed within residential areas.

Mr. Manhardt said in addition to acreage, we looked at available building space, either existing or planned. This data was provided by LVEDC. Available building space was classified as follows: manufacturing, office/business, retail/commercial and warehousing. When we added available building space to available land we estimated there is enough space for 214,000 additional employees. The 2040 projection is for 131,414 additional employees. Therefore, there is enough land and building space to accommodate our 2040 employment projection.

Mr. Manhardt then discussed how employment growth was allocated to urban and non-urban areas. We analyzed 2010 employment as it relates to urban areas and found that five out of six employees were located within urban areas. We allocated new employment to urban and non-urban areas based on this ratio. This provided us with an adjusted additional employment distribution. The 2010 employment was added to get an adjusted employment total. This total was then pro-rated to match the 2040 employment forecast totals. The distribution by municipality is shown on Charts 1 and 2. The municipalities that had all three factors – available space, urban land and proper zoning - are going to see the biggest increase based on this projection. A few of these municipalities are Allentown, Bethlehem City (N), Lower Macungie, Upper Macungie, Upper Saucon and Whitehall. They accounted for 60% of the entire Valley's building space. This has a big impact on where the employees are going. Areas that are not going to see a lot of growth are those missing urban areas, available space or appropriate zoning. The growth areas follow the general pattern of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Plan. Ms. Bradley asked where we got the available space data. Mr. Manhardt said he got the data from LVEDC's real estate data base. Ms. Bradley said their data is mostly larger spaces and it doesn't necessarily capture the small spaces in Easton. Mr. Manhardt said he didn't know what their size threshold is. Ms. Bradley asked if we could find out. Mr. Repasch asked if we have done this before and if we were close with our projections. Mr. Kaiser said we have done this before. The employment projections tend to be easier to measure than the population projections because you need more urban variables to attract employment than you need with the distribution of population. The population distribution tends to be more dispersed because you have developers building in rural areas. The way areas develop is quite unpredictable. Ms. Bradley asked if this accounts for immigration patterns also. She said Easton, West Easton and Wilson are getting a lot of the new population migration. Mr. Kaiser said yes. Ms. Bradley said LVEDC tends to want larger footprints in their database, and that is not realistic in most of the older communities. They don't account for that space. Ms. Bradley is concerned that this will only be a recruitment tool for western Lehigh County and not account for the real pressure we are seeing in Northampton County. Mr. Herman said obviously this is important for transportation planning. Mr. Kaiser said we model demographic and employment data as input to the travel model. The travel model tracks the travel connection by travel time to work, proximity to roads and availability of employment and residential. He said we have only one step to go. We have to do calculations of the number of households from the population data. Mr. Kaiser said we will come to the Committee with our forecasts of households when they are finished.

***CORRESPONDENCE - None***

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

Mr. Dougherty made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Repasch 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

*March 28, 2013*

### **MINUTES**

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, March 28, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matt Glennon chaired the meeting.

#### ***Members in attendance:***

##### **Lehigh County**

Norman Blatt  
Percy Dougherty  
Steven Glickman  
Ben Howells  
Christina Morgan  
Stephen Repasch  
Virginia Savage  
Lisa Scheller  
Peter Schweyer  
Donna Wright

##### **Northampton County**

Christen Borso  
Becky Bradley  
Gordon Campbell  
John Cusick  
John Diacogiannis  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Elliott  
Charles Fraust  
George Gemmel  
Matthew Glennon  
Darlene Heller  
Ross Marcus  
Pamela Pearson  
Michael Reph  
Elinor Warner

***Members absent:*** Karen Duerholz, Armand Greco, Michael Hefele, Kent Herman, Edward Hozza, Kenneth McClain, Sara Pandl, Bob Lammi, Kevin Lott, Thomas Nolan and Seth Vaughn.

***Staff present:*** Mike Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Joseph Gurinko, David Berryman, Teresa Mackey, Sue Rockwell, Travis Bartholomew, Chris Mukkadan and Josh Spano.

***Public Present:*** Tom Petrucci, Bath Borough; John Kempes, Celebration Fireworks; Darrin Heckman, Celebration Fireworks.

## ***COURTESY OF THE FLOOR***

Mr. Kaiser welcomed new Commission members Peter Schweyer and Elinor Warner to the Commission. Mr. Kaiser welcomed two new staff members – Chris Mukkadan and Josh Spano.

## ***MINUTES***

After a brief review, the minutes of the February 28, 2013 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Repasch. Ms. Bradley seconded the motion. The motion carried.

## ***COMMITTEE REPORTS***

### ***Comprehensive Planning Committee***

#### ***Horizon Builders/Celebration Fireworks – Borough of Slatington (County SALDO Application)***

Mr. Berryman stated that this is a County SALDO application for Horizon Builders/Celebration Fireworks in the Borough of Slatington. The Borough does not have its own Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. It is the only municipality in Lehigh County that doesn't have its own subdivision ordinance. Both Lehigh and Northampton counties have county ordinances that cover subdivision and land developments for municipalities that don't have an ordinance. In January, the Commission voted to allow a combined preliminary/final plan submission which is what we have in front of us for review, comment and action tonight.

Mr. Berryman said John Kemps, the owner of Celebration Fireworks, and his engineer, Darrin Heckman from Lehigh Engineering, are in attendance. Mr. Heckman said the property is in the Borough of Slatington. It is a residual slate quarry of about 43 acres. It is zoned rural/residential. We went to the Slatington Zoning Hearing Board to obtain a use variance to put this use on the property. The Borough has welcomed Mr. Kemps as a business in this area and for reclaiming the property. Mr. Heckman presented an aerial photo of the site. Mr. Kemps is proposing to put a 60 x 100 foot wide office building on the site. The other highlighted buildings as shown on the plans are going to be fireworks magazines scattered throughout the property. Mr. Kemps has to adhere to Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (BATF) regulations regarding the placement of the magazines. There are a number of setbacks that must be adhered to. The location of the magazines will be in an area which is currently slate. There will be almost no increase of impervious coverage. Mr. Kemps is proposing a 24 foot wide access lane which will allow two vehicles to pass and is the only real improvement to the property.

Mr. Heckman said they attended the Comprehensive Planning Committee meeting on Tuesday with their plans. Keystone Consulting Engineers provided comments that need to be addressed related to the survey. Also, Mr. Reese and Mr. Bartholomew have provided some drainage comments that need to be addressed. Mr. Heckman said we have no problems complying with the items in the review letter. There are however two waivers we are going to be requesting this evening. One of them is the plan scale. The plan on the board is 1" = 60' so it can fit on one sheet so you can see the property in its entirety. There is a second sheet to this plan set that is 1" = 50' which is the appropriate plan scale which has the details for erosion control, stormwater management and grading. We are providing this information but not on the plan that is actually getting recorded. We are also requesting a waiver for curbing. This is a rural residential district in Slatington Borough on Seventh Street which is a very rural road. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the draft letter from the Commission which includes approval of the waivers. Mr. Howells seconded the motion.

Ms. Morgan asked if there was an opportunity for public comment from people that live in the nearby area. Mr. Kemps said the Borough does not have a planning commission. The zoning waivers requested required public notice and public comment and the public attended that meeting. This is required by law. Mr. Heckman said they did notify all the property owners within 200 feet of the boundaries of the property as required by the Borough zoning ordinance. Some people did attend the Zoning Hearing meeting. They did have questions and we responded to them. Mr. Kemps explained his operation at that time. He said they received a favorable approval from the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Gemmel asked if they were aware there is a separate process for subdivision and land development. Mr. Heckman said yes, that was a condition of the Zoning Hearing approval. Mr. Heckman said the entire property is 43 acres. We are subdividing this property and doing the land development. Two parcels are being subdivided from the parcel. Each contains an existing residential dwelling. Mr. Kemps is acquiring the residual parcel.

Ms. Bradley asked if there will be fireworks testing as part of this operation. Mr. Heckman said no. There will be no issues with noise or smoke. They will be stored in sealed containers meeting BATF setback requirements that need to be adhered to. Ms. Bradley asked how this site will be secured so people can't come on the property and disturb the fireworks. Mr. Heckman said the access point will be gated. Mr. Kemps will be there seven days a week but not 24 hours a day. Mr. Kemps discussed the security measures for the site, discussing the security and integrity of the magazines. There are no cameras on the magazines but there is security around the building. The gate has double locks on it. Someone can walk up to a magazine, but it is unlikely they can do a lot of damage without having a vehicle. One of the requirements is the property only has one single point of entry.

Ms. Bradley asked how much commercial traffic is expected. Mr. Kemps said next to none. Mr. Heckman said Mr. Kemps is the only full time employee. There will be three part time employees, and the business is not open to the public. Ms. Bradley asked about delivery since 7<sup>th</sup> Street is a rural road. She also wanted to know if the road is paved. Mr. Heckman said it is paved, and three or four times a year a tractor trailer will come in to drop off supplies that will be disbursed to the magazines on the site. Mr. Repasch asked how they will be delivered from the site. Mr. Heckman said once everything is assembled to go to a show it will be delivered by a pick-up truck or small box truck. He said they are strictly for shows, not for retail sale. Mr. Gemmel asked about coordination between the Slatington Fire Department, Walnutport and Lehigh County Emergency Management. Mr. Kemps said he has spoken with them and explained the proposal. He said also the Slatington Fire Department uses the property to do training and they will still have access to the property.

Mr. Reph asked what the allowed minimum distance of a magazine is from a residential property. Mr. Heckman said it is 300 feet. The closest dwellings are the two already on the property. Mr. Glickman asked if any roads had to be constructed on the property. Mr. Heckman said no, we don't have to construct any roads on the property because pick-up trucks can drive on the compacted slate. The only road being constructed is the access road. Mr. Glickman asked if this would be an appropriate use anywhere else in the Borough without this variance. Mr. Heckman said no, there are no other areas in the Borough that would allow for this use without a variance. Mr. Glennon called for the vote. The motion carried.

#### *The Waterfront – City of Allentown – Subdivision/Land Development of Regional Significance*

Mr. Berryman said this is an advisory review of the "Waterfront Project" that meets the county comprehensive plan criteria for a development of regional significance. This is an existing industrial site with a proposal of retail, office and residential redevelopment on the site. Mr. Berryman said six years ago we saw zoning regulations that governed the development of the site. Our comments at that time were we did not want to see a project in the floodway of the Lehigh River due to the possibilities of flooding. Redevelopment within the flood fringe would be appropriate with adequate floodproofing. All of this

property is outside of the floodway. There is an area of the site that is within the flood fringe. Part of this area will be a parking lot and the building in the area is proposed to be floodproofed and will be raised a minimum of 4 ½ feet above the flood level. The flood level in that area is 261 feet. The building will be at a minimum of 265 feet. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the draft letter. Mr. Schweyer seconded the motion. Mr. Cusick asked if this project is being funded as part of the NIZ. Mr. Berryman said he believes it is. Mr. Glennon called for the vote. The motion passed with Mr. Cusick, Mr. Gemmel and Ms. Scheller voting no.

### *2012 Subdivision & Building Activity Report*

Mr. Berryman said every year the staff puts together a report on the subdivision and land development activity that comes through the LVPC. We have been doing these reports since 1973. Basically the number of plans for 2012 has been the same as 2011. We had 358 plans submitted in 2011 and 356 submitted in 2012. The interest is in the number of total and approved lots. Total lots are a combination of proposed and approved lots. An approved lot is something that has gone through the entire municipal planning process. The elected body has approved the plans, we have signed the plans, and they have been recorded at the County Recorder of Deed's Office. Mr. Berryman said you will note in 2012 there was less activity than in 2011. This is the same for residential and non-residential development. He said a lot of the projects coming through are projects that have been proposed many years ago and are just making it through the process. For example, the total number of approved lots in Upper Macungie was 209. Of those, 206 were from a subdivision originally proposed in 2008. These projects are taking a much longer time getting through the process and taking a much longer time to be built. Also, the phases of these projects are much smaller. During the building boom of the last decade, we used to see phases of building lots of 30, 40 or 50 at a time. Now you are seeing 10 lots at a time or less. One of the most interesting things we did was to compare regional unemployment rates to subdivision activity back to 1973. Mr. Berryman explained this comparison with a chart showing data from 1973-2012. In 1973 when we did our first report, subdivision activity was substantial; almost 28,000 lots proposed by developers and a 2.8% unemployment rate, which we have never seen since. Since then, there have been a number of recessions with higher unemployment and corresponding lower subdivision activity. There is definitely a correlation between unemployment and subdivision activity. Basically, demographic trends, unemployment trends and national economy trends are all converging in the Lehigh Valley. Mr. Repasch asked if the chart is on the website. Mr. Kaiser said we will make sure it is on the website. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to release the report to the public. Ms. Wright seconded the motion. The motion carried.

### *Reviews*

Ms. Dreisbach said there are five summary sheet items on page 11 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Schweyer made a motion to approve the comments. The motion carried with Mr. Reph abstaining on item #1 and Ms. Morgan abstaining on items #2, #3 and #4.

### *Environment Committee*

#### *Status Report on Lehigh Valley Trails Study*

Mr. Kaiser said Ms. Mackey is currently working on an inventory and gap analysis of trails in the area. The study should be completed in the next month or so. Ms. Mackey said in 2009 we did a comprehensive update of our trails data. We had seen a lot of municipal park and recreation plans coming in for review and we noticed that a lot of them were planning proposed trails across the two counties but they were all in separate documents. The main objective of the 2009 update was to get a big picture of what

was going on. In the process of doing the report DCNR had requested we structure our data to what they have in their database. They were trying to do a statewide network of trails and they wanted to standardize the information that was collected. We expanded a lot of the information we recorded for the trails. Ms. Mackey identified the types of information collected on trails. We also created another data set for the trail features. Ms. Mackey identified the features.

Ms. Mackey said the current project is being done in partnership with the Lehigh Valley Greenways Conservation Landscape Initiative and it is partly funded by a grant from DCNR. DCNR wanted to document where the gaps are across the state so that was one of the components for this project. In addition to the gaps, we were to update the trail data itself. Also, DCNR wanted us to include some type of information on safe road crossings. Then we will have the final product which is the report and updating DCNR's data.

Ms. Mackey said in the handout packet there is a map and a table with detailed information on the trails. There are four categories of trails: Open, Under Construction, Proposed and Conceptual. The difference between proposed and conceptual is that for proposed trails the land is either owned or under agreement for where the trail is planned and for conceptual trails it is not. A list of the trails and some of the trail features are included on the map. This study is close to being finalized. There is one more municipality to contact for information. Another map in the packet shows where the trail gaps are in the two counties. We identified ten gaps, and for each gap there is an individual map. Ms. Mackey briefly identified each gap. She said we will be including in the appendix a list of at-grade road crossings on state roads provided by PennDOT. This is mostly bicycle crossings. It doesn't include every pedestrian crossing. We are going to have references to the manuals that are used - Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, which is the one that PennDOT uses, and the AASHTO document, Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities. For the final product, we are going to update the trail report and upload the data to the DCNR system. The statewide trail map and the map showing the gaps both are on the DCNR website.

Ms. Dreisbach said she noticed there is a Pennsylvania Highlands Trail Network in at least two places in the southern part of the two counties. There are already trails there. She asked if they are linked together. Ms. Mackey said the network is basically running along existing trails if they can. They don't want to create new trails if something is already in place. Basically those trails are stacked right now. Mr. Cusick said the DCNR Tow Path on the Delaware River has substantial damage and there is some construction underway, but the map indicates it is open. Ms. Mackey said we don't update the data every time there is a breach in the trail and make an adjustment because it can be fixed in between updates. The D&L website will show if anything is closed. These maps are more for planning purposes and weren't meant to be trail guides. Ms. Bradley said when they did the trail in Easton, AASHTO worked against them in their really tight urban environment that has no ability to expand into downtown. She said they got some really good resource information from the American League of Cyclists which helped with some of the urban issues in the downtown portion where there is a sidewalk and road network as part of the trail. Ms. Bradley asked if we are planning to do any regional promotion of a trail guide for the public. Ms. Mackey said at either a Lehigh Valley Greenways meeting or D&L Trail Council meeting there was a discussion about creating a fold out map showing all of the trails. She doesn't know what their timeframe is for creating the map. Mr. Campbell asked if there is any documentation showing when the parts that are under construction may be complete. Ms. Mackey said the ones shown under construction for this round are those that will be under construction shortly or should be done by the end of the year.

## ***Transportation Committee***

### ***Status Report on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP 2013-2016)***

Mr. Gurinko said currently there is a proposal on the table at the State level to increase transportation funding significantly. At the Federal level, we are still waiting for something big to happen. The Lehigh Valley though has been having record amounts of money spent on transportation improvements. Last year we had 41 projects with a total value of \$210 million which is by far the largest year we have had in terms of the number of projects. When we were doing projects like the I-78 Corridor and the Rt. 33 Extension we might have had a higher value but as far as the number of projects it is by far more projects than we have ever had before. We finished about half of those projects. The other half, about 18 or 19 projects, are ongoing. We have a pretty full schedule for this year also. Mr. Gurinko provided a list of ten projects that he will be discussing tonight. This is a mix of projects already started, projects that will be started this year and projects in the near future. There is quite a bit going on in the Lehigh Valley. That is due in large part to PennDOT's ability to get projects out and keep them moving through the process. We will continue to work closely with them to take advantage of the engineering shortcuts they have taken in order to get through the process faster. Mr. Gurinko briefly reviewed the 10 projects listed below.

1. Route 22/MacArthur Road Interchange (Whitehall Twp.)
2. Route 22/Fullerton Avenue Interchange/Lehigh River Bridge (Whitehall Twp./Hanover Twp.)
3. American Parkway Bridge (Allentown)
4. Route 412 Widening (Bethlehem)
5. Route 145 Safety Project (Whitehall Twp.)
6. Route 33/Route 512 Interchange (Plainfield Twp.)
7. Easton Intermodal Center (Easton)
8. 15<sup>th</sup> Street/Ward Street Bridges (Allentown)
- 9.. 8<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge (Allentown)
10. Tatamy Bridge (Tatamy Borough/Forks Twp.)

Mr. Gurinko said this is just a small number of the projects in our Transportation Improvement Program. Between highway, bridges and transit our four year TIP program has a value of \$305 million. As more money becomes available, PennDOT is ready to get projects out the door and get them through to completion so we have a safer and well-maintained network. We will be doing all we can to make sure the planning is in place so the correct priority projects move forward.

## ***OLD BUSINESS***

### ***Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project***

Mr. Reese gave a brief background on the HUD Sustainability Project for the new Commission members. This is a project that began in 2011 with an eleven member consortium of organizations that submitted a grant application and successfully competed nationally for about \$3.5 million from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. Reese said we are now in the process of doing the work. The Planning Commission work involves three elements: a housing element, and energy and climate elements. The latter two are not currently in the county comprehensive plan. The primary work of late has been on the housing element. There are three pieces to that. We looked at 2008 housing sales data for the Lehigh Valley in a previous report. Under this grant, we have collected data for 2009 – 2012 to create a five year trend. Ms. Obi is doing most of the work. The other two parts of our housing work include an update of the Housing

Affordability Study, which we first created in 2007, and a Jobs/Housing Balance Study. We have consulting assistance from RKG Associates in Alexandria, Virginia to help with this work. For the Jobs/Housing Balance, we are trying to see what the relationships are between where people live and work in the valley, what kind of commute is associated with that. The consultant is using a new database where they are identifying workers and job locations at the census block level. The consultants are analyzing all that information throughout the two counties to see what those relationships are. We are also doing some work on the Jobs/Housing Balance Study in-house. We are looking at the relationship of transit service to that study. We have collected information from LANta on boardings and unboardings at each transit stop. We are looking at the primary locations for people getting on the buses and the primary destinations associated with that for the morning rush hour, afternoon rush hour and throughout the entire day. We will be meeting with LANta to discuss the information. We will bring this information to the Commission when we have more work completed.

### ***NEW BUSINESS***

Mr. Kaiser said everyone has a copy of the LVPC Annual Report. We completed a lot of work in 2012. This report gives a description of our work done during the year.

### ***CORRESPONDENCE - None***

### ***EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT***

Mr. Kaiser stated that he plans to retire on May 31, 2013. Mr. Kaiser thanked the Commission members for their hard work on behalf of the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. He stated that he has met on several occasions over the past few months with the LVPC officers to discuss succession planning. Ms. Dreisbach is the chair of the search committee that includes Mr. Glennon, Mr. Herman, Mr. Glickman and Mr. Lammi. The deadline for applications is Friday, April 26, 2013. Attached is a copy of Mr. Kaiser's retirement memorandum to the Commission.

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

*April 25, 2013*

### **MINUTES**

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, April 25, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matt Glennon chaired the meeting.

#### ***Members in attendance:***

##### **Lehigh County**

Norman Blatt  
Percy Dougherty  
Karen Duerholz  
Steven Glickman  
Armand Greco  
Michael Hefele  
Kent Herman  
Ben Howells  
Edward Hozza  
Sara Pandl  
Stephen Repasch

##### **Northampton County**

Becky Bradley  
Gordon Campbell  
John Cusick  
John Diacogiannis  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Fraust  
George Gemmel  
Matthew Glennon  
Darlene Heller  
Bob Lammi  
Ross Marcus  
Thomas Nolan  
Pamela Pearson  
Michael Reph

***Members absent:*** Kenneth McClain, Christina Morgan, Virginia Savage, Lisa Scheller, Peter Schweyer, Donna Wright, Christen Borso, Charles Elliott, Kevin Lott, Seth Vaughn, Elinor Warner.

***Staff present:*** Mike Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Joseph Gurinko, David Berryman, Teresa Mackey, Sue Rockwell.

***Public Present:*** Jeremy Fogel, Tim Harrison and Steve Nelson

### **COURTESY OF THE FLOOR**

**MINUTES**

After a brief review, the minutes of the March 28, 2013 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Dougherty. Mr. Repasch seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Pandl and Mr. Lammi abstaining.

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

Mr. Kaiser said Hamilton Crossings is a subdivision we received for review recently. We talked to the Comprehensive Planning Committee about it Tuesday, and since that time we received a letter from the engineer, Harold Newton, on behalf of Hamilton Crossings LP. They are withdrawing their application for a subdivision and land development review and stormwater review. They are going to submit an application in the future. Lower Macungie Township also sent us a letter stating they have been working on the project for a couple of years. They believe the LVPC would benefit by further discussion with the developer and the Township. Therefore, we removed this item from tonight's agenda. This is an information item only.

***MPC Reviews***

Mr. Glennon said there are seven summary items on page nine of the agenda attachments. Mr. Howells made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Pandl seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Mr. Kaiser said there is a handout every month that we don't talk about often and that is the Summary of Subdivision Activity report. Mr. Berryman said the summary report is published monthly. Basically, this report shows the extremely low level of subdivision activity continuing into 2013. Secondly, there have been no non-residential projects approved for March across the entire Lehigh Valley. Mr. Berryman said this is the first time this has happened in at least 12 years.

***Environment Committee - None******Transportation Committee******Report on TIP Projects under construction in 2013***

Mr. Gurinko said we have thirty six TIP projects under construction in 2013 as shown on the handout. Of those projects, twenty four are maintenance projects. We have eight projects that are safety-related and another four or five that could be classified as capacity improvements. Currently, twenty are already under construction. Three more projects will start in the spring. Another nine will start in the summer and four will start in the fall.

Mr. Gurinko gave a brief status report on some of the major projects. The Tatamy Bridge project started last year and is scheduled to be completed in the fall of 2013. The Rt. 412 widening improvements in South Bethlehem are under construction and are scheduled to be completed by 2015. The Ward St./15<sup>th</sup> St. Bridge is under construction and should be completed by the end of this year. The Easton Intermodal Transit Center project in downtown Easton will begin probably next month and will be wrapped up in the fall of 2014. The American Parkway project is the new bridge across the Lehigh River. This project is scheduled to be finished in the second half of 2014. The Route 22/MacArthur Road project is underway and should be completed by the second half of 2014. By the end of 2013 we expect to see about twelve of these projects

wrapped up. Mr. Gurinko said all of this information was compiled between the LVPC staff, PennDOT District Office and LANta.

Mr. Gurinko said this whole picture will change if the governor's proposal for additional transportation funding gets passed sometime this year. If it passes, we are looking at an additional \$1.8 billion per year five years from now for capital improvements in transportation. Mr. Dougherty asked what we expect to see if the Governor's proposal is passed. Mr. Gurinko said the top project would be the Rt. 22 widening of Section 400 which runs from Airport Road to 15<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Dougherty asked if that improvement can still be completed if it doesn't pass. Mr. Gurinko said there is currently no other funding available. Ms. Dreisbach asked how the Hellertown Streetscape project fit into these improvement projects. Mr. Gurinko said the streetscape project is scheduled to be done this year. It includes transit improvements, signage and streetscape type improvements. Mr. Glennon asked about the Ackermanville Bridge on Rt. 191 in Washington Township. Mr. Gurinko said they are only going to address the bridge replacement due to financial constraints. The straightening of the road will not be part of the project. Mr. Hozza asked about the transportation alternatives program. Mr. Gurinko said right now the LVTS has all of their allocation for the Lehigh Valley committed through 2014. He expects as these projects get completed somewhere near the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2014, we will be looking to go out with another program.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### *Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project*

Mr. Reese said we are continuing to work on the housing aspects of the HUD grant. The staff is looking at housing sales over a period of five years. In 2009 we created a report looking at the housing sales data for Lehigh and Northampton counties for the year 2008. Under this grant we are adding the years 2009-2012 to get a five year trend associated with that data. At this point we have a draft of the report. In addition, we have a housing consultant, RKG Associates out of Alexandria, Virginia. They are continuing to do their work under the contract. Primarily what they are working on is looking at the relationship between where jobs are located in the Valley and where housing is located and any kind of interesting relationships associated with that. They have created a very detailed draft methodology on how to analyze the data. On May 1<sup>st</sup> we are having our second meeting with the Housing Advisory Committee to review that proposed methodology.

### *Release of Trails Study*

Ms. Mackey said this project was done in partnership with the Lehigh Valley Greenways Landscape Initiative and was partly funded by a grant from DCNR. There are four parts to this project. The first one was updating the existing trails data. Second, DCNR wanted us to identify some trail gaps in the two counties. They also wanted us to provide safe road crossing information which would help the municipalities to incorporate safe road crossings into their trails. The final products then have to be updated and provided to DCNR.

Ms. Mackey said the final trails map, Map 1, is in the report that has been provided to each Commission member. There are four categories of trails: Open, Under Construction, Proposed and Conceptual. Ms. Mackey briefly reviewed some of the major changes to the map since the 2009 report. Map 2 is the Lehigh Valley Trail Gaps – Key Map for Lehigh and Northampton Counties showing ten gaps. This map shows gaps within any given trail, for instance, on the D&L there were some gaps that are in the trail itself. There are other instances where an open trail could connect with another open trail such as the Southern Bethlehem Greenway and Saucon Rail Trail. Ms. Mackey said DCNR is reviewing the report and there may be some minor changes.

***NEW BUSINESS******Municipal Household Projections***

Mr. Kaiser said a report on household projections has been provided to Commission members. It contains a data sheet – Table 1 - that gives our projections of households for each of the municipalities through 2040. It also shows the changes in each municipality during that period of time. Then we have a series of maps that show households by municipality. We also did some studies of persons per household. Persons per household generally have been going downward in the last 30 years. Then there was an increase in 2010. It may be because of larger immigrant families or the recession. We applied that data to similar data at the municipal level to come up with our forecasts. The forecasts are used for a wide variety of purposes. One of the purposes we use it for is it becomes a piece of the data input to our transportation model.

Mr. Kaiser said we started out with county forecasts and then developed municipal forecasts. We used the county forecasts as a regional control so that the municipal forecasts match up with the county forecasts. There aren't any real surprises in this picture. It is about what you would expect to occur. Most of the areas where houses are being built have good infrastructure with available sewer and water facilities. The upper tier of townships in Northampton County is gaining more households. They are basically suburban townships, and it will be interesting to see what happens as far as the provision of infrastructure to those areas and possible conflicts between those trying to preserve farmland and those that want to develop it.

We have another set of maps that show the density of development. Most of the higher density areas are in the cities and boroughs, and where you expect to see them increasing are in the townships that are in the perimeter of these areas.

Basically the main growth in households is along the corridor that follows Rt. 22 and I-78 from Easton westward out to Upper and Lower Macungie townships and those areas. This is going to be the main area of continued growth. The suburbs will look the same but there will be more of them. We can expect to see a lot more small subdivisions and developments.

Mr. Kaiser said these are the forecasts we propose to use for our work and we would like to begin to use them. He asked the Commission for an endorsement of the forecasts. Mr. Repasch said from a presentation standpoint it would be helpful to see it in a graphic format. Mr. Kaiser said we can do that. Mr. Greco made a motion to authorize an endorsement of the forecasts. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried.

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

Mr. Dougherty made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Lammi 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

*May 30, 2013*

### **MINUTES**

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, May 30, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matt Glennon chaired the meeting.

#### ***Members in attendance:***

##### **Lehigh County**

Norman Blatt  
Karen Duerholz  
Steven Glickman  
Armand Greco  
Michael Hefele  
Kent Herman  
Ben Howells  
Edward Hozza  
Kenneth McClain  
Christina Morgan  
Sara Pandl  
Stephen Repasch  
Virginia Savage  
Lisa Scheller  
Peter Schweyer

##### **Northampton County**

Christen Borso  
Becky Bradley  
Gordon Campbell  
John Cusick  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Elliott  
Charles Fraust  
George Gemmel  
Matthew Glennon  
Darlene Heller  
Kevin Lott  
Ross Marcus  
Thomas J. Nolan  
Pamela Pearson  
Elinor Warner

***Members absent:*** Percy Dougherty, Donna Wright, John Diacogiannis, Bob Lammi, Michael Reph and Seth Vaughn.

***Staff present:*** Mike Kaiser, Geoffrey Reese, Joseph Gurinko, David Berryman, Teresa Mackey and Sue Rockwell.

***Public Present:*** Tim Harrison, Hamilton Crossings; Steven Nelson; Katrina Wehr, The Morning Call; Randy Kraft, WFMZ TV; Ron Beitler, Lower Macungie Township resident; Joe Hilliard; Jonathan Hugg, Clark Hill Thorp Reed Law Firm.

### **COURTESY OF THE FLOOR**

## ***MINUTES***

After a brief review, the minutes of the April 25, 2013 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Greco. Mr. Howells seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Morgan and Mr. Elliott abstaining.

## ***COMMITTEE REPORTS***

### ***Comprehensive Planning Committee***

#### ***Hamilton Crossings – Lower Macungie Township – Subdivision/Land Development of Regional Significance***

Ms. Dreisbach said the Transportation Committee and the Comprehensive Planning Committee met together on Tuesday to discuss this project. Mr. Kaiser said at the joint Committee meeting we presented the staff position, and attached to tonight's agenda is a draft review letter addressed to the Township Planning Commission. Mr. Berryman said Hamilton Crossings is a proposed regional shopping center of about 590,000 square feet located in Lower Macungie Township, Lehigh County on two parcels along Rt. 222 (the by-pass) in Lower Macungie Township. The shopping center will be on both sides of Krocks Road. The project consists of several anchor stores and restaurants with 2,500 parking spaces.

Mr. Berryman then reviewed some historical information related to the project. In September 2007, the Rt. 222 by-pass was opened to traffic. The cost was \$140 million, and the main priority of this project was to alleviate congestion and traffic problems on Hamilton Boulevard (old Rt. 222) in the Township. As can be seen on the map on the board, Hamilton Boulevard runs parallel to the by-pass. Before the by-pass was built, all the east/west traffic was on Hamilton Boulevard. In 2009, we saw a shopping center project for this site. The LVPC wrote a consistency letter for it because the project did not have the impacts it does today. This review for the staff is all about scale and size. It wasn't about appropriate land use. It wasn't about whether it was a Brownfield, Greenfield or Grayfield. The scale of this project has impacts and consequences not only to the traffic and the roads but to the nearby residents. This is what we discuss in our letter. In regards to the impacts to traffic, the project is large at 590,000 square feet; it would be the third or fourth largest shopping center in the Lehigh Valley. The only centers larger in size would be the Lehigh Valley Mall, which is over one million square feet, Airport Center, Whitehall Mall and Northampton Crossings. All of these projects have one thing in common. They are all on interchanges and are not located on just any road. Mr. Berryman said interchanges can handle that amount of traffic. Krocks Road is an intersection. Intersections can't handle traffic the way interchanges do. One of our main points in the letter is that the problem is the size of the project.

Secondly, PennDOT designed the Rt. 222 by-pass project with specific parameters in mind so as not to recreate the problems on Hamilton Boulevard. They did not want to recreate a road with multiple driveways for multiple commercial properties with all traffic exiting and entering the road. When Rt. 222 was built, PennDOT bought property access back from property owners along Rt. 222. Our draft letter specifically mentions this. It goes to PennDOT's intentions to the purpose for the road. They were not proposing to open this road to anyone that wanted access to it. This included the Diocese of Allentown, the owner of the property proposed for Hamilton Crossings. The Diocese of Allentown was paid \$1.5 million for their property access. PennDOT bought the access back so they would not have openings on the road.

The Rt. 222 project is seven years old. Now we are seeing a proposal that is going to create a detrimental impact on an investment that is very young. The investment that is being proposed via Tax Increment Financing (TIF) will make traffic on the by-pass worse. The proposed traffic plan does not

enhance Rt. 222 and does not fix any problems on Rt. 222. It will increase delays. This is why we have conflicts with the TIF as well. We don't see the TIF as being constructive considering the impacts that will be created on the road.

Another point we have is in regards to the uses of public subsidies. The County Comprehensive Plan provides a general litmus test as to where it recommends the subsidies should go. They should go to places where you have problems. In staffs' opinion, Lower Macungie Township is not one of those places. Lower Macungie Township has some of the highest assessed valuations in Lehigh County, one of the lowest poverty rates and one of the highest median household incomes. We do not feel there is a need for the TIF. The other thing we bring up is in terms of jobs. Obviously this will create retail jobs. Our research shows they will not generate a substantial living wage.

Our next point goes to residential impacts. The shopping center abuts existing residential neighborhoods. These neighborhoods will be negatively impacted by this development and by the decision to grant waivers to the sections of the Township Zoning Ordinance that would have better protected the adjacent residential neighborhoods including side yards and buffer yards. The County Comprehensive Plan has a policy that states "neighborhoods should be protected from adverse impacts including environmental impacts. Such impacts include but are not limited to noise, air pollution, visual blight, offensive odors and vibrations." Because this project is so large and takes up about every square foot of the property, the residences are going to be right up against the shopping center. There are also places where there will be light spillage on residential properties surrounding the project, in some places well in excess of one foot candle. In other places there are 12 foot sound walls less than five feet off the property line. This seems excessive to us considering that most of the time fences need more than five feet when being set up between properties. Because all the side yards and buffer yards were reduced, what you have now is a lot of the active areas closer than you would have if the side and buffer yards were retained. From the map on the board, Mr. Berryman showed where, in one example, the loading area, cardboard compactor and lighting are much closer to the residential properties. Mr. Berryman said, in summary, these are the reasons why staff found this project inconsistent with the County Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Berryman said the State Transportation Grant request will pay for 100% of the proposed improvements to Rt. 222 and Hamilton Boulevard. The TIF (\$4.9 million) will pay for the improvements for Krocks Road and for the stormwater detention basin which will be located across Rt. 222. Mr. Howells asked what is the status of the PPL right of way there? Are the lines buried or aerial? Mr. Berryman said they are all aerial. He showed the location of the lines on the map on the board. No buildings are proposed under the power lines. It's all parking lot. Ms. Scheller wanted to know if anyone from LVPC would be attending the Lehigh County meeting on June 12<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Kaiser said Mr. Berryman and possibly Mr. Gurinko will be attending. Mr. Glickman asked how much traffic would be generated daily. Mr. Gurinko said the traffic consultant has worked with the PennDOT District 5 office to deal with things like trip generation, percentage of pass-by trips and linked trips. Mr. Gurinko said he only has a figure for peak hour trips: 374 for morning trips and 1,743 for evening trips of which 1,098 would be new trips. Others would be pass-by. On Saturday during peak hours there are 2,278 trips of which 1,275 would be new trips. These trips are peak hour not daily trips. Mr. Repasch asked for the comparison in size to the Promenade shops in Upper Saucon. Mr. Berryman said the gross area of the Promenade is 443,000 square feet, so it is considerably less than Hamilton Crossings.

Ms. Pandl presented a memo to the LVPC that she prepared on behalf of Lower Macungie Township. A copy of the memo was provided to the Commission members. She objects to the denial of the project as opposed to making recommendations for improvement. She pointed out that the intersection improvements at Krocks Road are really a service road. It's not an additional intersection directly into the

travel lane of Rt. 222. This is one of the suggestions by PennDOT District 5. They are waiting to hear from PennDOT Central Office in Harrisburg to see if they would support this approach or have another idea.

Ms. Pandl reviewed the memo with Commission members. She identified a number of policies of the Lehigh Valley Comprehensive Plan that she believes support this project. They include the following, among others. According to the County Plan, new growth should locate in areas designated for urban development in the County Plan. Ms. Pandl said the site is located in a recommended urban area. Offsite traffic impacts of developments of regional significance should be minimized. She said there is extensive design and analysis work performed by the project traffic engineer, the Township traffic engineer and PennDOT District 5 staff to mitigate off-site traffic impacts. These include a service road along the Rt. 222 by-pass in addition to improvements at the intersection improvements at Krocks Road, widening and improvements to Krocks Road, improvements along Hamilton Boulevard, use of adaptive signal technology along Hamilton Boulevard to alleviate existing congestion and provide coordinated traffic movement. Public sewer and water are available to the site. There will be four LANta bus stops within the development. The project will mitigate all traffic impacts. The traffic study and proposed mitigation improvements are currently under review by PennDOT. One of the major LVPC objections to this project relates to the interaction of this project with the Rt. 222 by-pass. She said there are no policies in the County Plan regarding restriction of land use along the Rt. 222 by-pass. Objections in the LVPC draft letter are based on an understanding of the by-pass purpose, not stated policy. PennDOT will have the final say on that whether favorably or unfavorably.

Lower Macungie Township has been in dialog with the developers for 2 ½ years to ensure a project that is an asset to the community and meets the Township's economic development and smart growth goals as well as long range planning goals. The Township has met with staff of PennDOT District 5 and LANta to devise a design that provides safe and efficient access for motorists, transit riders, bicyclists and pedestrians.

Ms. Pandl said this site meets the criteria stated in the Tax Increment Financing Act. In the end, it is the taxing authorities who will determine whether this project meets the Act's goals and is eligible for Tax Increment Financing. It is her opinion that it's not the role of the LVPC to make that determination. Ms. Pandl believes there is sufficient consistency between the proposed development and the County Comprehensive Plan to warrant a positive recommendation by the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission on this project that is of great importance to our municipality.

Mr. Tim Harrison, the developer for Hamilton Crossings, provided two handouts to Commission members. One is a four page executive summary and the other is a two page response to the LVPC staff comments. He said he has been working on this project since 2009. This project should solve 5% of the unemployment in the Lehigh Valley. This project should create 1,000 retail jobs. It will include Costco, Target and an organic grocery store that is a national chain that pays really well. Costco's starting salary for a cashier is \$17 an hour or \$35,000 a year for a 40 hour work week.

Mr. Harrison said the site had unregulated open-pit iron mining from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century until well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century. There are 333,000 tons of saturated "mine wash" that must be remediated to redevelop the site at a cost of \$12.5 million. This is a Brownfield site. The TIF plan states the money is going to be used only for infrastructure. This project is an investment of \$140 million with 425 construction jobs and \$5 million in new sales tax per year. They will also fix some flooding problems in the area. Mr. Harrison said he reviewed the County Comprehensive Plan and believes the project is consistent with the Plan. He reviewed the handouts with the Commission that explain his position. The extraordinary remediation and infrastructure costs will add approximately \$28.5 million to the cost of the project. He said no commercial project can handle these costs on their own. He said using the Institute of Traffic

Engineers assumptions, our impacts are less than 10 seconds which is the benchmark that PennDOT has established.

Mr. Harrison said this is not a typical situation. It is different because without the TIF and Lehigh County there is no project. The Lehigh County Commissioners want to know what the LVPC thinks. If the LVPC decides this project is inconsistent with the County Plan, Lehigh County will not support it and the project cannot be completed. Mr. Harrison respectfully requested the LVPC consider a compromise that the motion be not to recommend against the project. Why not say there are ways the project is consistent with the County Plan, but we're concerned about Rt. 222 and want to be at every PennDOT and Township meeting on the project.

Mr. Glennon said he has a letter from Attorney Jonathan Hugg, Clark Hill Thorp Reed Law Firm, representing Cedar Realty Trust, Inc. to be read into the record.

**RE: Objections of Cedar Realty Trust, Inc. to the Hamilton Crossings Project**

To the Planning Commission:

I am counsel for Cedar Realty Trust, Inc. and its subsidiaries Cedar-Trexler, LLC, Cedar-Trexler Plaza 2, LLC, and Cedar-Trexler Plaza 3, LLC ("Cedar"), which own and operate the Trexler Mall and Trexlertown Plaza shopping centers in Lower Macungie Township, Lehigh County.

Cedar objects to any approval, endorsement, or recommendation by the Commission in favor of the Hamilton Crossings project.

By supporting Hamilton Crossings, the Commission will facilitate the proposed Tax Increment Financing ("TIF") District advocated by the developer. Creation of the TIF District will penalize existing taxpayers through a "give away" of revenue that would otherwise lower taxes for all property owners. Current property owners will have to make up every dollar abandoned. Meanwhile, the notion that the TIF District will somehow guarantee decreased future taxes for anyone is pure speculation.

By way of background, Cedar has over the past three (3) years invested in excess of \$30 million dollars to redevelop Trexler Mall and Trexlertown Plaza. Cedar made this investment without any government subsidy or handout. In making this investment, Cedar meaningfully improved the utility of these centers for the community and generated jobs. In addition, this investment measurably increased tax revenues. However, by assisting the grant of TIF assistance to the developers of Hamilton Crossings, the Commission will penalize Cedar for not demanding that local government fund Cedar's private development.

The local retail market is simply not big enough to support Cedar's centers, the existing non-Cedar shopping centers, and the proposed Hamilton Crossings. Cedar knows (since many Cedar tenants have advised it), that the developers of Hamilton Crossings have approached Cedar's tenants at Trexler Mall and Trexlertown Plaza to move to their to-be-built center. The TIF subsidy will decrease the cost of capital to Hamilton Crossings. The subsidy will allow the owners of Hamilton Crossings an unfair advantage over existing commercial landowners since Hamilton Crossings will very likely be able to charge far lower aggregate rents. This is because the subsidy will substantially reduce, for the next twenty (20) years, the real estate tax reimbursement component customarily included in retail leases. Thus, you will simply be paying for, with public funds, the destruction of Cedar's shopping centers, that Cedar recently renovated, with private funds. This cannibalization of the local retail economy is inequitable and, surely, not what you or any local government body hopes to achieve.

More fundamentally, the TIF District is nothing more than a government subsidy and the product of aggressive, “take it or leave it” lobbying by a developer who has threatened to walk away if it does not receive taxpayer money. Meanwhile, the undeniable fact is that by aiding the formation of the TIF District, the Commission will harm existing local businesses by unfairly putting them at a disadvantage. By supporting Hamilton Crossings, the Commission will un-level the playing field and send the clear signal that it favors the recipients of the new TIF subsidy over older, established businesses that have historically supported the area. Cedar alone supports several local community groups – ranging from the Lower Lehigh Lions Club to an animal welfare event – and regularly allows them to use its facilities at no charge or for a nominal administrative fee. The owners of Hamilton Crossings, however, are newcomers and have no “sweat equity” in the neighborhood.

It is not the function of the Commission to pick winners and losers in the local economy. Against this zero sum backdrop, there are serious legal doubts about whether the proposed TIF District comports with the Tax Incremental Financing Act, the Uniformity Clause of the Pennsylvania Constitution, and the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution. It is apparent that the sole purpose of the TIF District is so that the developer demanding passage can make more money, not to remedy “blight” – which is the sole permissible purpose under the statute. If the Commission nevertheless supports the Hamilton Crossings project, my client may have no choice but to file suit to reverse its arbitrary and unfair decision, as well as to seek aggressive tax relief for its shopping centers. Other local shopping centers will likely do so as well, further diminishing the local tax base.

Accordingly, on behalf of Cedar, I urge the Commission not to support the Hamilton Crossings project.

Thank you.  
Respectfully,  
Jonathan W. Hugg, Clark Hill Thorp Reed

A copy of the letter was handed out to Commission members.

Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the Hamilton Crossings letter that has been drafted by the staff. Mr. McClain seconded the motion. Mr. Glennon asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr. Cusick asked the developer if he was aware of all the difficulties on the property before it was purchased. Mr. Harrison said he didn't purchase it yet. Mr. Cusick asked so now that you are aware of all these difficulties, have you gone back to the current owner to reduce the cost of the property in order to profitably develop it? Mr. Harrison said he has and the cost was reduced by an amount that he can't specify. Mr. Cusick said according to the letter by Jonathan Hugg, Mr. Harrison is essentially being accused of trying to poach his tenants. Is that true? Mr. Harrison said no. Mr. Cusick said so what you are saying is the content of the letter that was read to us is false. Mr. Harrison said yes. Mr. Gemmel said his concern is the comment on the Rt. 222 by-pass. He asked Mr. Harrison to verify there will be no direct access to Rt. 222 from his project. Mr. Harrison said that is correct. Mr. Gemmel said so people will access a service road from Rt. 222 then enter his project. Mr. Harrison said yes and showed where the access road will be connected. Mr. Gemmel asked if the impacts to Rt. 222 will be negligible. Mr. Harrison said he thinks it will be much less than 10 seconds. Mr. Glennon said he didn't see anything specific in the County Plan dealing with TIFs. He generally doesn't like TIFs, but he believes that it is really a matter of local concern. He asked Mr. Harrison if he was asking for our review to be silent on the TIF with a vote against traffic. Mr. Harrison said he wants our support of the project. He said the key thing for this project is that the County Commissioners approve it. If the LVPC took no position on the TIF but still recommended against the project, the County might find that to be less bad, but he doesn't know. Mr.

Howells asked if they talked to other agencies or interested parties. Ms. Pandl said yes – Lehigh County Conservation District, LANta, neighbors, PennDOT, and zoning hearing board meetings. Mr. Howells asked if they had guaranteed sewer allocation. Mr. Harrison said yes, through LCA.

Mr. Hugg entered the meeting. Mr. Glennon said his letter was read into the record. Mr. Hugg said his clients along with other members of the business community feel that support for this project is picking winners in the community and is unfair. My clients have invested a lot of money, private money, and our issue is the TIF. The TIF is a give away and it is a cannibalization of the local commercial real estate market. Mr. Cusick said he asked the developer whether he had approached any of Mr. Hugg's clients as to potentially relocating to his site. He then asked Mr. Hugg if he can state whether or not that, in fact, the developer has approached his clients about relocating to his site. Mr. Hugg said yes, he has.

Mr. Hugg said our centers have over 600 jobs. Mr. Harrison said he will have 923 jobs. Mr. Hugg said one of the County Commissioners said he was sure that everyone would keep careful note of jobs created by this project, but nobody would keep track of the jobs that are destroyed. Mr. Hugg said the 600 people in his two shopping centers will have their jobs put at risk because of this project. On Tuesday we heard about \$40,000 a year retail jobs. Mr. Hugg said that would be amazing in this economy. Also on Tuesday it was noted that you can't grant every TIF, that you have to make choices. He thinks this is a bad choice. It hurts the other commercial real estate owners. It is just unfair. Mr. Glennon said we are at the point now where Commission members can ask questions on the motion currently on the floor which affirms staff comments. Mr. Hozza asked Ms. Pandl about communication with their neighbors – Upper Macungie and South Whitehall. My concern is the majority of residents to the north don't take the by-pass. They come through South Whitehall, hang a left at Josh Early Candy and come out at Schantz Road and make a left at Krocks Road. He wanted to know if the Upper Macungie Supervisors and the South Whitehall Commissioners have been able to comment on how this will affect their roadways if this shopping center is built. Ms. Pandl said we have looked into that. The Lower Macungie Township Planning Commission required a stop signal at Cetronia Road and Krocks Road from the developer. This is a problem intersection already.

Mr. Herman said for clarification purposes everybody understands that this was originally submitted in early April. It was looked at preliminarily by the LVPC and then it was withdrawn. There was a long session with the Comprehensive Planning and Transportation committees on Tuesday. There has been additional information provided from Tuesday and tonight. He asked Mr. Berryman and Mr. Gurinko if there is anything they have heard to change the LVPC recommendation. Mr. Berryman said no. Mr. Gurinko said he reached the same conclusion. We have heard from the developer tonight and Tuesday that if you would follow the normal ITE Trip Generation processes you would get a different answer. He said he reviewed the Traffic Impact Study that was submitted to us. That is the only thing he can review as that is what he has at his disposal. This is what was created out of working with the PennDOT District Office. While there have been claims that there will likely be under a 10 second delay and improve the situation, the information he has is that there will be an additional 16 to 17 second delay over the no build scenario which is not acceptable by PennDOT's standards. The information he has heard tonight cannot be confirmed because that was not in the review material he was given. With respect to the by-pass, what we are looking at here is a \$140 million investment that was made six or seven years ago, and the concept was a controlled access concept. PennDOT paid to restrict that access. Mr. Gurinko said we have a concern about putting more public money into a road that degrades its performance so short a time after making that investment. Also, as he understands, PennDOT is looking at the Rt. 222 corridor as a whole primarily because if the access ban is broken as part of this, they suspect other developers will come back and expect similar restrictions to be lifted. PennDOT has a consultant looking at this corridor as a whole where they will consider this project as well as about 27 other potential developments in this area. Mr. Gemmel asked Mr. Harrison if he contracted a traffic study for this project. Mr. Harrison said yes. Mr. Gemmel asked him

if that information has been given to the LVPC and Lower Macungie Township. Mr. Harrison said yes. Mr. Gemmel asked Mr. Gurinko if he had this data and if the information he received is sufficient enough to make a determination about delays. Mr. Gurinko said yes. Mr. Glennon said he would like to call for the vote and asked if there were any more questions. Mr. Glickman said obviously the developer and Lower Macungie believe this project is consistent with the Lehigh Valley Comprehensive Plan. Obviously we feel differently, but aren't we the arbiter of what is and isn't consistent? Others may have their beliefs, but what it comes down to is what we've written and what we interpret. If we have convincing evidence otherwise staff would be swayed, but they are not. Therefore, their letter stands and that's what we're voting on.

Mr. Glennon said in order to give the Commission the widest range of options, he suggests the following. If the Commission were to vote not to support the staff letter, he would follow with a motion to support staff comments on traffic but to be quiet on the TIF matter and leave that as a matter of local concern. The current motion on the floor is to support the staff comments as stated. Mr. Hilliard, a resident of Allentown, asked to address the Commission. He said he hopes the LVPC would consider the TIF as a factor. There is a uniform consensus among universities that TIFs, KOZs and enterprise zones do not promote economic development, but they do cannibalize. He is also concerned about all the workers from Allentown going out on LANta buses. As an Allentown resident I would rather have these workers stay in Allentown where we can get some of the benefits. Mr. Hilliard does not consider Krock's Road and Rt. 222 an urban area. So for these and other reasons he would strongly encourage LVPC to take a position on the TIF. Mr. Glennon said that the current motion on the floor is to support the staff letter. Mr. Glennon called for the vote. The motion carried with Mr. Campbell, Mr. Glennon, Mr. Greco, Mr. Lott, Ms. Savage, Mr. Schweyer and Ms. Warner saying no to the motion and Ms. Scheller, Ms. Pandl and Ms. Duerholz abstaining.

### *MPC Reviews*

Ms. Dreisbach said there are two summary sheet items on page five of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Scheller seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. McClain abstaining on Item #1.

### *Environment Committee*

Mr. Repasch said there are two summary sheet items on page 6 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Gemmel seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Pandl abstaining on both items.

### *Transportation Committee – None.*

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### *Release of Trails Study*

Mr. Kaiser said you all have a copy of the Trails Study prepared by Teresa Mackey. She presented this study to the Commission in March and April. She has made a number of minor modifications to the study on the recommendation of Sherry Acevedo with the Lehigh Valley Greenways group. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the study and release it to the public. Mr. Glickman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

*Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project*

Mr. Reese said we are working on the five year housing sales data report for the Valley from 2008 – 2012. We have a draft report that will be on next month's meeting agenda. Our consultant, RKG Associates from Alexandria, Virginia, continues to work on both the Jobs/Housing Balance and the Housing Affordability Study. Most of their work in the last couple of months has been on the Jobs/Housing Balance. We have had a committee meeting and several follow-up discussions with staff so we could finalize the detailed technical work program for that effort. They hope to have that work finished and be in front of the committee in July.

**NEW BUSINESS***Approval of Office Space Lease Renewal*

Mr. Glennon said that office space lease renewal is recommended by the Executive Committee. In June we are finishing up the second 10 year term of the lease. We renegotiated the lease for the next 10 years. They had a schedule that basically increased the rent every 2 years by six percent for the next ten years. We negotiated it down to five percent so there will be substantial savings over the next 10 years. In addition, there is a schedule for office improvements. Mr. Kaiser said the lease is not just for space. It includes utilities, garbage collection, janitorial services and parking. Mr. Greco asked if there is a termination clause in the lease. Mr. Glennon said no, but they did investigate that. The landlord, upon their attorney's advice, said no. Mr. Herman asked who is the landlord. Mr. Kaiser said it is Hanover Plaza Associates. Mr. Howells made a motion to approve the lease. Mr. Herman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

*LVPC Pension Plan – Resolution to update list of individuals authorized to act on behalf of LVPC*

A copy of the resolution was provided to Commission members. Mr. Kaiser said we need someone to be in charge of the retirement plan. Since he is retiring we need to give Mr. Glennon and Ms. Dreisbach permission to be in charge of the plan. It's in resolution form because it came from the bank. Mr. Greco asked if this is temporary until a new Executive Director is hired. Mr. Kaiser said that is up to the Executive Committee. Mr. Greco made a motion to adopt the resolution. Mr. Cusick seconded the motion. The motion carried.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

Mr. Kaiser thanked the Commission for giving him the opportunity to work for such a special organization. He said it has been wonderful working with the Commission and our hard working staff.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT - None**

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

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 27, 2013*

### **MINUTES**

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, June 27, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matt Glennon chaired the meeting.

#### ***Members in attendance:***

##### **Lehigh County**

Percy Dougherty  
Steven Glickman  
Armand Greco  
Kent Herman  
Ben Howells  
Edward Hozza  
Kenneth McClain  
Sara Pandl  
Stephen Repasch  
Lisa Scheller  
Peter Schweyer

##### **Northampton County**

Becky Bradley  
John Cusick  
John Diacogiannis  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Elliott  
George Gemmel  
Matthew Glennon  
Bob Lammi  
Ross Marcus  
Pamela Pearson  
Michael Reph

***Members absent:*** Norman Blatt, Karen Duerholz, Michael Hefele, Christina Morgan, Virginia Savage, Donna Wright, Christen Borso, Gordon Campbell, Charles Fraust, Darlene Heller, Kevin Lott, Thomas J. Nolan, Seth Vaughn and Elinor Warner.

***Staff present:*** Geoffrey Reese, Joseph Gurinko, David Berryman, Sue Rockwell, Teresa Mackey and Mike Donchez.

***Public Present:*** Bob Sickler, Rehrig Penn Logistics; Adam Smith, Barry Isett & Associates; Peter LaRoche, Rehrig Penn Logistics; Mike Handzo, City of Easton; Brian Gish, City of Easton

### **COURTESY OF THE FLOOR**

**MINUTES**

After a brief review, the minutes of the May 30, 2013 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. McClain. Mr. Schweyer seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Lammi, Mr. Reph and Mr. Diacogiannis abstaining.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS*****Comprehensive Planning Committee******Rehrig Penn Logistics – Borough of Glendon (Northampton County SALDO Application)***

Mr. Berryman said there is an LVPC memo that provides background information on the proposed project, a site plan, several letters of correspondence and a draft review letter in the agenda packet. This development is in the Borough of Glendon. Glendon is one of three remaining municipalities in Northampton County that does not have its own subdivision ordinance. The other two remaining municipalities are the Borough of Chapman, which also does not have its own zoning ordinance, and the Borough of West Easton. The LVPC acts as the municipal planning commission for Glendon, and we followed the Northampton County SALDO for this project. In attendance tonight is Adam Smith, the applicant's engineer from Barry Isett, and Bob Sickler and Pete LaRoche from Rehrig Penn Logistics. Mr. Smith said this project is in the Glendon Business Center. This is actually a plan that is very similar to one this Planning Commission already approved a year and a half ago. Since that approval, the applicant has decided they no longer need the gravel storage lot that was proposed behind the building, so we removed that lot. At the request of the Planning Commission staff, we did keep the buffer fence and buffer trees proposed to be planted along the edge. There are some concrete pads for mechanical equipment on the outside of the building, a new concrete ramp, a concrete dumpster pad and also a paved apron which provides better accessibility for trucks to get to the dumpster. The stormwater system that was previously proposed to control runoff from the gravel lot is no longer proposed since there is no more gravel lot. The stormwater flows to a regional detention basin that handles this site. The draft review letter lists a few conditions, and the applicant will agree to the conditions.

Mr. Cusick asked Mr. Smith what additional traffic impact is expected in that area as a result of this project. Mr. Smith said the building has already been in existence for a long time, but it was vacant. Rehrig moved in several years ago. He doesn't know what the traffic was like with the previous tenant. Mr. Berryman said there are three actions for the Commission to vote on tonight. The first is granting a waiver on the plan scale, and the second one is granting the request for a combined preliminary/final plan application. The third action would be approving or not approving the land development plan. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to grant the waiver request for plan scale. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion. Mr. Gemmel asked if there is a plan scale requirement. Mr. Berryman said yes, there are three specific scales. Staff doesn't have an issue with the waiver request. Mr. Glickman asked if this was a county requirement. Mr. Berryman said it's in the Northampton County SALDO. Mr. Glennon called for the vote. The motion carried with Mr. Elliott abstaining. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to grant the request for a preliminary/final plan application. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Elliott abstaining. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the review letter. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Elliott abstaining.

*Status Report on Hamilton Crossings – Lower Macungie Township - Subdivision/Land Development of Regional Significance*

Mr. Berryman said LVPC staff attended the June 12<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Lehigh County Commissioners and explained the LVPC letter of May 31<sup>st</sup> in regards to the project. LVPC staff also attended last evening's meeting of the Commissioners, but no presentation was given. The County Commissioners voted 6 to 3 not to enter into the Tax Increment Financing.

*MPC Reviews*

Ms. Dreisbach said there are eight summary sheet items on pages 10 and 11 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Gemmel seconded the motion. The motion carried.

*Environment Committee*

*Status Report on Natural Heritage Inventory Update*

Mr. Reese said we have a contract with Western Pennsylvania Conservancy to do an update of our Natural Heritage Inventory. This is something that was done in 1999 and 2005. The contract runs out tomorrow. There are some important things coming out of this. The way the mapping is done today is significantly different than the way they did mapping, of even the same features, five or six years ago. Beyond the Conservancy's work, we also have some work to do under a contract with the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. One of the key things we have to do is to update the Natural Resources Plan Map. We use this map for a lot of different things in this organization. We use it for reviews of subdivision plans and zoning ordinances to see if there are any conflicts with our natural environment. We work with both counties in our open space programs to use that information to help us decide what properties are appropriate to acquire conservation easements. It is a very important part of our recommendations to the counties and others in terms of natural resources.

Ms. Mackey presented a map that shows the current data set we have. It is the 1999 and 2005 data. The 1999 data was the original inventory and in 2005 they did a data update. With the data update they made some changes on how they mapped some of the sites. They were more watershed-based so we couldn't use them in that format. We took the original 1999 data and any of the new sites from 2005 for use in the office. Ms. Mackey said in this data set it is broken down into two categories. We have statewide significant and local significant. We have 75 of the statewide and 19 local for a total of 94 sites. The one key thing about this data is they had one boundary for the entire site. It had the location of the species whether it was plant, animal or natural community, and then they also added buffers to it so you didn't know exactly where it was located. That is the data set we currently use. Ms. Mackey presented the new data set. Ms. Mackey said other than changing the name from Natural Areas Inventory to Natural Heritage, we now have 121 sites. The sites are now called Natural Heritage Areas. There are some key differences between how they mapped this data and the old data sets. Now, they have two boundaries for every site. They have the core habitat which is a very specific location of where the species have been identified. Then they have a supporting landscape. It gives us a little more detail as to where the element is located. Another thing that changed is the protocols they used for mapping. One of the protocols is there is a certain sensitive species that they are not allowed to map to a core habitat, so now they are all mapped to watersheds. Ms. Mackey said the circle areas on the map refer to flying species, whether it is a moth, bird or bat. They don't delineate every single piece of that area that could be their habitat so they just put a circle on the map. They also changed the significance categories. Previously, there were just the two. Now they have global, regional, statewide and local.

Ms. Mackey said with this data set they did not map any locals. They are re-running the significance ranks that are assigned to each of these sites, but initially as of right now they don't have any locals mapped. We thought the 2005 data had areas we couldn't use. Now we have areas that are even larger. We have to go through the data and figure out how we want to apply it to our Natural Resources Plan. Then we also have to look at the Greenways Plan to see if any of that needs to be adjusted.

Mr. Howells asked if some areas could be inside another area. Ms. Mackey said there are some overlaps. Sometimes the sites are merged. They look at these on a case by case basis. Mr. Greco asked if we have had any discussions on how to get this into a Natural Resource Plan. Ms. Mackey said not yet. Mr. Reese said we did spend four hours with the consultant to talk about these details and to try to understand them. Mr. Reese said they are virtually the only ones in the state that do this kind of work. They have a standing contract with the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. They basically work on a priority basis.

Ms. Mackey said we have been looking over the draft report to give them some comments and corrections. Mr. Glickman said since this is PennDOT money, this is really to direct when and where we should put transportation funding potentially in the future. Mr. Reese said PennDOT is interested in this because transportation projects traditionally slow down every time there is any kind of an environmental issue or "hit". Hits can take years or decades to resolve so they have a general interest in this mapping to see what projects they might do hoping to get a good idea of where the hits might come and where they might not. They would use this in their process to figure out the programming of projects and more to figure out which ones they expect to take a lot longer. Mr. Reese said perhaps the projects in those watersheds where we don't really know or can't map where those things are might be most problematic.

Ms. Dreisbach asked Ms. Mackey if there is a list of these species for each of the counties or the valley. Ms. Mackey said in the report they put that information in several different formats. They have a comprehensive list of every species or community they found. Then they have a list by number that matches a map that has everything numbered. Then they have an alphabetical list. They also have a detailed site description for each site. They have an aerial photo showing the individual boundaries. There is a lot of cross referencing of this data in the report. Mr. Glennon said he thought over the past few years that PennDOT, as far as bog turtles were concerned, was making the assumption that they were present everywhere and they found that it was less time consuming to assume they were there and would do whatever they do to mitigate when they have them rather than do a study to find out where they are. Mr. Gurinko said he doesn't recall they assume they were everywhere. There are a number of issues that will absolutely stop a project. Bog turtles are one of them. In fact we had an instance at the Rt. 33 and Rt. 512 interchange where there was a supposed siting of a bog turtle that took literally three years to figure out that there wasn't a siting.

Mr. Repasch said all of this work was done on properties that could be accessed. More than half of the property owners did not give permission to access their property. Ms. Mackey said they either didn't respond or said no. Mr. Reese said there are two other main components to this whole effort. One of them is we have been doing some additional work on greenways and the natural area implications on greenways. We have a Greenways Plan and we will need to do some work updating that document. We did add a specific component to deal with important corridors that may have some construction associated with them or some type of PennDOT work over the next several years. We provided 11 corridors to them to identify if there were any hits of these natural features. All of those corridors are maintenance projects. PennDOT is not building major road projects at this point and that is where you would really see significant impacts.

## *Reviews*

Mr. Repasch said there is one summary sheet item on page 12 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Howells seconded the motion. The motion carried.

## ***Transportation Committee***

### *Status Report on Transportation Capital Funding*

Mr. Gurinko said he has been before the Commission a number of times over the last year talking about infrastructure needs: structurally deficient bridges, resurfacing projects, the backlog of projects, what is happening at the Federal level and what's being proposed at the State level. We are seeing movement in the right direction. First of all, about a year ago, a two year bill was passed that provided Federal funding for highways, bridges and public transportation. That was called MAP 21. In effect, it did not provide any more money than was provided in the previous six year bill, but it redistributed that money. So for instance, safety now has twice as much money in it than it did under the previous bill. We are looking to continue to move forward with our current program, but we have to move money around as appropriate. Ultimately we may have to move some priorities around to make sure we are using our funding as efficiently as possible and addressing the key issues.

At the State level there were two reports that were key in this effort. The first was a report that identified the need. In that 2011 report, the Transportation Funding Reform Commission identified about a \$3.5 billion annual shortage. To get the existing infrastructure up to a passable level and to significantly cut down on our structurally deficient bridges, and unfortunately Pennsylvania leads the nation in structurally deficient bridges, and also to address public transportation needs, we have to spend an additional \$3.5 billion annually. If left unaddressed, that number would grow to \$7 billion in 2020. It is a very critical issue. The Corbett administration responded to that with a proposal of an additional \$1.8 billion annually by year five by uncapping the Oil Franchise Company Tax. That would provide the main revenue source for the additional \$1.8 billion annually to address this infrastructure issue. Incidentally, the estimates he has seen would translate to the equivalent of \$.28 a gallon. There is a lot of conjecture as to whether motorists would see that at the pump. PennDOT made an argument that there are other factors that may affect the cost at the pump other than the Oil Company Franchise Tax. Mr. Gurinko said in response to the administration's proposal, the Pennsylvania Senate came up with a proposal of an additional \$2.5 billion annually ramped up by year three. This is a much more aggressive plan. It also includes uncapping the Oil Company Franchise Tax plus an increase in license and registration fees and a number of other smaller items that would get us to that additional \$2.5 billion, again over a three year period rather than a five year period.

Mr. Gurinko said the politics of this is the Senate was expected to easily pass their proposal. The real question was what would get through the House. The other side of that story is that something must be done before the Pennsylvania legislature goes into recess the end of this week. This afternoon we got reports that a House Subcommittee approved a response to the Senate bill of a \$2 billion additional funding stream ramped up over five years. Mr. Gurinko said that proposal will go to vote to the full House probably tomorrow. If that passes the full House, they then go into negotiations with the Senate to try to get something that can move forward. There were a number of provisions. The license and registration fees would not be increased under the House proposal. The House proposal also made it possible for local taxation. It enables additional fees to be put on vehicle registrations. Mr. Gurinko said it allows local government to levee sales, income and real estate transfer taxes on transportation. Counties would also be allowed to impose a \$5 fee on vehicle registrations. The House will probably vote on this tomorrow and

people in the industry are certainly hopeful we will see some sort of resolution to this to provide for much needed additional funding.

Mr. Cusick said one of our local state senators voted against this proposal and the reason stated was related to the Rt. 22 widening. He asked Mr. Gurinko if he could shed any light on that. Mr. Gurinko said the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation put together what they called a Decade of Investment list of projects and they made that available to the legislators. It recently became available to the public. As part of that, under the Administration's proposal of \$1.8 billion over five years, the widening of Rt. 22 from Airport Road to 15<sup>th</sup> Street was included in that. This is our highest priority project for the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study and it was put on the back burner due to lack of funding. In addition to that, they also proposed preliminary engineering for the widening of Rt. 22 from 15<sup>th</sup> Street to Rt. 309 to the west and from Airport Road to Rt. 512 to the east. Senator Boscola would like it to be extended to Rt. 33. This is the limit of the study the LVPC did in 2001, but we had segmented that corridor in pieces.

Mr. Dougherty asked how the Berks-Lehigh connector on Rt. 222 got up so quickly for \$52 million. Mr. Gurinko said the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study has repeatedly told PennDOT that this would not be a priority in this area because we have already made an investment in the Rt. 222 corridor. For right now that is a negotiation tool for votes. PennDOT admits this is a draft list and there are things to be worked out. This is very similar to the demonstration projects at the Federal level. Mr. Dougherty said they are making it very clear if local legislators don't vote for this then no local money will be forthcoming. Mr. Gurinko said we looked at the list and looked at the roads other than the Rt. 22 work. Most of the work is resurfacing and bridges. Pennsylvania's structurally deficient bridges are around 22-23%. Without additional investment, that number will rise. It is a real problem. Bridges will be closed and detours will be necessary. Mr. Gemmel asked if the House proposal will be an increase to our present allocation from PennDOT for local roads. Mr. Gurinko said yes. Mr. Dougherty asked if the bridges we have closed are counted as deficient or are they taken off of the list. Mr. Gurinko said they are counted as deficient.

Mr. Gurinko said there is a statewide financial guidance work group. The purpose of this group is to distribute transportation capital funding to the 23 regions across the state. One of the main discussions we are having right now is one we've always strived for; a needs-based formula. We have never had the data to fully do that. We relied on things like lane miles within your area, population, structurally deficient bridge deck area, number of structurally deficient bridges, etc. Over the past four or five years, PennDOT has done an exhaustive search of the needs in their system and trying to get their arms around the local system as well. One of the key issues here is that a source of the transportation funding at the Federal level, which used to provide funding for the National Highway System, now funds not only the National Highway System, which includes roads like Rt. 22, I-78, the turnpike, Rt. 248, Rt. 611 and Rt. 33 in the Lehigh Valley, but also includes major arterial roads which aren't quite as important as the ones just mentioned but close to it. It includes all of the numbered traffic routes in the two counties. Mr. Gurinko said, because that pot of money expanded greatly and the pot of money left for all the other roads on the Federal system decreased significantly, it looks as if there is going to be a major redistribution of funding to the regions within Pennsylvania. The Lehigh Valley comes out as a winner in this funding redistribution. We have a lot of urban roads and we have a lot of roads on the system that has a larger pot of money. Some rural areas lost half of their Federal funding under the new formula. Mr. Gurinko said the Lehigh Valley will probably gain about 25% in funding for this particular pot of money. It translates to millions of dollars, but again some of the rural areas have really taken a hit. The financial guidance work group is trying to figure out how we go from where we are now to where we ultimately want to get to while maintaining reasonable construction programs for all areas of the state. If the additional State transportation funding comes through, this problem really goes away. We will have more resources and we can address these eligibility issues of the Federal funding by making it up with some state funding. Mr. Gurinko will keep the Commission informed on this issue.

Mr. Gurinko said at the State level we are very anxious to see if we can move forward. He was at a statewide meeting the last two days with PennDOT, and if they get the additional funding at the State level, they will be focusing on getting as many projects out as possible by the May primaries next year. Mr. Dougherty asked what the implications are to LANta. Mr. Greco said they are good. The Senate version is the best version for transit. We are hoping that somehow or another if we get a House version we can cobble things together. This is a capital program not an operating program. Mr. Greco said there are some very significant needs throughout the state.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### *Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project*

Mr. Reese said for this project we met with the Comprehensive Planning Committee this month. At the meeting, Ms. Obi reviewed the work she had done looking into the five years of housing sales data for the two counties. The report will come to the Committee very soon. We do have other people that have to see the report – a Housing Advisory Committee and a Consortium Committee made up of all the organizations that are party to this grant. We will be reviewing it at the Committee level, and after it has gone through the review process, we will bring it to the Commission to take action. In addition to that, we have a Housing Affordability Study and a Jobs/Housing Balance that we have RKG Associates from Virginia working on. They are working primarily on the Jobs/Housing Balance data and they expect to come back to the Valley the third week of July to review that information with our Housing Advisory Committee. They should have all the numbers put together and have some preliminary recommendations on the Jobs/Housing Balance at that time. In addition to that, they are working on the housing affordability issue. This is an update of a 2007 study this Commission prepared. They tell us they are on target to have a draft of both of those reports by September. Those reports also will be reviewed by the Comprehensive Planning Committee. Then it will go to the Advisory Committee we have established for this program and the Consortium. Ms. Pandl asked how are they gathering the data. They haven't talked to her municipality. Mr. Reese said they gathered a lot of data from the Advisory Committee. They have some very robust data sources for this purpose. Mr. Reese told Ms. Pandl that the consultant comes up about every other month and he could arrange a meeting.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### *Report by Search Committee and Vote on Executive Director*

Mr. Glennon said he is going to turn the meeting over to Ms. Dreisbach for a report on the search for the new Executive Director. The report will be done in Executive Session so staff was asked to leave, but the vote will fall back into regular session. Ms. Bradley and members of the public also left the room.

Mr. Glennon opened the regular session again. Ms. Dreisbach, on behalf of the Search Committee and Executive Committee, made a motion to appoint Becky A. Bradley to the position of Executive Director at a salary of \$92,000.00. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion. Mr. Glennon called for the vote. The motion carried.

Ms. Bradley said she is really excited to have this new opportunity. She looks forward to promoting the Lehigh Valley through planning and to continue the good work that this very wonderful and competent staff continues to do.

Ms. Scheller commented on Mr. Gurinko's and Mr. Berryman's attendance at the Lehigh County Commissioner's meeting on June 12<sup>th</sup> regarding the Hamilton Crossings project. She wanted to let the

whole Commission know they did an excellent job representing the LVPC at that meeting. They answered every question very well and professionally.

Mr. Dougherty said he would like to suggest that maybe we review the section of the Comprehensive Plan having to do with the recommendation that no government money be used in a particular project. He thinks what we were talking about at the time that this was put into the Comprehensive Plan was that we should not float a government bond issue as such by a government entity to attract industry. Since that time we have had so many things like LERTA, KOZ, NIZ and even the TIF, types of economic development that are considered good planning tools in terms of economic development around the country. Mr. Dougherty said maybe we should take a look at that again. He and some other members of the board were a little bit fuzzy about why we should be stepping in that arena. He fully supports what we said about the traffic and the impact there. He doesn't know if it is the place of this agency to be involved in some of the economic development tools that are out there which could be good planning tools also. Mr. Glennon said it is a legitimate area of inquiry. Mr. Dougherty said he thinks staff should take a look at it and come back with a justification and give a presentation. Mr. Glennon said it should start with a discussion among the Executive Committee or the whole Commission to give the staff some direction. Mr. Glickman said it may be interesting to have the Industrial Development Authority who uses that tool to tell us what their interests are. It may be good to get an outside opinion as well. Mr. Dougherty said some members of our Board of Commissioners think the Industrial Development Authority has a somewhat slanted view on it, but it is worth looking at.

***CORRESPONDENCE - None***

Mr. Glennon adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,

Kathleen Sauerzopf for  
Geoffrey A. Reese  
Assistant 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 25, 2013*

### ***MINUTES***

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, July 25, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matt Glennon chaired the meeting.

### ***Members in attendance:***

#### **Lehigh County**

Norman Blatt  
Percy Dougherty  
Karen Duerholz  
Michael Hefele  
Kent Herman  
Ben Howells  
Kenneth McClain  
Christina Morgan  
Sara Pandl  
Stephen Repasch  
Virginia Savage  
Donna Wright

#### **Northampton County**

Gordon Campbell  
John Diacogiannis  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Elliott  
Charles Fraust  
George Gemmel  
Matthew Glennon  
Darlene Heller  
Bob Lammi  
Carl Manges  
Ross Marcus  
Thomas J. Nolan  
Pamela Pearson  
Michael Reph

***Members absent:*** Steven Glickman, Armand Greco, Edward Hozza, Lisa Scheller, Peter Schweyer, Christen Borso, John Cusick, Kevin Lott, Seth Vaughn and Elinor Warner.

***Staff present:*** Geoffrey Reese, Joseph Gurinko, David Berryman, Mike Donchez and Sue Rockwell

***Public Present:*** See sign-in sheet

***COURTESY OF THE FLOOR***

## **MINUTES**

Mr. Elliott said he has a minor correction to be made under Public Present. Mike Hande is listed as attending the meeting. His last name should be spelled Handzo. Mr. Dougherty made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion passed with Ms. Morgan, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Diacogiannis and Ms. Wright abstaining.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### ***Comprehensive Planning Committee***

#### ***Lower Saucon Twp. – Zoning Ordinance Amendment/Zoning Map Amendment – Area of Applebutter Road***

Mr. Berryman said there is a draft review letter, copies of several residents' comments and two maps at each Commission member's place. In addition, Mr. Berryman presented a Power Point presentation on the rezonings. He said the proposal includes three separate rezonings. There is the proposed removal of an entire manufacturing zoning district in Lower Saucon Township. The draft letter also includes comments on a proposed 100 foot buffer between certain uses and on a "natural resource mitigation alternative" proposed by the ordinance. Staff reviewed this proposal against the County Comprehensive Plan. Some of the things considered include compatible land uses between zoning districts and adjoining municipal borders. We have to consider how land uses come up against each other and how land uses in one municipality may affect land uses in an adjacent municipality. Also considered are uses requiring buffers. Some uses require larger buffers than others based on their use. Buffering residential areas from adverse impacts is an important consideration. Also, this rezoning triggers our policy on land uses of regional significance. Finally, staff considered the natural feature preservation policy and implementation steps of the County Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Berryman presented the zoning map of the area as it stands today in Lower Saucon Township. He said we will be concentrating on three zoning districts. The Light Industrial District (LI), the Rural/Agricultural District (R/A) and Light Manufacturing District (LM). The map shows Lower Saucon Township, the City of Bethlehem to the south, Bethlehem Township to the north, and Freemansburg Borough to the west. On the south side of Applebutter Road, the City of Bethlehem has an Industrial Overlay District called the IN-O. This is the Majestic property where warehouses are being built. The map also shows an Industrial Zone where the Calpine power plant is located. The City of Bethlehem also has a Rural Residential District (RR) where residents live today.

Mr. Berryman said Lower Saucon Township's R/A District has some residential development and some agricultural development. Some of the permitted uses include various agricultural uses, single family dwellings on two acre lots and cluster development. The LM District is the district being proposed for removal. It is basically along Applebutter Road and it abuts the Industrial Zoning District in the City of Bethlehem. In this district, there are a variety of industrial uses permitted. Landfill operations are not permitted in the LM District. The LI District does permit the landfill operation and there are plenty of commercial and industrial uses in this district. One part of the proposed ordinance amendment changes landfill operations from special exception to conditional uses in the LI district.

The first rezoning is from R/A to LI. The R/A District currently includes single family homes and a PPL power easement. Only part of the Rural Agricultural District is being proposed to be rezoned to Light Industrial. The County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map shows that most of this area is recommended for urban development. According to the map, there are some natural features shown in the area. The staff visited the site several times. There are homes there. The Committee and staff concluded these zoning

districts as they exist today are incompatible. Basically the rezoning moves the incompatibility further west. What is going to happen with the change from R/A to LI is the LI District is going to expand. It will be abutting more of the R/A area. This R/A area has some high and medium priority natural features.

The second rezoning is LM to LI along Applebutter Road south of Skyline Drive. This area is right across the street from the power plant. This area is currently undeveloped. The County Comprehensive Plan indicates an area of high priority natural features on several parcels. The LM District of Lower Saucon actually provides a very good buffer between the City of Bethlehem and the Industrial Zoning Districts. Not all industries are the same. The IN-O District does not permit landfills. This district is largely Majestic warehouses. The Industrial District accepts landfills as special exceptions only, however, the power plant is sitting on the land that is zoned Industrial on Applebutter Road.

The third rezoning is LM to R/A. This expands a residentially zoned area when combined with the City's RR zone. However, it creates a new incompatibility with the City of Bethlehem's Industrial zoning to the south of Applebutter Road.

A summary of the proposed rezonings is they are essentially unlocking the existing buffers of the landfill as they are today. The zoning that is in place buffers the landfill from other municipalities and the other zoning districts as best as they can. We think the proposed rezonings will either extend incompatibilities at the municipal boundaries or other township zoning districts. We find them inconsistent with the County Comprehensive Plan. We recommend the Township retain its existing zoning.

Mr. Berryman said another point we bring up in the draft letter is traffic. We are recommending the Township look at traffic impacts as part of any action on the rezoning. Another point in the letter addresses buffering. The ordinance amendments state that activities of mines, landfills and waste disposal facilities have to be conducted no less than 100 feet from a property or a zoning boundary line. The Comprehensive Planning Committee does not believe 100 feet is sufficient. He said we also recommend against using zoning lines to regulate setbacks. We think that would set a negative precedent for other areas of the Township and other zoning districts. The natural resource mitigation alternative will allow applicants in the Light Industrial Zoning District to disturb or utilize a natural feature as defined in the Township's Zoning Ordinance. They would be able to preserve an equal amount of land outside the LI District as open space. Open Space is not the same thing as the natural feature you are disturbing. If another area can't be found, they can make a payment to the Township. This is inconsistent with the County Comprehensive Plan as well. There are several areas we would like to see protected either by zoning or by other means. Mr. Berryman identified these areas on the map. Ms. Pandl asked if these features would be protected under the existing zoning. Mr. Berryman said yes. He said only land in the LI District would be subject to the natural resource mitigation alternative. Mr. Gemmel asked if there is a buffer requirement in the current ordinance. Mr. Berryman said yes they have 100 feet now. He said there is nothing that would prevent the municipality from increasing that buffer. Ms. Pandl asked about the expansion of the R/A District to Applebutter Road. She asked if they are up against an industrial use now. Mr. Berryman said right now it is against the R/A District. He said they would be creating a new incompatibility with the City of Bethlehem's zoning district by moving the R/A District to Applebutter Road. They are fixing one problem and creating a new one.

Mr. Glennon invited the members of the audience to speak. Mr. Herman asked staff to first explain that this went through the committee process for the benefit of the audience. Mr. Berryman said the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission is looking at a letter that staff drafted and the Comprehensive Planning Committee reviewed and approved at a meeting on Tuesday. The full Commission is looking at a letter that reflects the Committee and staff opinion. Mr. Glennon said, for point of clarification, we vote on whether a proposal before us is consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan or not.

Mr. Samuel Donato, District Manager for IESI Bethlehem Landfill, said he has a couple of comments regarding the proposal and brought photos for people who have not seen the site. Mr. Donato explained the photos. He said the pictures clearly indicate that this is an industrial area. This is not Rural/Agricultural. It is not farming. This is heavy manufacturing. One of the pictures shows a view from the Rural/Agricultural District that is proposed to be changed to Light Industrial. The view is of a 600 megawatt power plant. Any developer he has worked with over the years would not want to build residential properties there. This is strictly an industrial area. This is the only industrial tract of land in Lower Saucon Township that can create and support this type of industry along with well paying jobs for Lehigh Valley residents. Mr. Howells asked how many residential properties are in this rezoning. Mr. Donato said about 12. They have the majority of them under agreement of sale and are ready to finalize an agreement of sale for the rest. Ms. Pandl asked how he proposed to use the area if it is rezoned. Mr. Donato said the proposal is to develop a solid waste disposal facility in conjunction with the existing landfill, but no application has been filed with the Township or PADEP to do that yet.

Ms. Priscilla DeLeon, Township resident and Lower Saucon Township Council member, said missing from all of the photos is the 100% character of the area Lower Saucon would lose by changing this zoning. The area to the west of the landfill is our character, our woodlands. It was stated that IESI owns 90% of the parcels and is in negotiation for the rest. In her opinion, that is spot zoning.

Mr. Russell Sutton, a Steel City resident, stated he bought his property thirty years ago and was told the landfill would be closed within six years. He loves the natural resources of the land. Mr. Donato showed one side of the mountain. Mr. Sutton said he was going to show the other side where he lives. This landfill is over 750 feet high. It can be seen from a 20 mile radius. There is no natural buffer that is going to block this from visibility. This is not a way of preserving natural space. There is a natural forest with deer and wildlife. Also, regarding traffic, Steel City has only one access road. They only have one way in and out of Steel City. There is another road that is one way but it gets washed out the majority of the time. There is a railroad track 50-75 feet from 12 River Road where you go into Steel City. If the track is blocked, they can't get out. The expansion is going to destroy their quality of life. Also, they really don't know what is going into that landfill. As far as he knows, there is no sampling done of materials going in there. Also, he knows for a fact that IESI takes asbestos. Mr. Donato said yes that is an approved waste stream to be disposed of at the landfill. Mr. Sutton said the only people who benefit from this expansion will be the landfill. The problem he has is the Township Planning Commission and the Township defeated this six to one, and it is coming back up again. He doesn't understand why this is happening and would appreciate the LVPC's help in preserving their quality of life.

Ms. Maryann Garber, IESI representative, said the Township has gone through an informal process to get feedback on the idea of rezoning this area. Lower Saucon Township Council directed its staff to prepare proposed map amendments and text amendments. They asked staff to present them to the Township Planning Commission to get their feedback. There was an informal process and several meetings before the Township Planning Commission a few months ago. The Township Planning Commission did recommend that none of the amendments go forward. The Township Council decided they wanted to choose one of these options to take through the formal MPC process. This is why the LVPC hasn't seen it before because this is the first time Council has decided to advertise, have a public meeting and have a formal process to consider the enactment of the rezoning. Ms. Garber wanted to address some environmental and health issues that Mr. Sutton believes are related to the landfill use. She wanted to point out to the LVPC that Mr. Berryman rightly stated that this is about planning. She said she had the minutes from an October 3, 2012 meeting that was held at the Township with Lower Saucon Township Council, representatives from DEP, technical consultants from the Township and technical consultants from the landfill. During this informal process, the people opposed to this zoning change made all sorts of

allegations. If you read those minutes, all of those issues were fully vetted and it was determined there were no environmental or health issues with respect to the IESI landfill. This is a proposal prepared by the Lower Saucon staff. There is no petition to rezone by IESI, and there is no landfill expansion on the table. This is the Township's proposal. Ms. Garber said there are two comprehensive plans at play here. There is a County Comprehensive Plan and a Multimunicipal Comprehensive Plan. Both of those comprehensive plans speak to future uses within their boundaries. Both of those plans make specific recommendations about this area that is proposed to be rezoned in particular. The County Comprehensive Plan identifies this area proposed for rezoning as urban development. Urban development is that area recommended for industrial and commercial projects. Mr. Berryman notes this in his letter. It is also important to note that the County Comprehensive Plan identifies this specific area as located near transportation infrastructure that is necessary to support industrial uses like the one being proposed. This is an area that is targeted for this kind of development because the infrastructure exists. There are rail lines and major roads in the area. When you are talking about planning for the future, that is the type of infrastructure you want to see in an area for commercial and industrial development. Most importantly, in the County Comprehensive Plan, it states that land uses of regional significance are important to LVPC consideration of the proposed rezoning. The County Comprehensive Plan identifies landfills and solid waste disposal facilities as land uses of regional significance. The use that would be permitted by this rezoning is a use that would be important to the county on a regional basis. Ms. Garber said the Township has its own professional planner who concluded that the zoning changes are generally consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan and the Multimunicipal Comprehensive Plan. She distributed several copies of the planner's report and reviewed its conclusions. Ms. Garber said this entire area subject to rezoning was zoned for Light Industrial in 1988. In fact, the Light Manufacturing District that exists today did not exist until 1998 when the Township decided they were going to create this LM District and take what was once an area of LI and change it to LM. They did that in 1998, but in fact, since that zoning change, there has been no development in this LM District. The current proposal takes 61.71 acres of what was formerly LI and is now LM and reverts it back to the LI use it was historically zoned for. Then it takes 35 ½ acres north of that and also changes it to LI. So in essence, it is taking the 101 acres that was originally zoned LI and turning it back to LI. She said Mr. Berryman talked about the LM District providing an appropriate buffer zone from the residential land use in the City of Bethlehem. If you put the proposed rezoning in, there is still a buffer from the residential uses because you have a piece of Rural/Agricultural before any of the Light Industrial starts. If you really want to take Mr. Berryman's recommendations to heart and that actually the LM District is a good buffer between LI and other uses, then maybe rather than recommending no rezoning at all, perhaps recommend this area stay LM and the area north become LM. Then you will have a buffer all the way across and you can get rid of the alleged incompatibility issue. Ms. Garber said it is just a suggestion and she would like people to start thinking about how to address these concerns rather than just dismissing the rezoning. Ms. Garber said with respect to the natural resource mitigation alternative, it strikes a balance for the Township. It enables them to permit industrial development in their Township which serves as an economic base for their community. At the same time, it allows the Township to retain their power to preserve natural resources that they truly believe are worthy of protecting. What this arrangement does is, it allows the developer to propose this mitigation alternative and the Township retains the power to say no, that property you want to swap is not acceptable. The payment is to be made in the event there is not a suitable property to swap, and the development can still go on. The Township can get that money and wait for a suitable project to come up and preserve the resources they want to preserve. The Township should make the decision on what should be preserved and we should not shut down their ability to bring development into their community. Mr. Hefele asked if these are Township generated amendments. Ms. Garber said yes. He asked her if she represented the landfill. She said yes. Mr. Hefele asked if she assisted in preparing these amendments. Ms. Garber said no, but she sat through all of the meetings. She sat in on the subcommittee meeting the other day and felt there were important things that she wanted to bring to the attention of the Commission. Mr. Repasch asked to see the slide of the natural areas and he wanted to know what kind of natural areas we are talking about. Mr. Berryman said from the aerials and our mapping, this has a hydric

concentration to it. Mr. Repasch asked if it is wetlands. Mr. Berryman said possibly. It is also 15% to 25% steep slopes and woodlands.

Mr. Gemmel said he was a little confused on how this informal process started and how it ended up here. Ms. DeLeon said she is on the Landfill Committee and was called by the solicitor to meet with their President to discuss their proposal. She said the proposal came from IESI first. She told them there needed to be a public meeting where they had to ask Council to change the zoning. They had a public meeting and invited residents to come. The solicitor suggested the Township take the lead on this. All of their consultants worked on this and Council authorized staff to prepare a map and send it to the Township Planning Commission for an informal review. This was last summer. Finally in the fall they voted 6 to 1 against the rezoning. Council took their recommendation and didn't do anything. Then our Council President brought it up again a few months ago. Council voted 3 to 2 to send it to the LVPC.

Mr. Jay McLaughlin, IESI employee, said his fellow employees asked him to speak on their behalf. He said they have good paying jobs at the landfill and would like to keep their jobs. He lives in Bucks County and has been a member of the Bucks County Solid Waste Advisory Board for over ten years. He knows that Act 101 of the State regulations requires each county to have a Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. The landfill is in Lehigh, Northampton, Monroe, Montgomery and Bucks counties' plans. There is a unique feature of the landfill which serves the public. In June of 2013, the landfill recorded 8,419 vehicle loads. Of these loads, 991 were small volume, general vehicles (cars, vans and small trucks) generating 879 tons of municipal solid waste. They are basically apartment clean ups, people moving in and out of the area, and local tradesman waste. No other landfill in the Lehigh Valley serves this category of customers. A logical conclusion based on these numbers is the landfill offers a vital, convenient and exclusive service for over approximately 5,000 citizens in the Lehigh Valley. They would like to keep their jobs. He has worked in this industry for over thirty years with no health problems. It is a healthy, safe environment.

Ms. Donna Louder said she was born and raised in Lower Saucon and lived in Steel City for over 40 years. She submitted a speech on Tuesday to the Comprehensive Planning Committee. She said if this expands, it is the death of that area of the Township. There is nothing else that land can be used for. This expansion will give IESI 12 more years. After 12 years this will be dead land in the Township. They will pack up their equipment and office and they will move away. They are bonded by the DEP, but the Township is left with this useless land. The Township will lose its natural resources, backyards, landscapes and skylines of the mountain. She is on the Landfill Committee as a volunteer for 1 ½ years and has learned a lot. Between 60-80% of the trash being hauled in is coming from New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. The rest is from the Lehigh Valley or Bucks County. Ms. Louder requested the vote tonight be based on saving the natural resources and not the economic end of it.

Mr. Gene Boyer, Township resident, said Lower Saucon Township did not start this process. IESI went to the Township and wanted a public meeting to look at the possibility of rezoning. They do have an interest in this. They have almost 100% of the properties purchased already. Tonight he has heard the most comprehensive study and report of that area on the zoning and zoning ordinance between Lower Saucon and Bethlehem from LVPC staff. He thinks that LVPC staff did a much better job than the Lower Saucon Township planner. He attended 90% of the Lower Saucon meetings and did not hear what he heard tonight. Lower Saucon Township residents would like to see the green areas stay that way and not have an extension of the landfill. He understands that people work at the landfill. Thousands of people lost their jobs when Bethlehem Steel closed. If the landfill closes when they are scheduled to close, only 25-40 people will lose their jobs. There shouldn't be a financial consideration in this. It is about rezoning.

Mr. Bob Wells, Township resident, said he was very disappointed with the photos he saw today. He doesn't think it is an accurate representation of what the community looks like. He has heard that the mountain shields part of the community from the landfill. However, he can stand in Bethlehem Township and see the entire landfill over the top of the mountain with cranes, crows and buzzards that literally destroy the skyline. He doesn't trust IESI or what they say they are not going to do. He believes they are taking a devastated area and expanding it two or three times. He understands that the speech by the attorney was very eloquent. The residents can't afford to hire an attorney. They are counting on the zoning to protect them. They are hoping that their own community and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission will use the zoning that is place now to put a buffer between them and something that will no doubt destroy the value of their homes. This has put fear in the hearts and minds of the people who live next to the landfill. He asked the LVPC to think of the negative impact this will have if this zoning is changed.

Ms. Stacie Misczenski, Township resident, said the decisions being made here tonight will have a lasting affect on future generations. IESI, an entity of a Canadian organization – Progressive Waste Solutions, is a business that compromises the standard of care that is portrayed in the County Comprehensive Plan. However, Lower Saucon Township continues to entertain the expansion of the landfill after the community continued to tell them they are against the rezoning of Applebutter Road. They are here tonight once again to tell their governing body they are against this rezoning. The Comprehensive Plan suggests that natural feature preservation could be provided through zoning regulations. However, the zoning changes being proposed for Applebutter Road would jeopardize the natural resources currently preserved by the existing Comprehensive Plan. The community voted for open space during the election. Approving a natural resource mitigation alternative suggested by the Township goes against everything the community voted for, the preservation of open space and natural resources. IESI knew the terms of the contract and knew the landfill had an expiration date. She respectfully asked this Commission to demonstrate the duty of care exhibited in the Comprehensive Plan and vote no for the rezoning of Applebutter Road.

Mr. Dave Spirk said he has been a Township resident for 25 years. People don't like to talk about sewer plants, energy plants that take natural resources out of our earth, gambling houses and landfills, but it just so happens, in sight of this landfill we have all four of those. Whether we like it or not, we as citizens are creating the waste. We have to have landfills. This area is one of the oldest, most industrial areas in the Lehigh Valley. Bethlehem Steel was there over 100 years ago. What those two dimensional maps don't show is, it really is an industrialized area. There are no concentrations of houses along Applebutter Road. If you were to figure out where to put a landfill in Lower Saucon, this is the only spot. If you think about where to put a landfill in the Lehigh Valley this may be the best spot. It is across the street from an energy plant. This landfill ships the methane across to become energy. It takes the condensate from the landfill to the sewage treatment plant. We as a community have to bring in taxes, have businesses, we have to have schools in order to exist. Lower Saucon Township's budget is around \$6.8 million. The landfill's tipping fees are \$2 million every year from IESI. Every person here chose to live in the proximity of the landfill that has been there since 1941.

Ms. DeLeon wanted to say that she read the consultant's report and also read the Lehigh Valley Comprehensive Plan and she disagrees that the rezoning is generally consistent. LVPC staff did an excellent job with their review. She does not support any expansion of the landfill beyond the current boundaries of the Light Industrial District. She voted no to any zoning changes at past Council meetings. Nothing has changed since the Township adoption of their Multimunicipal Plan in 2009. When IESI acquired the property in 1999, the zoning was already in place. They knew the boundaries and restrictions. Now they want the Township to expand out of their box. IESI is the major property owner in this area. It

is not known how many letters of intent they have with other property owners. She also submitted comments Tuesday at the Committee meeting. She supports the recommendation against the rezoning.

Ms. Judy Rudolph, Township resident, said she lives near the top of the mountain on the other side, and if IESI is allowed to expand, there are going to be problems. They only check for air pollution four times a year. In 1988 they went from 11,610 tons to a half a million tons of garbage a year. It is not just local places. She did a whole spreadsheet of where the garbage is coming from. Mr. Matt McClarin, Township resident, said he also submitted comments. The plans of the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission and Lower Saucon Township clearly say using high intensity uses in this area is not part of the plan. He would appreciate it if the LVPC votes not to change the zoning. Mr. Glennon said that concludes the public comment period. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the review letter in which we recommend the Lower Saucon Council not enact the zoning ordinance and map amendments and retain the existing zoning. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion. Mr. Dougherty said the public made many good comments, but we are just looking at the County Comprehensive Plan. We are not taking those aspects into consideration. We are looking at the zoning, land use, traffic and the problems associated with our Comprehensive Plan. Whatever action we take tonight is a recommendation of this body. It will still go back to Lower Saucon who will make the final decision. What we say tonight is our suggestion. Mr. Glennon called for the vote. The motion carried with Mr. Elliott abstaining.

#### *Reviews*

Ms. Dreisbach said there are six summary sheet items on page 9 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Duerholz seconded the motion. The motion carried.

#### *Environment Committee - None*

#### *Transportation Committee*

##### *Presentation on 2012 Traffic Trends Report*

Mr. Donchez said a copy of the report is at each Commission member's place. He said LVPC staff conducts about 100 traffic counts per year under contract with PennDOT. We use the data internally ourselves. The data we collect we use to help calibrate our Regional Travel Demand Forecasting Model. The data has a whole host of other uses. It is used to help determine roadway design. It is used by realtors to help market properties. It is used to determine state highway funding for different areas.

There are basically two kinds of counts. We have volume counts which count the total volume of vehicles passing a given location. There is a classification count which also takes into consideration the volume, but in addition to that, it takes into account the particular type of vehicle passing a particular location. Travel fluctuates depending on the day of the week, time of the year or the month of the year. During the summertime months of May, June, July and August, there will be more traffic than the rest of the year. During the fall, winter and early spring, traffic tends to be less. When we get the raw counts we have to factor the data to take out these seasonal biases. Within the past year in Lehigh County we conducted 48 counts, and in Northampton County we conducted 47 counts. The counts are conducted on a cycle of every three years and sometimes five years. We don't revisit the same site every year. Mr. Donchez said the report includes a comparison between statewide traffic growth for different classifications of roadway and the growth for similar type roads within the Lehigh Valley. For the urban interstate group there was 23% growth statewide. There was also 23% growth within the Lehigh Valley over the ten year

period of 2001-2011. However, for all of the other classifications of roadways, the traffic growth within the Lehigh Valley has exceeded what has been realized statewide. This is not a new trend.

Mr. Donchez said this is an informational report. We do this annually to show what traffic counts we conduct during the year and how we compared to the statewide average. We provide this data to municipalities and we also put it on our website.

#### *Status Report on Transportation Capital Funding*

Mr. Gurinko said last month he informed the Commission about three proposals coming before the state legislature for increased transportation funding for highways, bridges and transit. All of these were primarily financed by a removal of the cap on oil company franchise taxes. The Administration had a proposal on the table to increase transportation funding by \$1.8 billion annually ramped up over five years. The Senate had a version that would have increased transportation funding by \$2.5 billion ramped up over a three year period. At the time the House was just coming out with a proposal of an additional \$2 billion a year ramped up over a five year period. This was going to be a consideration for much needed increased funding that would provide long-term solvency for Pennsylvania highways, bridges and transit. Mr. Gurinko said to the best of his knowledge, while the Administration and the Senate versions were solid versions with the Senate version having passed with a 45-5 vote, the House version became very partisan and never came to a vote. When the legislature recessed on July 1<sup>st</sup> there was no vote taken. It was his understanding that if nothing was done before the summer recess, nothing was likely to get done from here on out. Since that time PennDOT and the Secretary have said they are very optimistic that something will get done in early fall. Apparently the legislature will address this in some fashion. Right now we are moving forward with the understanding there is no additional money available from the state and hopeful that something does break in order to address this critical infrastructure issue.

Mr. Dougherty asked for an overview of how our local delegation voted. Mr. McClain said there were two local House of Representatives who voted yes to bring it out of committee. They were Mike Schlossberg and Julie Harhart and they were the only local representatives on the Transportation Committee. Then the General Assembly did not take it to a vote. On the Senate side, Lisa Boscola was one of the five dissenting votes.

#### *Schoenersville Road Corridor Signal Study*

Mr. Donchez said the LVPC has been engaged for the last few months in conducting a study of the Schoenersville Road Corridor. The study area extends from Stoke Park Road to the intersection of 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It is approximately 1.8 miles in length. It is a study of the signalized intersections. We have been finding it more and more difficult to build our way out of traffic congestion. It is challenging to physically add capacity to roads. Using a different approach, we are trying to squeeze more operational efficiency out of the existing infrastructure, in effect, adding capacity to the road without physically widening it. This is accomplished by trying to make the signals function so the progression of traffic through the corridor results in a lot less delay. We conducted data collection in January. We conducted speed and delay runs where you travel the corridor during the morning and afternoon peak hours and register travel times between signalized intersections. We recorded stop delay, the time spent motionless in the vehicle and other delay causing incidents. We looked at the data and analyzed it to see how well the corridor was performing as a whole. Basically the end result is that, in most instances, the corridor functions okay. The largest problem along the corridor is during the AM peak hour for the southbound movement. That was the movement where every signalized intersection experienced a stop delay. It had the slowest travel speed and the greatest amount of delay. We took a look at some of the signal timing plans. The oldest timing plans within the corridor date back to 2004. The intent is to take this study to PennDOT District 5-0 and

the City of Bethlehem tomorrow to present the findings of the report and get their feedback. We want to find out if this results in a programmable project. This means a project that we can program on the TIP. The project would be funded 100% with Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds which would require no local match. We have done similar studies in the past. We have done a study of the Lehigh Street Corridor in Allentown. That project was programmed on the TIP. About a year ago we did a study of the Northampton Street Corridor in Easton. This project was also programmed on the TIP. The type of improvements we think will be realized from these types of studies are a low cost, high benefit type of project with a quick turnaround. Ms. Pandl asked about the use of adaptive signal technology. Mr. Donchez said we are going to explore that option with PennDOT if it's applicable to the corridor.

### ***OLD BUSINESS***

#### *Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project*

Mr. Reese said the Comprehensive Planning Committee was presented with a draft report on five year housing sales data for the Lehigh Valley. They voted to forward it to the Housing Advisory Committee and the Consortium group. Once these two groups have provided comments, the report will go back to the Comprehensive Planning Committee, which at some point will recommend it to the full Commission. We do have a consultant who has been busy working on the Jobs/Housing Balance report. In the last couple of days they forwarded most of their data and analysis associated with the report. Our staff is going through that and we will get comments back to them. Then we will get it ready to go to the Housing Advisory Committee. We will meet with them sometime in August to begin the review process on the Jobs/Housing Balance report. The consultant is continuing to work on the update of the Housing Affordability Report. They are continuing to gather that data and get it to us so we can review it prior to getting it to the Committee.

### ***NEW BUSINESS - None***

### ***CORRESPONDENCE - None***

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

Submitted by,

Kathleen Sauerzopf for  
Geoffrey A. Reese  
Assistant 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 29, 2013*

### **MINUTES**

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, August 29, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matt Glennon chaired the meeting.

#### ***Members in attendance:***

##### **Lehigh County**

Norman Blatt  
Percy Dougherty  
Steven Glickman  
Armand Greco  
Kent Herman  
Edward Hozza  
Sara Pandl  
Stephen Repasch  
Virginia Savage  
Lisa Scheller  
Peter Schweyer  
Donna Wright

##### **Northampton County**

Christen Borso  
Gordon Campbell  
John Cusick  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Elliott  
Charles Fraust  
Matthew Glennon  
Carl Manges  
Ross Marcus  
Thomas J. Nolan  
Pamela Pearson

***Members absent:*** Karen Duerholz, Michael Hefele, Ben Howells, Kenneth McClain, Christina Morgan, John Diacogiannis, George Gemmel, Darlene Heller, Bob Lammi, Kevin Lott, Michael Reph, Seth Vaughn and Elinor Warner.

***Staff present:*** Becky Bradley, Geoffrey Reese, Joseph Gurinko, David Berryman and Sue Rockwell

***Public Present:*** None

## ***COURTESY OF THE FLOOR***

### ***MINUTES***

After a brief review, the minutes of the July 25, 2013 meeting were moved for approval by Ms. Pandl. Mr. Schweyer seconded the motion. The motion carried.

## ***COMMITTEE REPORTS***

### ***Comprehensive Planning Committee***

#### ***MPC Reviews***

Ms. Dreisbach said there are six summary sheet items on page 11 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Greco seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Hozza abstaining on Item #6.

### ***Environment Committee***

#### ***Lehigh River Fish Passage Improvement Feasibility Study***

Mr. Reese said the Wildlands Conservancy commissioned a study prepared by KCI Technologies. The point of it was to evaluate whether or how exactly you could pass more shad past the Easton and Chain Dams. Those dams were originally built in the 1830's. Prior to that, shad would have had an easy opportunity to move up through the Lehigh River system and to spawn. The fish are in the Atlantic Ocean most of their lives, but they need to spawn in fresh water streams and rivers. Since those dams were created, the shad have had a difficult time moving up through the Lehigh River system. Easton and Chain Dams are two of the dams on the Lehigh River. Two others relatively local to these dams are a dam in Allentown and one in Northampton. The point of this study is to evaluate the engineering capability of trying to move more shad past the existing facilities of the Easton and Chain Dams. These facilities have been there a long time and are very significant facilities. They are 30 and 20 feet high, respectively, and 590 to 700 feet wide. There are existing fish passage facilities at each of these dams. They were constructed in 1994. The Fish and Boat Commission that monitors this information on a routine basis found that they were not getting sufficient passage of shad to support the restoration of the fishery and establishment of a self-sustaining population. The point of this is what can be done engineering wise to modify these dams and their fish passage structures so you can get sufficient shad and other types of migratory fishes through these facilities up into the Lehigh River system and again imprint them to the system. The Easton Dam is owned by the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. The Chain Dam is owned by the City of Easton.

At the joint Environment and Comprehensive Planning Committee meeting on Tuesday, we reviewed the fact that the study looked at the engineering associated with what you could do in modifying both the dams themselves and the fish passage structures to move more shad. One of the main thoughts associated with this is that, if you have more than about a 10 foot change in elevation associated with these dams, it is going to be very difficult to efficiently move shad through the facilities. We reviewed with the Committee some of the basic options that were studied. Those options include the lowering of the dams

across their full width to move the shad through, or lowering just a portion of the dam. All of these options involve some lowering or other modification of the dams other than completely taking them out and involve the creation of fish pass ways. The bottom line of this is the engineering feasibility study identified what could be done. There was not a sufficient level of fish passage associated with any of those modifications except for the complete removal of the dams. The study recommends complete removal of both of those dams. The study includes the costs of dam removal. One of the key principles associated with the study is that the Delaware Canal and the Lehigh Canal, that obtain their water because these dams are there, must be watered under any selected approach. The dams create a heightened water level. That water level allows for the water to go into the canals and keep them watered. If those dams are taken away, there is no longer a system of watering those canals and you have to find an engineering approach. Those engineering approaches involve pumping water into the canals. Cost estimates were provided associated with construction of those features and the annual operating costs for pumping.

In terms of the draft letter, the first main paragraph gives the background of what they accomplished with the study, what their intention was and what some of the costs will be. There are other issues and costs beyond the construction or demolition of the dams and the canal watering. There are utilities that may be impacted and there are additional costs associated with that. They have laid out those costs at a planning level. We reviewed the removal of the dams relative to our Comprehensive Plan. One of the things we comment on is that the removal of the dams is recommended in the Wildlands Conservancy *Lehigh River Watershed Conservation Plan*. We generally supported the Lehigh River Conservation Plan. That plan though does not totally say remove those dams. It provides several criteria. The first criteria is it must be feasible. The second criteria is it can only be accomplished if it also fits with cultural heritage issues associated with any of those facilities. There are those types of issues associated with the removal of these dams for the municipalities involved and recreational facilities as well. Our commentary states that this study is too limited to currently support removal of these dams. The report does not, beyond saying that it is important to move shad up the Lehigh River system, provide any further documentation of that. It is not obvious to many people why it is so important to move shad. Of the four dams previously mentioned on the Lower Lehigh system, this study only looks at the lowest two dams. If these dams were to be completely removed, you still would only accomplish getting shad to the base of the Allentown dam. If you really are trying to reintroduce shad to the entire Lehigh River system, that accomplishes about 25% of that goal based on drainage area. Also, there are impacts on cultural, historic and recreational resources. They don't devote any significant conversation in the study about those issues. Finally, the study does not quantify perceived environmental benefits, beyond shad, associated with dam removal. Environmental benefits associated with the removal of the dams should be substantiated in the study. For these reasons, our conclusion is that we don't currently have enough information from this study to support the removal of the two dams.

Mr. Dougherty said his major problem is the cultural and historical aspects of this. Another aspect is looking at how much money we are talking about removing these dams and where that money is going to come from. Mr. Glickman asked if this is for fishing purposes or just reintroducing the equilibrium before the dams were in place. Mr. Reese said the study really didn't elaborate on it. He said the reintroduction of shad is one of the formative reasons for the Fish and Boat Commission. Mr. Herman asked if this study got traction would it be used as a tool to get public support to fund the removal of the dams. Mr. Reese said that could potentially happen. He said nothing will happen to these dams, however, unless the owners want something to happen. Mr. Glickman asked if there were conversations with the dam owners regarding the report. Mr. Reese said there have been conversations, but we haven't been part of them. Mr. Campbell

asked what the dams provide other than watering the canals. Mr. Reese said that was the reason why they were built; they are not there to prevent flooding. Ms. Wright said, even if you had the money to remove the dams, the amount of money you would need per year to water the canals is astronomical. Mr. Elliott recommended the draft letter be amended by adding the words “and costs” after “environmental benefits” in two places on page 14. Mr. Glickman asked if this presentation is based on the final report or are they asking our opinion as a further contributor to the report. Mr. Reese said this is their final report. According to the Wildlands Conservancy, their next step is to respond to all the comments and identify what their action plan will be. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the letter as amended. Ms. Dreisbach seconded the motion. The motion carried.

*Reviews*

Mr. Repasch said there are two summary sheet items on page 15 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Greco seconded the motion. The motion carried.

***Transportation Committee***

*Update on Transportation Funding – New Weight Restrictions on 38 Bridges in the Lehigh Valley*

Mr. Gurinko said he reported last month that the Pennsylvania legislature did not act on providing additional transportation funding on any of the proposals that were before us. As the Secretary of PennDOT has said many times, there is a cost to inaction. As part of that there was a press conference last week where the Secretary announced there would be 1,000 already-posted bridges across Pennsylvania that will receive new restrictions. Some of the bridges will be posted to a lower weight; some will be closed. Mr. Gurinko said this will certainly have an economic impact on the Commonwealth. It will probably require lengthy detours in some areas. What he wanted to do this evening was to give the Commissioners an idea about how this impacts the Lehigh Valley and what we can expect in the future.

Mr. Gurinko reviewed the following information regarding new restrictions on Lehigh Valley bridges:

POSTED/CLOSED BRIDGES IN THE LEHIGH VALLEY

	Lehigh Co.			Northampton Co.		
	State	Local	Total	State	Local	Total
Bridges Currently Posted	13	31	44	15	49	64
Bridges Affected by Announcement	6	14	20	8*	10	18

\* The Kromer Road Bridge over Route 33 in Plainfield Township will be closed.

Mr. Gurinko reviewed the average weights of various types of vehicles. These bridge closings very well could affect emergency response. A fire truck is a definite consideration when we look at what will get restricted. A fire truck is 19 to 30 tons, so if you are looking at restrictions under 30 tons, it could affect emergency response. The average tractor trailer is 40 tons. Any restrictions are going to be less than 40 tons. This has a direct bearing on commerce in the Lehigh Valley and across the state. The reason to do this at this time is because Pennsylvania has 25,000 bridges. Of those 25,000 bridges, 11,000 are rated at 80,000 pounds (40 tons) and no more than that. The Secretary and PennDOT are trying to extend the life of these

bridges by lessening the impact of continued pounding of these heavy vehicles on these most at risk bridges. There are no additional financial resources coming into the picture, so the question is how we can best maintain what we have in the network. If there is continued inaction, the Secretary said there would be another list a year from now. The average age of a Pennsylvania bridge is 51 years. The average life expectancy is 50 to 75 years. Today, when PennDOT replaces a bridge, they are trying to design it for a 100 year life. Mr. Gurinko said even with that it requires maintenance to keep the structure viable. In Lehigh County, a couple of major roads that are impacted are Rt. 29 in Upper Milford Township, Cedar Crest Boulevard at the Broadway intersection and the Rt. 329 Bridge over the Lehigh River. In Northampton County, roads include Rt. 512 in Bushkill Township and a couple on Newburg Road as well.

It is well documented that Pennsylvania has the highest percentage of structurally deficient bridges in the nation. Assessing a bridge as structurally deficient doesn't mean it is unsafe for use. If it is structurally deficient, it isn't necessarily posted. Again, it is an indication that the bridge needs attention, or it is going to get to the point where it is posted. Mr. Gurinko reviewed the following statistics with the Commission:

**STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT BRIDGES**  
(As of 7/1/13)

	PA	LV	L. Co.	N. Co.
State-Owned	18%	18%	15%	21%
Locally-Owned	35%	30%	36%	26%
Total	21%	21%	20%	22%

We will continue to look at how this impacts the Lehigh Valley and to advocate for additional funding so we can address these issues and maintain the system to keep it safe and efficient. We will continue to report back to the Commission as these types of issues develop. Mr. Glickman asked who polices these restrictions. Mr. Gurinko said the state police and also local police. Mr. Gurinko said if local municipalities don't post the bridges, PennDOT will post them and charge the municipality. Mr. Herman asked if PennDOT has the authority to do this. Mr. Gurinko said yes. Mr. Repasch asked if this is a done deal. Mr. Gurinko said yes. Mr. Dougherty said if Corbett's transportation bill passes in the fall, how much of this problem will go away. Mr. Gurinko said none. Even if the transportation bill passed, these bridges wouldn't be addressed immediately; however, the Secretary said if one of these bridges was programmed and designed and it was coming up to two years before it was ready to go to construction, PennDOT would look at lifting the restriction. Again, the intent is to lengthen the life of the bridge. Mr. Herman asked if the local governments will get this information. Mr. Gurinko said yes they will, but PennDOT doesn't have the local bridge posting information yet. Mr. Repasch asked Mr. Greco how this would affect LANTA. Mr. Greco said on the state side it will not interrupt our services. There are some bridges we are concerned about with our paratransit vehicles, but we haven't seen the local list yet. Mr. Gurinko said a letter went out to all of the municipalities on Monday. Ms. Bradley said we reached out to the District office and asked them to host a presentation to the municipalities and the counties affected at our office on what all this means. Mr. Young is going to get back to her next week. Mr. Greco asked if there is anything the LVPC can do to assist the municipalities and the counties in addressing this issue. Mr. Dougherty said when he went to District 5 he was told to put pressure on our local legislators.

Mr. Gurinko said the Federal Highway Administration requires all bridges 20 feet or longer be inspected every two years. One real big missing piece in this puzzle is locally owned bridges between 8 and

20 feet. We had conducted an inventory for PennDOT of those bridges last year. We came up with an inventory of 240 bridges. Inspections are not required on those bridges. Mr. Gurinko said that is a huge wild card as to what kind of condition those bridges are in. We tried to direct some of our planning funds to bridge inspections between 8 and 20 feet and it ended up that the Federal Highway Administration wouldn't allow us to use Federal funding for that. Mr. Herman asked if PennDOT has authority over those bridges. Mr. Gurinko said no. Mr. Herman asked if LVPC has data regarding those inspections. Mr. Gurinko said we have locations but we don't have the expertise to do the inspections. Mr. Gurinko said if there was a bridge that really did not look good we went through PennDOT's bridge engineer and their local bridge services person. We told them what we saw and they went out and took a look. We recorded the type of bridge, location, and took pictures, but we have nothing that will determine the engineering sufficiency. Mr. Glickman asked, in terms of locally owned bridges, what is the municipal liability if there is a problem with a bridge. Mr. Hozza said there is municipal immunity. Mr. Gurinko concluded his presentation.

### ***OLD BUSINESS***

#### *Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project*

Mr. Reese said we are going to have our next meeting of the Housing Advisory Committee on September 12, and the main agenda item for that meeting is to review a report that looks at five years of housing sales data for Lehigh and Northampton counties from 2008-2012. We did this report internally. It was reviewed by our Comprehensive Planning Committee and authorized for release as a draft to go to that Advisory Committee to begin the review process. This will come back to the Comprehensive Planning Committee and the full Commission after it is reviewed by our Housing Advisory Committee. In addition to that, we are working on the Jobs/Housing Balance and Housing Affordability Study. We have received a great deal of data from our housing consultant and we are reviewing that before it goes to the Housing Advisory Committee.

### ***NEW BUSINESS***

#### *Social Media*

Ms. Bradley said we have a Facebook page. We have a lot of information on our website, but there are a lot of people who don't know about the Commission. We are looking for easy, low cost or no cost ways to get out information about the LVPC. We are going to post some aerial histories of the Lehigh Valley to show development over time and things of that nature. Facebook is the first part of our strategy. We should have our LinkedIn account going hopefully within a month or two. Then we will move into Twitter.

#### *Programs and Services Guide*

Ms. Bradley said over the last month we created a programs and services guide. A copy of the guide was provided to Commission members. It is a one page guide that summarizes the general programs, plans, initiatives and things we work on. We are going to start doing other guides for specific subject areas. We will start with transportation and then move into other areas.

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

Ms. Bradley said it has been a really great few weeks. There is a tremendous staff here. The quality of the work and thoughtfulness has just been remarkable. We have attended a number of meetings and have had a number of conversations with many people, but we are not done. We have participated in a Chamber Transportation Committee. We met with Whitehall Township officials regarding some of their transportation needs. We met with Hanover Township, Northampton County. We have had five newspaper articles in the last four weeks. These articles discussed everything from the Schoenersville Road study, Bridges and the Freight Rail Study. We hope to continue that work and increase that level of public awareness and engagement with our partners in the community.

Ms. Bradley said, working with Ms. Pandl, the LVPC partnered with the Pennsylvania Planning Association Lehigh Valley Chapter to offer a series of nine free workshops over this fall and into the early spring. The topics will include everything from fiscal analysis for development, subdivision reviews, etc. It will also offer continuing education credits for planners. She and Ms. Pandl are also trying to coordinate with township planning directors to meet and discuss township specific issues. We will do one for the boroughs, too.

Mr. Kaiser is going to be honored by the March of Dimes in kind of a Lifetime Achievement Award in October. We will email that date to you. It is a commercial and industrial developer's breakfast. We will get a table for that, so if you are interested in attending, let us know.

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

Submitted by,

Kathleen Sauerzopf for  
Becky Bradley  
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 26, 2013*

### **MINUTES**

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, September 26, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matt Glennon chaired the meeting.

#### ***Members in attendance:***

##### **Lehigh County**

Norman Blatt  
Percy Dougherty  
Karen Duerholz  
Steven Glickman  
Michael Hefele  
Kent Herman  
Christina Morgan  
Kathy Rader  
Stephen Repasch  
Virginia Savage  
Lisa Scheller

##### **Northampton County**

Christen Borso  
Gordon Campbell  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Fraust  
George F. Gemmel  
Matthew Glennon  
Bob Lammi  
Kevin Lott  
Carl Manges  
Thomas J. Nolan  
Pamela Pearson  
Michael Reph  
Elinor Warner

***Members absent:*** Armand Greco, Ben Howells, Edward Hozza, Kenneth McClain, Sara Pandl, Peter Schweyer, Donna Wright, John Cusick, John Diacogiannis, Charles Elliott, Darlene Heller and Seth Vaughn.

***Staff present:*** Becky Bradley, Geoffrey Reese, Joseph Gurinko, David Berryman and Sue Rockwell

***Public Present:*** Natalie Vu, Temple University Student; Eric Davis

***COURTESY OF THE FLOOR***

## **MINUTES**

After a brief review, the minutes of the August 29, 2013 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Repasch. Ms. Dreisbach seconded the motion. The motion carried with abstentions by Ms. Morgan, Mr. Gemmel and Ms. Rader.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### ***Comprehensive Planning Committee***

#### ***Edwin Ziegler Lot Consolidation/Land Development Plans – Borough of Slatington – Request for Extension (Lehigh County SALDO Application)***

Mr. Berryman said on page 8 of the agenda attachments is a copy of a request for an extension from Edwin Ziegler in the Borough of Slatington. Slatington does not have its own SALDO; therefore, the County SALDO applies in the Borough. At the July 2013 Comprehensive Planning Committee meeting, the Committee looked at a plan for a lot consolidation and development of a truck terminal for Mr. Ziegler. At that time, the Committee voted to table the application because Mr. Ziegler had some work to do on stormwater management, landscaping and various other issues. Mr. Berryman said, without an extension, the LVPC and Comprehensive Planning Committee would have to take action on this plan at the October 2013 meeting. At this time, the plan is basically incomplete, and there would probably be no other choice but to deny the application. Therefore, the applicant requested an extension until January 31, 2014. Staff recommends granting an extension until January 30, 2014, which is the date of our Commission meeting, not January 31, 2014. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the motion for the extension. Mr. Glickman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

#### ***Stone Post Meadows-Lower Nazareth Township-Subdivision/Land Development of Regional Significance***

Mr. Berryman said on pages 9 and 10 of the agenda attachments is a draft review letter that the Comprehensive Planning Committee approved on Tuesday. The reason this plan is being reviewed here tonight is because it is considered a land use of regional significance in the County Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Berryman said this project is located in Lower Nazareth Township, Northampton County. The proposal is for three uses on a property of approximately 51 acres: 498 apartments, about 130,000 square feet of office space in two buildings and one 10,000 square foot daycare. The property is in the Office Park Zoning District. It is currently a vacant, largely undeveloped property near Route 33 at the intersection of Hecktown Road and Country Club Road. The County Comprehensive Plan land use plan recommends this area for urban development to be served by public water and sewer. The concept of apartments, office buildings and a daycare would be an appropriate use of this property.

The draft review letter provides a number of suggestions on basic things that would improve the plan. One of the main points in the letter is that with the apartments, office buildings and daycare all in close proximity, we would like to see improved pedestrian connectivity. If you live in the apartments, you have to drive your car to get to the daycare, even though it is on the same property. If you want to go to the office buildings, you have to drive. The same is the case for access to Louise Moore Park, which is just south of the property. Also, the proposed landscaping between the uses could be improved. There is rather thin buffering between the apartments and office and daycare parking lots.

The plan being reviewed tonight is called a tentative plan. A tentative plan in the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) is related to Planned Residential Developments. The plan is submitted to a municipality for review and approval with an ordinance supporting zoning changes coming afterward. Only the tentative plan is being reviewed tonight, not the zoning ordinance. The Township pulled the zoning ordinance from our consideration earlier this week. Our review is basically of a sketch plan. The MPC requires tentative plans to show few details. There are basic areas outlined for stormwater management, but the details are not required at this point. The same goes for traffic studies that would show how traffic would move in and out of this development and around the Township and how it would affect the interchange. Those are details that would be submitted with a final plan after the ordinance has been submitted. At some point in the future, we will have an opportunity to review the zoning ordinance that would allow this development. Currently apartments are not allowed in the Office Park district.

Ms. Morgan asked what the benefit is of doing this as a tentative plan instead of reviewing the whole package. Mr. Berryman said he is not sure what benefit the developer would have in submitting the project this way to the Township. Ms. Morgan asked exactly what are we looking at. Mr. Berryman said we are looking at the sketch plan submitted to the Township in advance of an ordinance. Mr. Gemmel asked if there is a time element. Mr. Berryman said we have 30 days to do our review. The Township has to hold a hearing within 60 days of submission of the plan to them. Mr. Campbell asked about the nature of the ordinance. Mr. Berryman said since it was withdrawn, we couldn't discuss it. Mr. Glennon asked for an explanation for the benefit of the Commission members of what it means that the ordinance was withdrawn. Ms. Bradley said we met with the Township Monday because we had a chance to review the ordinance. We learned it was a new procedure for them as well, and they are still trying to figure out how all of it is going to work. They felt more comfortable withdrawing it, since even their own solicitor isn't sure how it is going to work, to figure it out and then bring the ordinance back. They will be able to make better decisions once they have things worked out with the ordinance. The developer was involved with the crafting of the ordinance. Ms. Morgan asked what happens if the ordinance takes a tail spin. Ms. Bradley said the plan could take a tail spin, too. They are just trying to work it out. Mr. Glennon said he doesn't have a problem seeing this site developed; however, this is a very valuable piece of property for business generation. There are a limited number of sites with great access to Rt. 33 that have the potential to develop the high quality jobs that this site could have. Mr. Glennon said the developer has asked for rezoning that would allow apartments. He has a real problem with this as a project of regional concern. He finds it objectionable to change this to high density residential. Ms. Rader asked if this borders any residential zones on any side. Mr. Berryman said yes, and he pointed to areas on the map that are low density residential that allow about ½ acre lots. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the review letter. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. Mr. Berryman said we are only providing comments on the tentative plan tonight. Mr. Gemmel asked about commenting on the density. Mr. Berryman said we could, but the density is in accord with the County Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Glennon called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried.

#### *MPC Reviews*

Ms. Dreisbach said there are five summary sheet items on page 11 of the agenda attachments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Hefele seconded the motion. The motion carried.

## ***Environment Committee***

### ***Committee Participation***

Mr. Repasch said we have no formal action tonight, but we do have an issue to discuss. The Environment Committee is very lean. We have been trying to get more people on our Committee for several years. We presently only have five members. The LVPC is now into the phase of the sustainability study dealing with climate change and energy issues. The staff recommended that the Environment Committee act as the Advisory Committee to oversee and review that portion of the plan. In order to do that, we need new members to participate on the Environment Committee.

Ms. Bradley said the American Planning Association (APA) put out a guidance document related to climate change. There is a lot of debate about whether climate change is or is not happening, and we wanted to avoid that debate. That is not what this is about. It is really about things communities can do to be more efficient in how they operate and providing a better environment for their residents and for the community. Mr. Reese said there are 100 different policy recommendations in the APA report. We are not thinking this was going to be some type of revolutionary issue. We are already addressing many of these issues in our Comprehensive Plan. The very first recommendation from the APA report is Compact Development. That is exactly what we have been proposing for a very long time. We have a Compact Development pattern. We have places that are walkable. There are things we currently work on everyday that are in our current plan and are simply reinforced as you look at them through the perspective of climate change and energy.

Ms. Bradley said we are going to review the APA document against our Comprehensive Plan. We want to see if there are things we are missing, policies we may need to beef up. This is going to take a lot of time and effort because it is relevant to more than one section of our Comprehensive Plan. In the energy piece, we are looking at the types of energy used in the Lehigh Valley now, beyond electric. We want to be able to make recommendations for people to save money. Ms. Bradley said this gives us a chance to start looking at our Comprehensive Plan to find out where it can be improved and where more can be added. Mr. Repasch asked for new members to the Environment Committee. We will probably start an hour earlier, at 10:00 am, to make sure we have sufficient time to handle regular Committee business. Mr. Glennon said he will join the committee. Ms. Dreisbach asked if the Committee time can be changed to later in the day to accommodate our schedules. Mr. Repasch said he would be willing to do that to improve the attendance. Mr. Lammi said this work will take about 15 months to complete, so it will be a long term commitment. Mr. Glennon said he would like to see more representation from the cities. Mr. Hefele and Mr. Glickman volunteered to join the Committee. Ms. Bradley said we can send out a poll to see if other Commission members would be interested in joining as well.

## ***Transportation Committee***

### ***Update on Recently Announced Bridge Restrictions***

Mr. Gurinko said there is still no new funding in transportation. He heard it may be addressed next week. Last month, the Secretary of Transportation made an announcement on new postings of bridges. There were 38 identified in the Lehigh Valley, a combination of state owned and locally owned bridges. At that time, the State had just come out with postings for their bridges, but not for locally owned bridges.

PennDOT, in an effort to reach out to the legislature and local municipalities, held a session this morning to talk about this issue. Mr. Gurinko borrowed their power point presentation for this evening.

Mr. Gurinko said, on August 22, there were 1,000 bridges given weight restrictions across the state. PennDOT manages about 25,000 bridges across the state. In the first round, the Secretary of Transportation identified about 1,000 bridges that need to be newly posted or those already posted that need to have greater restrictions. These bridges are structurally deficient. The purpose of the restrictions is to lessen the loads on those bridges and lessen the rate of deterioration. Mr. Gurinko said PennDOT is trying to extend the life of the network so that the need for investment isn't so dire immediately. The Secretary, in his announcement, indicated that if more money wasn't made available, this would unfortunately become an annual announcement where more bridges would be posted to try to keep as much of the network open as possible.

Last month we talked a little bit about the variety of weights of different vehicles. An important number to remember is 17 tons. If a bridge is posted at less than 17 tons, PennDOT will not allow a school bus to cross. In terms of locally owned bridges on smaller roads, this becomes a key issue.

A structurally deficient bridge is a bridge that is identified through engineering inspection as having a deficient component or components. There are three main components – superstructure, substructure and deck. For this analysis, PennDOT did not consider structural deficiency on decks because it is easy to fix. Superstructure or substructure is a different story. On a scale of zero to nine, where nine is in the best condition and zero is in the worst condition, anything rated four or lower makes a bridge structurally deficient. The other thing to consider is the number of bridges with a rating of five out there. Chances are within the next few years these will deteriorate to where they will be structurally deficient. Not all structurally deficient bridges are posted. All posted bridges are structurally deficient. This is not to be thought of as a dire situation where bridges may fall down tomorrow. If a bridge is in danger of failure, PennDOT will close that bridge. The term structurally deficient just lets engineers know attention is needed sooner rather than later.

There are a number of other terms to define here. Safe load capacity is a load that can be carried safely by the structure. The inventory rating is a load that can be carried by the structure for an indefinite period of time. The significance of this is that some states post based on the inventory rating. If PennDOT posted based on inventory rating, 11,000 bridges would be posted across the state; 44% of PennDOT's bridges would be posted if they used this conservative approach. The State of Connecticut uses this approach. PennDOT has eased that standard a bit. They actually use an operating rating, which is the maximum load allowed on a structure.

Five state owned bridges in the Lehigh Valley will get new postings, which means they are open now, but they will be posted. Postings are expected to be completed by late fall. Eight existing postings will be reduced and another eleven will remain unchanged. Mr. Gurinko presented tables that show the state owned bridges in Lehigh and Northampton County where the postings will be reduced, where they were previously opened and will be posted in the future, and where the postings are unchanged.

There are a total of 24 locally owned bridges in Lehigh and Northampton counties that are structurally deficient. Four of those will be new postings. Eighteen existing posted bridges will be reduced and two will remain unchanged. Unfortunately, those two are closed. The posted letters to the municipalities and the two counties will be sent out by the end of October. Those entities will be given two months to post the bridges in order to implement this program. Mr. Gurinko presented a table for the locally owned bridges that shows the same kind of information as the state owned bridges.

Mr. Gurinko said, according to PennDOT, snow plowing could also be a problem with some of these restrictions. This is a very real problem that really points out the need for additional investment in the network. We expect that, if no action is taken, this will become an annual process. The purpose of this is to make sure that as much of the network stays open as possible. Mr. Gurinko presented a map that showed the local bridges impacted by the restrictions.

Mr. Eric Davis, representing Representative Simmons, said the representative is interested in facilitating several road projects. Both of the projects are in Upper Saucon Township. The first project is at Rt. 309 and Center Valley Parkway. The Township has a plan for improvement of the jug handle for people to get on Rt. 378 from Saucon Valley Parkway and also people getting on Rt. 309. The representative wants to give support for this project and was told that the LVPC needs to take action on it. The second project is Camp Meeting Road and Lanark and the intersection with Rt. 309. The Township and school district would like to see a left hand turn lane put in at that location because the school district uses that road for their buses. They think this would help improve the traffic flow. They both have \$400,000 to put toward this improvement. The project is estimated to cost \$2 million. Representative Simmons also supports this project and is going to try to work with leadership if the Transportation Bill goes through to see if they can get funding for these projects. Ms. Bradley said we handle these issues through the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study that is managed through the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. Mr. Gurinko said we have a meeting of the Technical Committee on Monday, September 30<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 a.m. at this office. That would certainly be an appropriate forum for this discussion along with this meeting and our Transportation Committee meeting. Mr. Gurinko said he will give Mr. Davis his business card and would be happy to speak to Representative Simmons. We can get him on the agenda for a future meeting. We are in the process of updating our Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). We are about to start with it. The TIP is a four year program for high priority highway, bridge and transit projects for the Lehigh Valley. Mr. Gurinko said if you want to see a project completed in the near future, that is the plan you need to be on.

## ***OLD BUSINESS***

### *Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project*

Mr. Reese said we have worked on the Housing Sales Data Report. This report looks at five years of housing sales data for Lehigh and Northampton counties from 2008-2012. Our Comprehensive Planning Committee has looked at the report and agreed to release it as a draft. It has gone on to our Housing Advisory Committee for the purpose of the HUD project. That committee was introduced to this report earlier this month and there is a second meeting scheduled to review it on October 16<sup>th</sup> where we hope to finalize the review of that report with the committee. At that point, it will go to the Consortium for review. When they are finished with their review, it will come back to this group for final approval action.

Other pieces we are working on include the Housing Affordability update and a Jobs/Housing Balance Study being done by our consultant. We are working hard at the staff level to look at the information from the consultant and are preparing it to go to the Housing Advisory Committee in November. In addition, on the Climate Study, Sue Rockwell and Travis Bartholomew have done almost all of the research for this. We shared some of that data with the Committee. Now we have to go through that data to see how much we need to use to create background documents of our own. On the energy side, Dave Berryman and Ngozi Obi have been working on that research, but are not quite as far along with that yet.

***NEW BUSINESS – None***

***CORRESPONDENCE – None***

### ***EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT***

#### ***Training Opportunities***

Ms. Bradley said we have had a wonderful fall training season. We run the Local Government Academy which provides low cost or no cost training for government officials and interested individuals in the public who want to know how to adopt an official map and how that tool can be used to decide what they want to do with their land, and Subdivision and Land Development review training. These courses are coming up, and Ms. Bradley handed out two flyers for the courses. The Official Map class will be held on October 8<sup>th</sup> from 9:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m. at our office. That training is free. The Basic Course in Subdivision Review is three evening sessions on October 16, 23 and 30. The cost is \$90. This is a really good course for planning commission members to understand how a plan is reviewed and what the legal requirements are for review.

#### ***Website***

Commission member Bob Lammi has graciously offered to help us update our website. We have been meeting with Mr. Lammi and our staff technology group to restructure, reorganize and develop our website. Ms. Bradley wanted to publicly thank Mr. Lammi for working with us on this project.

#### ***Commission Appointments & Reappointments***

We have had a couple of reappointments and an appointment of a new member to the Commission. Ms. Pearson and Mr. Nolan have been reappointed by Northampton County Council last week. Ms. Bradley welcomed Ms. Rader from Upper Macungie Township to the Commission.

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

Submitted by,

Kathleen Sauerzopf for  
Becky Bradley  
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 31, 2013*

### **MINUTES**

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, October 31, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matt Glennon chaired the meeting.

#### ***Members in attendance:***

##### **Lehigh County**

Percy Dougherty  
Steven Glickman  
Armand Greco  
Michael Hefele  
Kent Herman  
Ben Howells  
Kenneth McClain  
Christina Morgan  
Kathy Rader  
Stephen Repasch  
Virginia Savage  
Lisa Scheller  
Peter Schweyer  
Donna Wright

##### **Northampton County**

Christen Borso  
Gordon Campbell  
John Diacogiannis  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Elliott  
Matthew Glennon  
Darlene Heller  
Kevin Lott  
Thomas J. Nolan  
Pamela Pearson  
Michael Reph  
Lori Sywensky  
Seth Vaughn

***Members absent:*** Norman Blatt, Karen Duerholz, Edward Hozza, Sara Pandl, John Cusick, Charles Fraust, George Gemmel, Bob Lammi, Carl Manges and Elinor Warner.

***Staff present:*** Becky Bradley, Geoffrey Reese, Joseph Gurinko, David Berryman, Sue Rockwell and Ngozi Obi.

***Public Present:*** Kevin Duffy, The Morning Call

***COURTESY OF THE FLOOR******MINUTES***

After a brief review, the minutes of the September 26, 2013 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Dougherty. Mr. Repasch seconded the motion. The motion carried with abstentions by Ms. Wright, Mr. McClain, Mr. Diacogiannis, Mr. Elliott, Ms. Sywensky and Mr. Vaughn.

***PRESS CONFERENCE & SPECIAL PRESENTATION******National Community Planning Month Honor***

Ms. Bradley said October is National Community Planning Month and the Executive Committee passed a resolution earlier in the month supporting planners. National Community Planning Month is designated by the American Planning Association which is the professional planning organization. They set the standards for planning throughout the country. National Community Planning month tells people how planning is beneficial from where we work, to where we live, to how we get to shops, jobs, churches, schools and how all of those things are interconnected. Ms. Bradley thanked the Executive Committee for their support.

Ms. Bradley said as part of National Community Planning month in 2014, we will have our first awards ceremony for the communities in the Lehigh Valley. We have designated a number of categories, including Land Developments, Revitalization Projects, Open Space Projects, Environmental and Transportation Projects and Multi-Municipal Cooperation. The most important award will be the Community of Distinction Award. We will be looking for members of the Commission to serve on that review committee. The idea is to recognize the wonderful things happening in the Lehigh Valley. Finally, the City of Allentown received a very competitive Award of Merit from the American Planning Association – Pennsylvania Chapter for their Lehigh River Waterfront Master Plan.

Mr. Hefele said they were thrilled to receive recognition from the APA. The waterfront plan took about ten months to complete. It looked at the entire Lehigh Riverfront area all the way from Hamilton Street to the city line. This is about 125 acres. We relied very heavily on public involvement and public input. We had some of the best attended public meetings he had ever experienced. There were actually very few negative comments. The plan includes opportunities for intensive mixed use development. The project is located at the former Lehigh Structural Steel site and involves a partnership between Jaindl Properties and Dunn & Twigg. They are in the approval process with our planning commission. They have a million square feet of development proposed for that site. They have a nine year build out proposed to accomplish that. Additionally, the Neuweiller Brewery property that abuts the waterfront on Front Street has been vacant for over 40 years. We have been able to market it and are under an agreement of sale. The property will be converted into a mixed use development and will also include a brewery. The plan also calls for additional public space and access. One of the issues we always have in an older urban waterfront area is that the surrounding neighborhoods get walled off from the river because of the industries along the waterfront. One of our key objectives is to make sure all the neighborhood streets extend down to the water as well as pedestrian and bike paths. It is a very ambitious plan. We have a good start, and as we proceed, we hope to see more projects come out of this plan as the years go on.

Ms. Bradley said the Community of Distinction and other awards may feed into additional statewide and national awards as part of this program. This will be a great opportunity for the Commission to showcase all the good work being done in the three cities, the rural areas and suburbs. We are proud to do this for the Lehigh Valley. Ms. Bradley said we are hoping to get road signs for the Community of Distinction so it becomes permanent. This way everyone will know about the award and the planning commission. We will be taking nominations next summer.

## ***COMMITTEE REPORTS***

### ***Comprehensive Planning Committee***

#### *Reviews*

Mr. Hefele said there are seven summary sheet items on pages 8 and 9 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Hefele made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Heller seconded the motion. The motion carried.

### ***Environment Committee***

#### *Status Report on Climate and Energy Plans*

Ms. Rockwell said under the HUD Sustainability Grant the LVPC is responsible for preparing climate and energy plans for the Lehigh Valley. We needed to establish an advisory committee to help with this work. Last month our Environment Committee agreed to act as that committee. We have several new members: Mr. Glennon, Mr. Glickman, Mr. Hefele and Mr. Elliott. As far as the climate component goes, we have gathered a variety of climate change research that we thought would be useful to us in this project. From this research, we have prepared a draft background report on climate change. On Tuesday, we reviewed the report with the Committee and are asking for their input. It is a work in progress right now. We will also be putting together a toolbox that will contain educational material such as fact sheets and model ordinances. Another part of this project is to put together a list of stakeholders that we need to discuss and work with on policy issues, and we're starting to look into that. One of the documents we found during our research is an APA document: Policy Guide on Planning and Climate Change. We are going to be looking at that document very closely. It has a lot of good ideas on policies. The end product of this whole project is the addition of a climate component to the comprehensive plan, complete with goals, policies and strategies. We are hoping to have a draft climate component by April 2014 and a final component by September 2014.

Mr. Berryman said the 2005 comprehensive plan does not have an energy component, but through this project, we will be updating the plan to include energy. Mr. Berryman and Ms. Obi are working on an Energy Baseline Report which will provide background information and research on energy consumption and production locally and at the state level using whatever data sources we have at our disposal for that data. Back in the mid 80s, the planning commission actually had an Energy Center here where we collected data on energy. We went out and did public participation on energy use and conservation. The energy report will be the first step in providing the Committee with information to make cogent and practical goal and policy decisions on energy.

## ***Transportation Committee***

### ***LANta Enhanced Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Study***

Mr. Greco said LANta has done a presentation on the Enhanced Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Study a number of times. He said they are getting to the end of the project. Tonight he is going to review the last technical piece of the program. The Authority has worked over 1 ½ years on this project. This is a project that was built off of a 12 year program we developed and approved back in 2010 called *Moving LANta Forward*. Mr. Greco explained the creation and establishment of this program. They primarily looked at the 100 series routes. They are the primary routes we operate that have the heaviest traffic and the most service. We received public input and had an advisory committee of 35 people. We developed goals and criteria and we ranked corridors. We developed service plans and capital plans that have dollars associated with it. Finally, we made land use and transportation an emphasis with what we do at the authority with hopes the combination of the two will produce benefits for all of us. Mr. Greco further discussed details of several routes. We want to broaden the availability of choice to the riders of our system. We also are working on off-board fare collection so you can pay fare with a ticket. Finally, there will be signal optimization on the corridors which will help all traffic move faster.

The implementation plan will be in six phases. Each plan would last one to two years and each phase will stand alone if necessary. Along with the changes, we will be modifying some of our existing services. Mr. Greco further discussed the six phases. He said the Capital Plan represents \$17 million dollars of investment if we do everything. The technical document will be finalized by the consultant shortly. It will be up to LANta's Board of Directors to decide how we can proceed.

Ms. Morgan asked what is the overall goal of the plan and what do you want to accomplish. Mr. Greco said the goal is to enhance ridership and support the communities' development plans. We would like to see as a result of this program a broader ridership base. Most of our riders have very few options other than the bus. We would like to see additional riders who would leave their car home and take the bus. Mr. Howells asked if there have been any in-depth studies done over the served person cost on various routes and why there is a variance. Mr. Greco said it is done every year. Mr. Schweyer said part of the challenge of overall ridership is we serve the entire Lehigh Valley. A couple of months ago we had looked at that. Unfortunately a lot of the lower density riders are the ones from Slatington to Walnutport to the Slate Belt. Since we are a regional authority we are not going to cut the services even though from a cost perspective there is no profit.

Mr. Dougherty said one of the keys is the density of population. You have to have a dense population node to be able to serve well. He thinks LVPC, LANta and municipal governments have to figure out ways to get density up in the corridors. We should be concentrating on these corridors instead of trying to serve everybody. He thinks this is a problem with many of the local townships. The diffused population is costing us a lot of money in terms of services. In the case of LANta, it is very difficult to serve a diffused population. Mr. Greco said transit and general transportation problems affect highways and other infrastructure. We are not just looking at transit but we want good community planning that will help in many respects. Lower Macungie is one of our strongest advocates.

Ms. Bradley said there is a positive spirit with the Southwest Lehigh Comprehensive Planning Group. Ms. Wright and I attended a recent meeting. It is a good multi-municipal comprehensive planning effort. Their plan includes the boroughs of Emmaus, Alburtis and Macungie, and the townships of Lower Macungie, Upper Milford and Lower Milford. They are looking to update that plan hopefully with the LVPC. They are working together to plan jointly and to do things to promote transit. There was a lot of discussion regarding transportation. Mr. Greco said he has spoken to a lot of suburban planning commissions since LANta adopted *Moving LANta Forward*. These planning commissions listen and are very much in tune to what we are trying to do. Mr. Greco said he hopes they get the first phases going in a year or two. That decision will be made by the LANta Board. Mr. Greco concluded his presentation.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### *Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project*

Ms. Obi said we are updating the Housing in the Lehigh Valley 2008 Report. This report has worked its way through our LVPC Housing Advisory Committee which met Thursday, September 12<sup>th</sup> and Wednesday, October 16<sup>th</sup>. Currently, the Committee is reviewing the report. Hopefully it will be released to our consortium partners in November, and then it will come to the LVPC Comprehensive Planning Committee for comment. After that it will be brought to the Commission. We are still working with the consultant, RKG, on the Affordable Housing Assessment of the Lehigh Valley. We are expecting a draft of that report in early 2014. Our consultant is working on the Jobs/Housing Balance Study. They will be here next month to discuss it with the Advisory Committee. Their updates to that report and a draft of that report will be available to LVPC in early 2014. As part of the housing report, we are also doing a public participation program called Housing Matters. You will see this program advertised on billboards. You will see it on our LVPC Facebook page as well as on our partners' Facebook pages. You will see us on twitter providing updates on our housing efforts. Our website will also have this information. Our community partners for this effort are the Community Action Committee of the Lehigh Valley (CACLV), our consortium partners and the Envision process and the Lehigh Valley Research Consortium. The public participation process will consist of meetings and a housing survey. We will have a general component where we are working with the Lehigh Valley Research Consortium doing a phone survey asking the survey questions. We also have a city component where we will be working with CACLV to do meetings and surveys. We also have a non-city component where we will be having public meetings and surveys in the boroughs, townships and rural areas in the Lehigh Valley.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### *Northampton County Livable Landscapes Plan*

Ms. Bradley said Northampton County is working with the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission to create a Livable Landscapes Plan. This is not only an update to the current Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan, but will include some new and interesting things including blue ways, so our water recreational resources can be addressed. We'll be looking at linkages between our urban and rural corridors and looking at some of those urban revitalization opportunities and the parks and trails that run through those. We will be looking at the economic benefits of open space, preservation and recreational development possibly looking at opportunities for outfitters, etc. We are going to be mapping some of the historic resources that tie into the idea of cultural and natural landscape. We want to look at Northampton County parks,

recreation and open space as an economic benefit as well as an amenity and an opportunity to improve the values of homes, schools and our entire community. We are trying to take a typical park plan and turn it into something more. We want to thank Northampton County for the opportunity to accomplish this. We look forward to sharing this with you next year. Mr. Dougherty asked if this is from the County appropriation or is this extra money. Ms. Bradley said it is extra money, but we don't have an exact price yet. It is being funded by their Act 13 Marcellus Shale Gas allocation.

***CORRESPONDENCE – None***

***EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT***

*Presentations and Professional Development*

Ms. Bradley said the last couple of months have been very successful going out into the communities and meeting a lot of people and presenting to the Renew Lehigh Valley Smart Growth Summit last week and the LVEDC broker developer group earlier this month. We participated in a number of meetings as LVPC staff representing the Commission at several PennDOT meetings. Ms. Bradley said we participated in the American Planning Association and the American Public Transportation Association in partnership with LANta. Tomorrow she will be with the county planning directors statewide. We have done everything from participating in Unified Planning Work programs to meetings with PennDOT officials and the Lehigh Valley Greenways and Sustainable Communities Partnership just throughout October. Ms. Bradley provided a handout listing courses held in October and those scheduled for the remainder of the year. She said we provide a series of LTAP courses through PennDOT. They are largely for public works and municipal officials on everything from safe driving to minimizing municipal liability to appropriate work zone traffic controls to the American with Disabilities Act. We have some upcoming LTAP courses and partnership courses with the American Planning Association – Lehigh Valley Chapter and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. Our next course is Smart Planning in Small Towns and Rural Areas here next week. We also have a traffic signs course for municipal and public works officials in November. There will be a course on full depth reclamation. On December 4<sup>th</sup> Lower Macungie will be hosting the Fiscal Impact Analysis Decision Support Tool specifically for planners and planning commissions. This is also through a partnership with the LVPC. We're looking next year to increase our training and services to our municipal partners through expansion of our Local Government Academy program. She asked Commission members to spread the word in their communities to attend the courses. Most of them are free.

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

Submitted by,

Kathleen Sauerzopf for  
Becky Bradley  
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 21, 2013*

### ***MINUTES***

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, November 21, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matt Glennon chaired the meeting.

### ***Members in attendance:***

#### **Lehigh County**

Norman Blatt  
Karen Duerholz  
Steven Glickman  
Michael Hefele  
Kent Herman  
Ben Howells  
Ed Hozza  
Christina Morgan  
Kathy Rader  
Stephen Repasch  
Virginia Savage

#### **Northampton County**

John Diacogiannis  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Elliott  
Charles Fraust  
George Gemmel  
Matthew Glennon  
Bob Lammi  
Carl Manges  
Thomas J. Nolan  
Lori Sywensky  
Seth Vaughn

***Members absent:*** Percy Dougherty, Armand Greco, Kenneth McClain, Sara Pandl, Lisa Scheller, Peter Schweyer, Donna Wright, Christen Borso, Gordon Campbell, John Cusick, Darlene Heller, Kevin Lott, Pamela Pearson, Michael Reph and Elinor Warner.

***Staff present:*** Becky Bradley, Geoffrey Reese, Joseph Gurinko, David Berryman and Sue Rockwell

***Public Present:*** Allen Howells

***COURTESY OF THE FLOOR***

## **MINUTES**

After a brief review, the minutes of the October 31, 2013 meeting were moved for approval by Ms. Dreisbach. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried with abstentions by Mr. Blatt, Mr. Hozza, and Mr. Gemmel.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### ***Comprehensive Planning Committee***

### ***Comprehensive Planning Committee***

#### ***South Whitehall Township – Cluster Developments in the R-3 Zoning District (MPC Review)***

Mr. Berryman said there is a draft review letter and additional related material with the agenda packet. The Township is proposing a concept of cluster development that includes both residential and non-residential development permitted only in the R-3 district. It would allow twin units and single family dwelling units and provide for a variety of non-residential uses including offices and restaurants. Our review focuses on the non-residential uses and density of units proposed. The R-3 district is a low density residential district, but the district is mostly built out. In the R-3 district there are no non-residential uses currently allowed, but the cluster development provisions would allow these uses only in low density districts. One of our concerns is that they would be creating new pockets of commercial development in areas that are largely residential in nature. The ordinance would allow up to 2.6 units per acre. The county comprehensive plan recommends up to 4 units per acre. The overall recommendation is that the cluster development proposal is inconsistent with the County Comprehensive Plan. We are aware that the Township is currently looking at their zoning ordinance, and Traditional Neighborhood Design is something they are thinking about doing. That would be a better approach if they want to incorporate residential and non-residential compact development in the Township.

Mr. Glickman asked why the Township is going ahead with the cluster development approach. Mr.

Mr. Glickman asked why the Township is going ahead with the cluster development approach. Mr. Berryman said he believes this is a “developer proposed” ordinance. Mr. Glickman asked if there is any connectivity required between the residential and non-residential uses. Mr. Berryman said no. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Manges seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Morgan abstaining.

#### ***aMPC Reviews***

#### ***MPC Reviews***

Mr. Dreisbach said there are seven summary sheet items on page 7 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Berryman said Item Nos. 6 and 7 are related to the same tract known as the “Bortz tract” located in South Whitehall and Upper Macungie townships. There is a proposal we haven’t seen yet that mixes apartments and commercial uses together. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried with abstentions by Mr. Hozza (Item # 1) and Ms. Rader.

### ***Environment Committee***

Mr. Repasch said that Dork Sahagian, Professor of Earth and Environmental Science at Lehigh University, provided a presentation on climate change at the Environment Committee meeting on Tuesday.

Mr. Sahagian will be providing a presentation on energy at the January 28, 2014 Environment Committee meeting. Mr. Repasch invited Commission members to attend the meeting.

### *Reviews*

Mr. Repasch said there are nine summary sheet items on pages 8-9 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Gemmel seconded the motion. The motion carried.

### *Status Report on Climate and Energy Plans*

Ms. Rockwell said under the HUD Sustainability Grant the LVPC is responsible for preparing climate and energy plans for the Lehigh Valley. The current county comprehensive plan does not include climate and energy components, but the end product of the work we are doing is an addendum to the plan complete with goals, policies and strategies including these elements. To help with this work, we established an advisory committee. Our Environment Committee is serving as that committee. To date, we have prepared a draft background report on climate change that we provided to the Committee last month for their review and input. It is still a work in progress. One of the documents we found during our research on climate change is an APA document: Policy Guide on Planning and Climate Change. This document was also provided to the committee for their review. We are currently putting together a spreadsheet that compares the policy recommendations in the APA guide with related policies that are already in the county comprehensive plan. We will be working with the committee over the next month or so to identify those policy areas that should be considered further. We anticipate having a draft climate component by April 2014 and a final component by September 2014.

Mr. Berryman said we started working on an energy profile baseline data report that includes information on pricing and uses and how energy has been used differently at the municipal level between 2000 and 2010. The report includes charts and maps that indicate these differences. This report will be part of a much larger report. In addition to Professor Sahagian providing a presentation on energy in January 2014, we hope to have someone speak about green building and LEED at some point. We are on the same schedule to complete an energy component.

### *Transportation Committee*

#### *Update on Transportation Funding*

Mr. Gurinko said tonight he will be presenting an update on transportation funding at the state level. The state legislature acted on funding today, and Governor Corbett is expected to sign the bill. We will have an additional \$2.3-\$2.4 billion annually in state funding ramped up over five years. The \$2.3-\$2.4 billion will occur in year five and every year thereafter. There is \$1.3 billion annually for state roads and bridges, \$480-\$495 million for public transportation and \$237 million for local roads and bridges. There is also a multimodal fund that will address bike paths, pedestrian walkways and rail freight issues at \$144 million. This is a significant increase. The primary revenue generator will be from the lifting of the cap on the Oil Company Franchise Tax that will occur over a five year period but in three separate installments. It will be about 9.5 cents in each of those three installments for a total of about an additional 28 cents of taxes per gallon. Also, fines for moving citations will be increased as a result of this legislation. However, this bill eliminates the state Retail Gas Tax of 12 cents per gallon starting January 1, 2014.

Mr. Gurinko said one of the key issues for the Lehigh Valley is that, with this funding, the widening of Route 22 from about Route 309 to Route 512 is back on the table. As far as structurally deficient bridges and postings of these bridges, the postings will stay in place. They are not high priority bridges. Those bridges in dire need of improvement will be addressed with this funding. This legislation has a major impact on the Long Range Transportation Plan that we're in the process of updating to 2040 because it has to be financially constrained. This funding will give us the ability to do more than asset management.

Mr. Repasch asked if the ongoing work on Route 22 in Whitehall is compatible with the widening project. Mr. Gurinko said yes. We wanted to make sure that whatever they did, they wouldn't have to tear it out with the widening. Mr. Gemmel said he understands there may be a problem with federal funding. Mr. Gurinko said yes. Potentially, if there is no action to supplement the highway trust fund, there will be a shortage of \$15 billion in 2015. If that happens, the Pennsylvania allocation for federal transportation funding will go from \$1.6 billion to approximately \$7 million. Ms. Bradley said the important thing to remember here is that without the transportation bill passing, any road condition issues or bridge repairs that need to be done would not occur. This is critical to keeping our community and economy moving forward. Mr. Gurinko said that a compelling argument made by the Secretary of Transportation was that the "do nothing" approach would actually cost taxpayers more. Ms. Bradley said we also received our travel model today. It allows us to look at the impact of growth industries and specific developments on our transportation network and be able to better prioritize funding expenditures.

## ***OLD BUSINESS***

### *Status Report on HUD Sustainability Project*

Mr. Reese said we have three housing reports we're working on. One is almost complete. It is the 5 year housing sales data report for the two counties created by staff. The Comprehensive Planning Committee approved it as a draft. It has moved to the Housing Committee that was created for this program. There is a meeting of this committee tomorrow, November 22, and hopefully it will be released at that time. The two other reports we're working on with the help of a consultant include an update of a report created back in 2007 on housing issues and a jobs/housing balance study. The consultant is working on both of these and will provide a status report at tomorrow's meeting.

Mr. Reese said another component in this effort is public outreach. Public outreach consists of a survey that is being done by phone by the Lehigh Valley Research Consortium that will be finished by the end of December. We are also having community meetings as listed on the agenda and on a handout provided to Commission members. Also on the handout is a QR code that can be used with a Smartphone to take the survey. Ms. Duerholz asked how people are finding out about the community meetings. Mr. Reese said in the cities we are working with CACLV and they have a network in place to work on a variety of issues everyday. We are working directly with them and they are letting people know. In the broader community, we are in the process of designing how that will roll out. CACLV does not have that presence outside of the cities. There is also a message on an electronic billboard on Route 22. We have it on our website, on Facebook and Twitter. We are also going to get fliers out to as many places as we can. Ms. Duerholz asked if any of the media will be involved in getting the word out. Ms. Bradley said they will be starting up in January. We are also looking for rural and suburban communities to host community forums in January.

***NEW BUSINESS******Northampton County Livable Landscapes Plan***

Ms. Bradley said Northampton County Council authorized the LVPC to create a new parks, recreation and open space plan for the county. It will pull together all the work we've done over time with our Greenways Plan. A new component of the plan is that we'll be looking at blue ways and waterways as active recreational facilities. We'll still have a farmland preservation component in the plan. Another new component will be historic resources, particularly tourism related as well as scenic view sheds and cultural landscapes. Connectivity is a key component, too, because that's how you move from rural to suburban areas to the cities. Another key component that will make this plan different is the economic benefits of recreational facilities. Companies that locate in places now are looking for that value added piece. There's all kind of information that show people live in places longer and housing values are higher when you have parks, recreation and open space in communities. We're hoping to quantify that and include it in the plan.

***CORRESPONDENCE******LTAP***

Ms. Bradley said we do a lot of training for public works officials in partnership with PennDOT. They are very well attended. They are starting to send thank you letters asking us to keep offering training.

***EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT******Web Hits***

Ms. Bradley said we are in the process of updating our website with the assistance of Mr. Lammi. We wanted to organize it better and to make it more user-friendly. However, when we looked at how well it currently performs, it does very well. Commission members were provided a copy of the LVPC web hits from the last quarter. Ms. Bradley said people are really interested in our model ordinances with over 51,000 hits in three months. There is also a lot of interest in stormwater management and the county comprehensive plan.

***Fiscal Analysis as a Decision Support Tool***

Ms. Bradley said the LVPC has partnered with the PA Planning Association on providing workshops throughout the valley. Lower Macungie is hosting the Fiscal Analysis as a Decision Support Tool workshop on December 4 from 4:00-5:00 PM. There are over 30 registrations. People are really interested in learning about the financial impact of development. This is a good introduction to the topic. Next year we are hoping to offer a more in-depth workshop on the topic.

***December Meeting and Commission Photo***

Ms. Bradley said the December LVPC meeting will be held on December 19 at 11:00 am. We will have a formal photo taken after the meeting. Lunch will be provided. We will also be revealing the new

LVPC logo at the meeting. Mr. Glickman asked if the press will be invited. Ms. Bradley said she will invite them.

*Toys for Tots*

Ms. Bradley said we have been collecting for Toys for Tots during November and December. We have a box in the office if anyone is interested in donating to this worthy cause.

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

Submitted by,

Kathleen Sauerzopf for  
Becky Bradley  
Executive Director

# *Memo*



961 MARCON BOULEVARD, SUITE 310  
ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18109  
(610) 264-4544

*December 19, 2013*

## ***MINUTES***

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, December 19, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the LVPC Conference Room, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Matt Glennon chaired the meeting.

### ***Members in attendance:***

#### **Lehigh County**

Norman Blatt  
Matt Croslis  
Percy Dougherty  
Karen Duerholz  
Steven Glickman  
Armand Greco  
Virginia Haas  
Michael Hefele  
Kent Herman  
Edward Hozza  
Kenneth McClain  
Sara Pandl  
Kathy Rader  
Stephen Repasch  
Peter Schweyer

#### **Northampton County**

Gordon Campbell  
John Diacogiannis  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Elliott  
George Gemmel  
Matthew Glennon  
Darlene Heller  
Bob Lammi  
Carl Manges  
Salvatore Panto  
Pamela Pearson  
Michael Reph  
John Stoffa  
Lori Sywensky  
Seth Vaughn

***Members absent:*** Ben Howells, Christina Morgan, Lisa Scheller, Donna Wright, Christen Borso, John Cusick, Charles Fraust, Kevin Lott, Thomas Nolan and Elinor Warner.

***Staff present:*** Becky Bradley, Travis Bartholomew, David Berryman, Michael Donchez, Anne Esser, Joseph Gurinko, Alice Lipe, Teresa Mackey, David Manhardt, Chris Mukkadan, Ngozi Obi, Sue Rockwell, Lynette Romig and Joshua Spano.

***Public Present:*** None

## ***COURTESY OF THE FLOOR***

### ***MINUTES***

After a brief review, the minutes of the November 21, 2013 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Repasch. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried with abstentions by Mr. McClain and Mr. Reph.

### ***REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE***

Mr. Glickman said the Nominating Committee proposed Mr. Herman to be the new Chair, Ms. Dreisbach to be Vice-Chair and Mr. Repasch to be Treasurer. Mr. Glickman made a motion to approve the nominations. Mr. Dougherty seconded the nomination. The motion carried.

### ***COMMITTEE REPORTS***

#### ***Comprehensive Planning Committee***

##### ***2013 Comprehensive Planning Committee Report***

Ms. Dreisbach directed Commission members to the 2013 Committee report on pages 7-11 of the agenda attachments. She thanked the staff for the work done over the year.

##### ***MPC Reviews***

Ms. Dreisbach said there are six summary sheet items on pages 12-14 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Berryman said there was some discussion at the Committee meeting about agricultural security areas and easements for Item #6. The draft letter was revised to include Committee comments, and the summary sheet reflects the comments. Ms. Dreisbach made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. Mr. Glickman asked about agricultural security areas. Mr. Glennon said an agricultural security district is set up by the individual township or between townships. It is essentially a precursor or requirement to be involved in an agricultural security district in order to apply for farmland preservation. It gives the property owner an additional presumption of right to farm issues. It is often considered as a statement of future intent to think about applying for farmland preservation. Mr. Glennon called for the vote. The motion carried with Ms. Pandl abstaining.

##### ***Special Comprehensive Planning Committee Meeting***

Ms. Dreisbach said there will be a special Comprehensive Planning Committee meeting on Tuesday, January 7<sup>th</sup> at 12:00 p.m. for anyone interested to review a proposed FedEx development plan that was just submitted. There is a proposed Lower Nazareth Zoning Ordinance that will also be discussed. In other news, Ms. Dreisbach said that Ms. Wright agreed to be the new Chair of the Comprehensive Planning Committee in 2014.

## ***Environment Committee***

### ***2013 Environment Committee Report***

Mr. Repasch said at our Tuesday meeting we had a really comprehensive review of a draft energy report that the Commission will be hearing about in the next few months. He directed Commission members to the 2013 Committee report on pages 15-18. He thanked the staff for the work done over the year.

### ***Resolution to Close Out NHI & Greenways DCNR Contract***

Ms. Mackey said as part of the NHI Update, there is a contract with DCNR that required us to do some additional work using the data Western Pennsylvania Conservancy developed for the report, which is completed. As part of the contract, we had to update our Natural Resources Plan map, Greenways Plan map and Natural Heritage Inventory maps from the Lehigh Valley Greenways Plan. We reviewed the site descriptions from the NHI Update report and we had meetings with the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy to try and get this data into a working data set. We took whatever habitat references were in the report's site descriptions and used the data layers we have that would be appropriate for the species' needs. Ms. Mackey reviewed the changes to the three maps. The maps are in draft form right now because there might be some additional updates made in 2014. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2-13 to Close Out NHI and Greenways DCNR Contract. Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion. Ms. Pandl asked how this is going to be filtered down to local municipalities so we can look at it in respect to our ordinances. Ms. Mackey said it may be released separately or be part of the Comprehensive Plan Update. At this time, she isn't sure when it will all be done. Mr. Glennon called for the vote. The motion carried.

## ***Transportation Committee***

### ***2013 Transportation Committee Report***

Mr. McClain directed Commission members to the 2013 Transportation Committee report on pages 20-23. We would like to add three or four new members for 2014. There were a great many staff members who worked with the Transportation Committee. He thanked the staff for their work.

### ***OLD BUSINESS – None***

### ***NEW BUSINESS***

#### ***Approval of 2014 LVPC Budget***

Ms. Bradley said just prior to this meeting, the Executive Committee met to review and approve the 2014 budget, so we are passing around a copy of that budget and a summary memorandum. We have two functions. We are the county planning agency for Lehigh and Northampton counties and we provide those services under the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. We are also the Regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). We

manage all of the transportation planning throughout the region which is called the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study. Those two parts of our organization are funded jointly under the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. We have \$280,000 that is coming to us from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development for the Sustainable Communities Program. Basically our role in that is the creation of the Regional Housing Plan which is ongoing now and will conclude next year. This has new elements we haven't looked at in the past. This is primarily the Jobs/Housing Balance piece which asks if you make a certain amount of money, is there housing available to you and is there a shortage in your price range? Are there areas where we need more housing for various income levels and what could that housing look like by type? Ms. Bradley said that is a really sophisticated study. We don't have a final draft yet, but we are working very closely with the Housing Advisory Committee. This committee includes the banking community, Lehigh Valley Association of Realtors, Lehigh Valley Homebuilders Association, the Green Builders, Housing Authorities, etc., so we get a really balanced plan that includes both the public and private sector. We are doing our climate and energy piece as part of that. Then we are responsible to the whole 12 member consortium to create an addendum of the entire consortium's work. This will be an addendum to the Comprehensive Plan which will include everything from fresh food access as well as developing goals and policies in our Comprehensive Plan that support the Regional Economic Development Plan that is also being done as part of this effort.

Ms. Bradley said we have \$18,000 in work from the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources that includes an update of our model floodplain regulations to be compliant with the Biggert- Waters Act from the federal government and changes to the National Flood Insurance Program. We have \$425,000 each that comes from Lehigh and Northampton counties. Then we have \$60,000 for the Northampton County Livable Landscapes Plan with a balance of \$20,000 to be paid for the conclusion of that work in 2015. We have \$129,500 budgeted as revenue for our Subdivision and Land Development reviews. Ms. Bradley noted that right now our expected 2013 year end projection is \$186,000 for subdivision revenue, which is a significant increase over the past five years. We wanted to put a conservative estimate in that line because you can't predict how much money will come in each year. Under our MPO function we have received a contract for \$848,933 from PennDOT which accounts for about 40% of our budget. This is a net increase of almost \$74,000. In the last couple of months we have been able to bring in additional monies from our partners at PennDOT and FHWA to grow our Transportation Planning Program and our MPO functions. Our key expenses are largely staff related at \$1.67 million with \$82,243 for our professional services, which is almost 4% of our anticipated expenses. About 17.5% or \$373,000 is for office overhead.

Prior to this meeting, there was one change made by the Executive Committee. If you note on your sheet, we have a difference between anticipated revenue and expenses. The Executive Committee voted to move that balance which was \$56,705.96 in revenue to public participation and public engagement, which is a new line item. We never had this before so we want to thank the Executive Committee for helping us move the organization forward with additional community services, events and participation. This is the only change to what is proposed in the budget. Ms. Haas made a motion to approve the 2014 LVPC budget. Mr. Greco seconded the motion. The motion carried.

## *Approval of 2014 LVPC and Committee Meeting Dates*

Mr. Glennon said that Commission members should have a list of 2014 meeting dates for the LVPC and all our committees. Mr. Dougherty made a motion to approve the meeting dates. Mr. Glickman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

***CORRESPONDENCE - None***

## ***EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT***

### *New LVPC Logo*

Ms. Bradley said we have been working over the past 4½ months on how to rebrand the organization and make it more appealing in terms of appearance. Ms. Bradley presented the new LVPC logo and explained how it was developed by staff. We thought it was important to keep the image of government, so we used a standard font and text that could be read on any computer or website and used the squares to organize the world we live in. We relied heavily on our Land Use Survey and what people value most about the Lehigh Valley. There were 4 things people value most: 1) our waterways and water quality and access to water resources shown in the dark blue, 2) the backdrop in the sky of the Lehigh Valley shown in the light blue, 3) our green environment including parks, recreation, open space, and the mountains shown in the light green, and 4) everyone likes the quality of life and sense of place and the vision for a future we can all manage or the idea of sustainability shown in the dark green. We will also have a new website to present to you in January. Ms. Pearson made a motion to approve the new LVPC logo. Ms. Pandl seconded the motion. The motion carried.

### *Commission Recognition*

Mr. Herman said he looks forward to serving as chair for the next two years. He presented Mr. Glennon with several mementos in recognition of his service as chair. Ms. Bradley also presented Mr. Glennon with a memento from staff. Ms. Bradley presented Ms. Dreisbach with a memento for her service as chairwoman of the Comprehensive Planning Committee. She presented Mr. Croslis and Mr. Stoffa with mementos in appreciation for the assistance and support they provided to the LVPC.

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

Submitted by,

Kathleen Sauerzopf for  
Becky Bradley  
Executive Director