

# Memo



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

*November 19, 2015*

## **MINUTES**

The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, November 19, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. at the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission, 961 Marcon Boulevard, Suite 310, Allentown, PA.

Mr. Kent Herman chaired the meeting.

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

#### **Lehigh County**

Norman Blatt  
Shannon Calluori  
Karen Duerholz  
Steven Glickman  
Armand Greco  
Kent Herman  
Christina Morgan  
Kathy Rader  
Stephen Repasch  
Julie Thomases

#### **Northampton County**

Gordon Campbell  
John Diacogiannis  
Liesel Dreisbach  
Charles Elliott  
George F. Gemmel  
Darlene Heller  
Robert Lammi  
Thomas J. Nolan  
Pamela Pearson  
Michael Reph  
Lori Sywensky

***Members absent:*** Percy Dougherty, Edward Hozza, Richard Molchany, Sara Pandl, Lisa Scheller, Kevin Schmidt, Donna Wright, Christen Borso, Eugene Clater, Kevin Lott, Hayden Phillips, Lynn Prior, Tina Roseberry and Elinor Warner.

***Staff present:*** Becky Bradley, Geoff Reese, George Kinney, Eric McAfee, Sue Rockwell, Dave Manhardt and Ben Holland.

***Public Present:*** Bruce Haines, Historic Bethlehem Merchants; Kacey and Gabe Lloyd, Long Tail Creative; Nicole Radziewich, The Morning Call.

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

Mr. Herman asked if anyone would like to speak at this time. Mr. Lloyd said he and his wife attended tonight to discuss the Road to Rail Program. Mr. Herman said it is not on the agenda but they could ask staff questions about it if they'd like. He explained how the Commission meetings work. This is the monthly meeting of the entire Commission. The Commission consists of people who are appointed by the two counties. Members include local government officials and some citizen representatives. We will be taking official action on the matters on the agenda tonight. Mr. Lloyd said they are from Orefield and are interested in how transportation can affect urban growth. He said they have spent time in Europe and have seen how cities really thrive with light rail and other modes of transportation because they attract younger people. He said they moved to the Lehigh Valley several years ago and love it here. He thinks transportation could be a catalyst for younger people to move to the Lehigh Valley.

Mr. Herman said we could spend hours explaining what has been accomplished here and what is being planned for transportation in the Lehigh Valley. Ms. Bradley said Mr. Kinney will get their contact information so we can have a more detailed conversation. Mrs. Lloyd said they just wanted to be more involved and aware of what is going on. Ms. Bradley said we actually manage the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study, which is the federal arm of our regional planning entity. We manage the funding of about \$3.9 billion for roads, bridges and transit. We just updated our 20-year Long Range Transportation Plan for infrastructure in the region, which includes all of those modes with a particular focus on multimodalism. She said we will be starting a sidewalk inventory to be done by the end of June, then a bike/pedestrian plan for the region, and then we're working with PennDOT and LANta to explore options for enhanced transit service such as bus rapid transit, which is a precursor to rail systems. We are working with SEPTA, NJT, PA Norfolk Southern and Amtrak to explore options for rail for the region. It's all very preliminary at this point. We do know that vehicle registrations and population are increasing every year. Safety is becoming a bigger concern as there is more road congestion. We have reduced air quality also. It is in our mutual interests to build a better multimodal future. Ms. Lloyd added that she is more interested in bike transportation, and they are very interested in learning more about this at a later date. Mr. Herman noted that the Commission members are volunteers. He encouraged them to participate in local government. It's important that young people participate.

## ***MINUTES***

After a brief review, the minutes of the October 29, 2015 meeting were moved for approval by Mr. Greco. Mr. Glickman seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Duerholz, Mr. Elliott and Mr. Lammi abstaining.

## ***COMMITTEE REPORTS***

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

#### ***City of Easton – Comprehensive Plan 2035 – Complete Update***

Mr. McAfee said there is a two-part document we reviewed that includes *Transform, Unify and Thrive*, which is the bulk of the actual Comprehensive Plan 2035 for the City. Accompanying the plan is an appendix on existing conditions and analysis, which has a lot of the underlying data.

Mr. McAfee said we are about half way through the 45-day review period. Our review letter, included on pages 10-13 of the agenda attachments, is still a preliminary draft at this time.

Mr. McAfee said the biggest consideration for a document that is predominately consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan is throughout the document there are references to the interplay of proposed development along crucial corridors in the City of Easton, particularly waterway corridors. The document does not clearly distinguish what sort of activity it encourages. The clearest cut description of this is distinguishing waterway-based economic development from actual land development, which should eliminate this confusion. We are trying to say that, while it is also encouraging waterway-based economic development such as recreational activities, it also comes very close to encouraging all-out new construction transit-oriented development. The document does not make as strong a consideration of the problems this might propose in terms of floodplains and flood hazards, as well as what they might pose to the ecological conditions of these waterways in terms of riparian buffers. There is one point later in the document where it does make reference to a do-not-build condition, but there are numerous situations throughout the document where it does passively encourage development along waterways. Our recommendation is that the document be much clearer in its language of what it is trying to encourage in these areas.

Mr. McAfee said the vision statement objective 2.2a talks about the Black Diamond site, which is an old brownfield site, and the sort of activity that it encourages in an area that is otherwise highly prone to ecological sensitivity due to natural features such as steep slopes. In objective 2.2d, they talk about Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) along vacant lots, many of which encourage multimodal access and pedestrian movement towards the waterfront. They are not really making any sort of acknowledgement with respect to the fact that much of this activity could place these structures fully within a floodplain or floodway. In objective 3.3a, they talk about established industrial areas along Bushkill Creek and the Lehigh River. We do encourage redevelopment of long dormant activity, particularly as adaptive reuse or infill development, but it has to be as mindful as possible to all natural features.

Mr. McAfee said when you look at the existing conditions and analysis report, there are a few concerns regarding housing and homeownership. The gray highlighted text on page 3 of the review letter is in response to recommendations from the Comprehensive Planning Committee on Tuesday. We see the housing analysis does not make a compelling case given the data. It is somewhat strange to see such an emphasis on multifamily housing when the primary vehicle for owner-occupied multifamily housing would be condominiums. There is not a particularly strong demand for condominiums. There is a fair amount of equating of affordable housing to public housing without clearly showing which economic groups would be the primary consumers of the affordable housing or public housing or whether or not there is sufficient demand, given that the City of Easton has some of the lowest median home values in the entire Lehigh Valley. Finally there is also some concern about the way the document analyzes the extreme divergence in home prices within the City. The West Ward has significantly lower home values than the College Hill neighborhood. While that might be true, it doesn't make any reference to the fact that the College Hill neighborhood has housing stock of a completely different type than the West Ward. There are likely many extenuating circumstances to explain this divergence.

Mr. McAfee said some of the mapping also underplayed our chief concerns, and they were not as up-front about showing restrictions along floodplains, while there is some reference to natural features, and there is a descriptive reference to certain overlay districts that would

presumably have protection from any activity in the floodplains. We don't have a clear sense of space where those overlay districts would apply and exactly how they might align or not align with floodplains or riparian buffers. Our final concern in regards to that would be significantly mitigated if there was at least a visual sense of what is to be done by including those overlay districts in the mapping as it relates to zoning. Ms. Duerholz asked if the surrounding communities get copies of this letter. Mr. McAfee said we are only sending it to the City. Ms. Bradley said the City is responsible for getting comments from adjacent municipalities. Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve staff comments. Mr. Gemmel seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Elliott abstaining.

### *Geographic Information System Presentation*

Mr. Manhardt and Mr. Holland provided a power point presentation on the work they have been doing. Mr. Manhardt said we prepare all the maps for our publications. Any publication that comes out of the Commission usually has a map we created. We manage a lot of the data, both spatial and non-spatial. With the non-spatial data, such as tables from the Census, we make it spatial so we can visualize it. We also create, procure, process and analyze data. An example of this process is we acquire county parcel data, process the parcel data into a unified Lehigh Valley parcel layer so we have the same attribute data across the board. We also process the parcel layer into our existing land use layer based on county assessment land use codes. Then we can analyze the data from a regional perspective.

Mr. Holland said we use this data in many of our publications such as the County Comprehensive Plan and Long Range Transportation Plan. He provided some specific examples to explain the process of reconciling land use data and land coverage. Another issue we need to deal with is mixed use parcels. Mr. Manhardt said one of the ways we are going to address this issue is through the Delaware River Basin project. They are working on creating a land use data set. The University of Vermont, one of several partners, is doing the technical work. Funding for the project is through the William Penn Foundation. He said the idea is we can take some of the land cover data, we've received tree canopy data so far, take the existing land use at the parcel level and combine it with this land cover. Then we can reclassify this parcel into its true land uses. We are going to end up with a true representation of what is on the ground as far as land use and land cover. Mr. Elliott asked if we will have more than one land use attributed to the parcel. Mr. Manhardt said we will probably summarize it at some point if we need to at the parcel level. It will ultimately be a blanket layer for the whole Valley of the specific land uses. Mr. Gemmel asked if this information goes back to the counties. Ms. Bradley said we process it for the counties, but they don't need it. Their GIS is for tax assessment purposes. We are their County Planning Agency so we have an obligation under the County Planning function to then use our GIS for that purpose. Mr. Manhardt said the counties have their use for the data, and we have a different use. We have to figure out how to best manage the data. Ms. Bradley said there is a state mandate that all county tax assessment offices have to use standardized GIS coding. They made it an unfunded mandate, and the counties are trying to figure out what that means. There is a working group through the County Commissioners' Association of Pennsylvania that is working on it. Our job will ultimately become easier as that rolls out over a five-year period.

Mr. Manhardt said the next topic is how we get the information out to the public and municipalities. We have been working on developing ArcGIS online capabilities. We have in a draft form now a general land use plan viewer, a natural resources plan viewer and a transportation data viewer. ArcGIS online is a web-based mapping application, we can upload data to it, and it

is available on the internet twenty four hours a day, seven days a week. Moving towards an interactive, dynamic comprehensive plan is where this will eventually go. He showed some examples, including the general land use map. He explained how it can be used and the type of information that would be included. We are also working on the natural resources plan and transportation data. We are putting data online so people can interact with that data. Mr. Manhardt said right now we are going through beta-testing and figuring out the best way to lay it out and what data we need to present. We will probably start rolling them out this winter for public access.

### *Ordinance Reviews*

Mr. Repasch said there are five summary sheet items on page 14 of the agenda attachments. Mr. Herman said staff will go through all the reviews first, and then Mr. Haines could speak on the Bethlehem item.

Mr. McAfee said the first two summary sheet items were brought before the Comprehensive Planning Committee two days ago. For the first one, what seemed like a modest change, given the extreme rural nature of Upper Mt. Bethel Township and the fact there is no part of the jurisdiction that falls within the urban area, we did have some concern that, even though it didn't conflict with the County Comprehensive Plan, the tenfold increase in maximum building size for their industrial and commercial districts from 35,000 to 300,000 square feet opens the floodgate for the possibilities for large industrial warehouse facilities. This is incompatible with the rural and agricultural uses that dominate the Township. Item No 2 is a revision of what we saw in September on the Martin Tower rezoning. There were modest changes that are largely consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan. Item Nos. 3-5 are new tonight. They were not reviewed at Tuesday's Committee meeting. Item Nos. 3-4 are a matter of local concern, and Item No. 5 is fully consistent with the county plan.

Mr. Bruce Haines, 63 West Church Street, Bethlehem, said he represents the merchants from Main Street. He said they believe there are three aspects of the city zoning ordinance that are inconsistent with the County Comprehensive Plan. The first one deals with the allowance of up to 380,000 square feet of retail space at the Martin Tower property. It makes it over 250,000 square feet, which makes it regionally significant, not a matter of local concern. Mr. McAfee said we did make the change to the review letter that there is the likelihood of it being of regional significance.

Mr. Haines spoke with respect to greenfields on page 52 of the county plan, which states the LVPC supports the renewal, redevelopment and retrofitting of existing shopping centers, industrial sites and office complexes in preference to the development of new facilities on greenfield sites. Mr. Haines' position is that this is a greenfield site with respect to retail. There is no retail on site now. It's an office. The zoning allows up to a minimum of 380,000 square feet of retail. Mr. Haines and the Main Street Merchants believe not dealing with that is inconsistent with the county plan because the City is implementing a new, regionally-significant shopping district that is tax-subsidized, which the county plan also discourages. From their perspective, this is a huge conflict with the comprehensive plan. Mr. Haines and the Main Street Merchants were disappointed the first time the LVPC did not accept that position.

Mr. Haines said the third aspect deals with the goal on page 109 in the county plan with respect to historic preservation, which is to preserve the important historic buildings, structures and sites in Lehigh and Northampton counties. The zoning, as it is being changed, removes the

restriction on tearing down Martin Tower. In the current zoning, if there is any retail or residential development on the site, they can't tear down the tower. With the new plan, that restriction is removed. The tower is on the National Register of Historic Places so we would argue that this has not been identified in the September letter or the November letter. Mr. Haines said, for that reason, he is here to ask this body to request staff to review this again in light of our comments and come back next month. Mr. McAfee said the biggest consideration here in this entire process, including what took place Tuesday and two months ago, is that these are purely, at this point, zoning changes that change the full scope of the possibilities of what might take place on this land. Beyond that, we don't have any idea what is going to take place at this point. We don't have a land development plan to review. We're just reviewing zoning, which is an array of regulations within which this eventual land development may operate. Anything regarding what the composition might be in terms of retail is 100% speculative. Ms. Bradley said the zoning ordinance does not require that the Martin Tower building be torn down. It just allows it to be a consideration. Ms. Heller said that is correct. Mr. Gemmel asked if we review it and see that removal would be allowed, would we comment on it being on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Bradley said probably. She noted that a National Register designation does not provide any protection for a building. Mr. Glickman said that it is still a consideration in the county plan. Ms. Bradley said yes, but there is no land development plan. Mr. Gemmel asked if we should comment on it. Mr. McAfee said we did in the original letter. Mr. Elliott asked if the policies in the county plan regarding impacts on National Register sites refer to land developments or also zoning changes. Ms. Bradley said we did comment on that in the September letter. Mr. McAfee said the letter was trying to reconcile the nature between being an historic property and one that has no current development proposal. The ultimate goal is to adaptively reuse the structure, but recognizing there has been no development in eight years, we need to expand the flexibility of possibilities.

Mr. Herman asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Elliott asked about the rationale of Upper Mt. Bethel Township on Item No. 1 regarding the increase in building size. Mr. McAfee said their rationale is that it is a large, extremely rural municipality and is the second largest township in Pennsylvania. They believe a township of that size warrants some greater flexibility. Ms. Sywensky asked what the review time frame on the Martin Tower item is. Ms. Bradley said we are required to send a letter in 30 days. She said this ordinance was reviewed in September. They made some changes, and the changes are the only thing we are reviewing at this time. The Commission voted it was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan in September. The changes are minor in nature, but we have to review them. The overall intent of the ordinance is exactly the same. Mr. McAfee said the changes are mostly a reorganization of classifications, but they do include a reduction in the size of retail. Mr. Haines said there is an assumption here that just because the tower hasn't been developed in eight years that it needs to come down. No impact studies have been done.

Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the staff comments for Item Nos. 1-5. Ms. Dreisbach seconded the motion. Mr. Repasch withdrew the motion so the Commission could vote on each item. For Item No. 1, Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Rader, Ms. Thomases and Mr. Gemmel voting no. For Item No. 2, Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Dreisbach seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Glickman, Ms. Thomases, Ms. Rader, Ms. Pearson, Mr. Gemmel, Ms. Morgan and Mr. Reph voting no and Ms. Heller and Ms. Szywensky abstaining. For Item No. 3, Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Gemmel seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Diacogiannis abstaining. For

Item No. 4, Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Diacogiannis abstaining. For Item No. 5, Mr. Repasch made a motion to approve the comments. Ms. Dreisbach seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Lammi abstaining.

### ***Environment Committee***

#### ***Livable Landscapes – An Open Space Plan for Northampton County***

Mr. Reese said a copy of the report is at each Commission member's place. He provided a power point presentation. Mr. Reese said we previously talked about the contents of the report, including the five areas of open space and the six goals. He presented a graphic from the report that talks about relationships between open space resources, health and wellness, and economic activity---information that was provided in our Return on Environment study from a year ago. The point of the Return on Environment Study is to look at natural systems service benefits and dollars provided by our open space resources and also property value benefits. At the center of the graphic linking open space, health and wellness and economic activity is multimodal connectivity, recreational economy and ecological resilience. Mr. Reese said we reviewed a draft of the Northampton County Livable Landscapes document with the Environment Committee in September and also received comments from the Steering Committee. We have received comments from the County and several Commission members last month. We received additional comments from the Environment Committee on Tuesday. We believe we are ready to move forward with this. Mr. Gemmel said he is always amazed at the text of these documents. The writing and editing are outstanding. Mr. Repasch made a motion to forward the document to the County for adoption. Mr. Lammi seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

### ***Transportation Committee***

#### ***Transportation Alternatives Program***

Mr. Kinney said the Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) is a federal program that consolidates some of the older programs that didn't necessarily qualify for federal funding through our Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) or Transportation Improvement Program. It is not a grant program or match program. It is actually a straight funding reimbursement program. Mr. Kinney said an applicant receives 100% funding for construction; however, they are expected to do the pre-work for that construction in the form of environmental clearances, utility work, right-of-way acquisitions if necessary, and those kinds of improvements. This program is really looking at shovel-ready projects. It is a competitive selection process. Those agencies not eligible to submit an application include nonprofits, DOTs and MPOs. A nonprofit can partner with an eligible applicant. Eligible applicants include local governments, regional transportation authorities, transit agencies, natural resource or public land agencies, school districts and tribal governments.

Mr. Kinney said the state is holding \$9 million of TAP money for Federal Fiscal Year 2015. We as a region are holding a two-year pot of money at \$1.27 million. The funding minimum for a construction project is \$50,000. The funding maximum is \$1 million, but PennDOT can consider extenuating circumstances where funding could exceed \$1 million. Mr. Kinney said there are ten funding categories outlined through the TAP program for eligible projects. Each category is explained in a manual put out by PennDOT regarding guidance and procedures for the program,

which is available through our website. As part of our allotment, we have control through the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study, the local MPO. We removed four categories from consideration of that money because the six remaining categories are more in keeping with what we're trying to accomplish with our recently adopted LRTP. These categories are more transportation enhancement related and include biking/pedestrian facilities, biking/pedestrian education, conversion of abandoned railway corridors to trails, construction of overlooks and viewing areas, historic preservation and rehab of historic transportation facilities, and archaeological activities.

Mr. Kinney said we recently completed the LRTP. New to the LRTP is a discussion on mobility and mobility enhancements such as transit-oriented development, walkable neighborhoods, complete streets, and road diets, among others. What we're trying to strive for with respect to regional submissions is how does a project fit within the LRTP and Lehigh Valley Comprehensive Plan and how is that project integrating and tying all those things together. Mr. Kinney described some things that are more fitting with the LRTP like road diets and expanded sidewalks. These kinds of projects will go a long way in scoring really well with respect to the regional funding. Mr. Kinney said we have made all of this information available on the LVPC web page. We conducted a TAP kickoff meeting this morning where we discussed expectations and where to get the information. On our website, there are links to the power point presentation from this morning, the TAP application, the Program Guidance, our Long Range Transportation Plan and the Lehigh Valley Comprehensive Plan. We plan on doing a photo inventory on the awarded projects and track them over time to watch the development. The program is open now, and the closing date is January 8th. PennDOT is offering a pre-application eligibility determination if a project doesn't quite fit the program eligibility criteria.

#### *Catasauqua Town Hall Meeting*

Ms. Bradley said we have been working with Catasauqua for over a year to come up with some urban design alternatives to improve their pedestrian environment, as well as calm traffic, and come up with an affordable plan for them to be able to turn Front Street into a two-way street. Simultaneously, the Borough has been working with an architect and designer, as well as an engineering firm, to come up with a new emergency management facility at the former Iron Works site. It has been a Brownfield site for many years. It has its environmental clearance. They are also coming up with a greater site plan. They will be putting out an RFP to find a developer soon. It is a really great thing that we have been able to work on the public infrastructure piece of it. The Borough has been able to work on the public/private piece of it for the redevelopment of the Iron Works site. We are going to do a joint town hall meeting to talk about how all of those things relate to each other. It is a really great thing to be able to work private/public together, the regional entity with the local government. This meeting will be held on Monday night from 6:30-9:00 p.m. at the Catasauqua Area School District Conference Room. If you have an interest, please feel free to attend.

#### ***OLD BUSINESS - None***

#### ***NEW BUSINESS***

Mr. Herman said, yesterday at the Executive Committee meeting, the Committee appointed a Nominating Committee for reorganization of officers for the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. The Committee consists of Percy Dougherty, Bob Lammi and Steve Glickman.

They will report back at the meeting next month with their recommendations for the new officers. Also, Mr. Herman informed the Commission that Bethlehem was named by the Wall Street Journal as the 9th best city to live in among 550 United States cities with a population over 65,000. This is quite a tribute to the City of Bethlehem.

*Beyond Codes: Fair Housing and Model Ordinance Updates*

Ms. Bradley said we started talking about Fair Housing and what that meant to zoning at the last meeting. We showed you how complicated it was through a track changes document that we have been working on with the counties and cities for a very long time. As part of that effort, we have actually updated seven model ordinances. We have drafts for you this evening. The ordinances are Inclusionary Zoning, Density Bonuses, Street Connectivity, Mixed Uses, Traditional Neighborhood Development, Cottage Housing and Conservation Subdivisions. Ms. Bradley said many of our communities have used these in the past and adopted portions of them or even adopted the whole ordinance. We will be emailing to you direct links to these ordinances and give you a month to look at them and bring comments back to us at the December meeting. The Comprehensive Planning Committee asked us to give them a summary of what has changed, so Mr. McAfee is in the process of putting that together. It should be ready tomorrow. These model ordinances are some of the most popular things that we do. We want to keep those relevant and alive. She said the Cottage Housing Ordinance was written about seven years ago. Allentown has adopted a very close version of that, and they now have a Cottage Housing Development. We are proud of that, and we want to keep doing more of that work. Ms. Bradley said, regarding Fair Housing, it is not a one size fits all issue. There is not going to be any one ordinance that will be a magic bullet on the Fair Housing issue. We had two separate Fair Housing meetings last week. We partnered with North Penn Legal, the two counties, the three cities and the Community Action Committee of the Lehigh Valley to talk about this issue and discuss what the difference is between Fair Housing and Affordable Housing and what your obligations are. Fair Housing is a civil rights issue, and Affordable Housing is a financial availability issue. Also, inadvertent Fair Housing violations is a big issue for our municipalities.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

*Pennsylvania Humanities Council*

Ms. Bradley said she has been working with Ms. Szywensky from Northampton County, and we have been talking for some time with the ten communities that make up the Slate Belt about the preparation of a multimunicipal comprehensive plan. A Pennsylvania Humanities Council/Orton Family Foundation grant opportunity became available. It is basically an organizing grant. They tend to fund more humanities type projects than organizing multimunicipal comprehensive plans. We applied for a grant anyway and received \$5,000 to help to do some preliminary organizing, and we hope to do a multimunicipal comprehensive plan there.

***EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT******December Meeting and Commission Photo***

Ms. Bradley said our December Commission meeting will be December 17th at 11:00 a.m. We will be taking the Commission picture and serving lunch. Also, the Transportation Committee meeting will be held at 9:00 a.m. on December 17th.

***Toys for Tots***

Ms. Bradley said we are collecting for Toys for Tots again this year if you would like to donate an unwrapped toy. The deadline is December 8th.

***ADJOURN***

Mr. Repasch made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Sywensky seconded the motion. Mr. Herman adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by,

Kathleen Sauerzopf for  
Becky Bradley  
Executive Director