

Moore Township Board of Supervisors
2491 Community Drive
Bath, PA 18014
July 7, 2021

The Regular Monthly Meeting for the Moore Township Board of Supervisors (BOS) was called to order on Wednesday, July 7, 2021, by Chairman Daniel Piorkowski at 6:00 PM. The meeting was conducted at the Klecknersville Rangers Volunteer Fire Company fire hall. Members present were Chairman Daniel Piorkowski, Vice Chairman David Shaffer, Supervisor Richard Gable, Township Manager Nicholas Steiner, Township Solicitor David Backenstoe, and Township Engineer Kevin Horvath from Keystone Consulting Engineers (KCE).

Chairman Piorkowski reported an executive session was held Tuesday, July 6 regarding personnel issues. The next Regular BOS meeting will be Tuesday, August 3, 2021 at 6:00 PM.

SUB-DIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

WAIVERS & DEFERALS

REGULAR BUSINESS

MINUTES

Mr. Shaffer made a motion to approve the minutes from June 1, 2021

Mr. Gable seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

FINANCIAL REPORT

Mr. Gable made a motion to approve the Financial Report

Mr. Shaffer seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

PAYMENT OF THE BILLS

Mr. Shaffer made a motion to pay the bills

Mr. Steiner noted bills for the month from General Checking are \$152,154.86. The Liquid Fuels bills are \$9,056.66.

Mr. Gable seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

APPROVE PAYROLL

Mr. Gable made a motion to approve the payroll

Mr. Shaffer seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Chief Gary West read the report for the month of June 2021.

Police Vehicle

Chief West recalled the debate between purchasing from Kovatch Ford or Koch 33, both of which are COSTARS dealers. The Kovatch quote came in slightly higher but has since sold the vehicle. The Koch 33 quote, which was lower of the two, is \$53,158. He asked the Board to approve the purchase of the 2021 Ford Police Interceptor. Mr. Gable asked for confirmation the cost is \$53,158, but COSTARS takes off another \$5,946 for a total of \$47,212. Chief West confirmed the total price of \$47,212.

Mr. Gable made a motion to purchase the police vehicle at Koch 33 for a cost of \$47,212

Mr. Shaffer seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

FIRE & AMBULANCE

Mr. Jason Harhart read the most recent month's fire and ambulance report.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Tractor and Mower for Recreation Center

Mr. Craig Hoffman received a quote for a zero-turn mower at \$15,400. They currently have a tractor that is too small. The deck needs to be taken on and off which abuses the tractor. It is used to mow and work at other aspects of the Recreation Center. He is looking to purchase a zero-turn mower and a tractor. The tractor would be \$17,916. The total is approximately \$33,000. The Township would receive a trade-in for the mower of \$4,250. He is asking if the Board would be interested in purchasing the mower and tractor for the Recreation Center. Mr. Shaffer asked how much was budgeted. Mr. Hoffman said they received a quote of approximately \$25,000 last year. He spoke to Mr. Brandon Biery and thinks it will be too small for their needs, and they will still be taking the deck on and off the tractor. They wouldn't gain anything by purchasing the tractor originally budgeted for, but they did budget \$25,000. Mr. Piorkowski asked if the tractor last year was almost \$25,000 for a single tractor. Mr. Hoffman said yes. Mr. Piorkowski asked if he is looking to purchase two pieces of equipment for \$33,000. Mr. Hoffman confirmed noting we would also take off the trade-in value of the tractor. Mr. Piorkowski asked for the trade-in amount. Mr. Hoffman said it's \$4,250. Mr. Piorkowski said it brings them close to the same price of the budgeted tractor. Mr. Hoffman said the mower and tractor uses COSTARS pricing. Mr. Piorkowski asked if they budgeted for the tractor. Mr. Steiner said they budgeted \$25,000, and this is about \$3,000 over. They came in approximately \$9,000 under for the Zoning vehicle, so there's room.

Mr. Shaffer made a motion to purchase the zero-turn mower for \$15,403.50 and the regular tractor for \$17,916.75 with the \$4,250 trade-in coming off that total

Mr. Gable seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

FIRST REGIONAL COMPOST AUTHORITY (FRCA)

Mr. Gable said all the equipment is running. Last month, he reported they received a grant for \$350,000 to purchase a new grinder which will cost about \$850,000. They can submit again next year to get

another \$350,000. The new grinder will be purchased this year. There is mulch at the yard waste site, but compost is done until next spring.

NAZARETH COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (COG)

Mr. Piorkowski said the regular and comprehensive plan meetings were canceled.

RECREATION COMMISSION

Nothing to report.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Mr. Gable said they will have the Oktoberfest dinner on October 14 at the fire company. Latteman's will do the catering, but they don't have a menu yet. Work is progressing at Edelman noting Mr. Bob Fedio has been working on the building. They purchased signs for the Point Phillips and Little Mexico one-room schoolhouses. Their goal is to get eleven signs for the eleven schools that were in the Township.

LAND & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD (LEPB)

Mr. Bob Romano noted they were unable to have a preservation open house last year due to COVID. They would like to hold it Monday, September 13 at 7pm at the Recreation Center pavilion. Ms. Dawn Gorham from the Wildlands Conservancy will do a presentation on preserving land, specifically woodlands and open space. She did a presentation for the Township before and will answer any questions regarding preservation. It will be a good opportunity to learn about the Township's preservation process. More information will be provided on the website and community Facebook page.

Open Space Evaluation

Attorney Backenstoe received a copy of the new evaluation sheet but hasn't had a chance to thoroughly review it. The item was tabled.

New Member

Mr. Shaffer said they received four letters of interest for the LEPB. The letters were sent to the board members. For those who responded, they selected Mr. Thomas Roberts.

Mr. Piorkowski made a motion to add Thomas Roberts to the Land and Environmental Protection Board

Mr. Gable seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

Schiavone Park Pond Improvements

Mr. Shaffer said AquaLink, the company asked to do aquatic herbicide treatments at the two ponds of Schiavone Park due to the high algae and weed content, received the permit and did their first application last week. Routine treatments will be every two to three weeks for a total of five or eight per year.

COMMUNITY DAYS COMMITTEE

Mr. Mike Tirrell said concert in the park is this Friday with Uncle Smiley.

New Member

Mr. Tirrell asked that Ms. Lisa Green be appointed to the Community Days Committee.

Mr. Shaffer made a motion to appoint Lisa Green to the Community Days Committee

Mr. Gable seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

ZONING AND BUILDING OFFICER

Mr. Harhart submitted his report for the month of June.

TOWNSHIP ENGINEER

Schiavone Farm Sediment Erosion Project

Mr. Horvath updated the status of the Schiavone farm sediment erosion project. They completed plans and specifications and expect to advertise this Friday. Bids will be received in about three weeks with a recommendation on an award at next month's BOS meeting.

Dell Road Traffic Study

Mr. Horvath distributed a letter from KCE dated July 2 to the Board outlining the findings of the traffic study to determine if it would be appropriate to post W. Dell Road as restricted to trucks due to the condition of the road. It is deteriorating rapidly as a result of truck traffic. They did traffic counts and evaluated the roadway geometry, width, and condition. In all cases, the roadway is below standards or deficient in terms of its ability to support truck traffic. They have a recommendation and exhibit in the letter suggesting the Board pass an ordinance to restrict truck traffic on W. Dell Road between Copella Road and Moorestown Drive. They also suggest they post a total of two signs, one on each end facing toward Copella and Moorestown Drive. KCE also suggest the Township, or authorize KCE, to coordinate with the operators of the Sunny Side Landscape business to appropriately post the signage to keep the trucks off the road but be considerate they may need certain allowance for vehicles visiting the site. Furthermore, the recommendation would be to consider coordinating with PennDOT for additional signage on Community Drive and Moorestown Drive in advance of the intersections to inform or advise motorists trucks are not permitted on the road. This would take time with PennDOT on permitting and coordination, but the Board can pass an ordinance to post the road to further protect from deterioration. He also has supporting documentation that can be provided to the Township.

Mr. Gable made a motion to authorize Solicitor Backenstoe draft an ordinance restricting truck traffic on W. Dell Road

Mr. Shaffer seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

TOWNSHIP SOLICITOR

Bamboo Ordinance

Attorney Backenstoe explained the zoning officer and some board members received complaints or questions regarding bamboo because bamboo was creeping onto a property from the neighbor. Bamboo is an aggressive vegetation with many townships having regulations and prohibitions on planting bamboo. The BOS had a general discussion, and members of the public had concerns because they had bamboo or want to plant bamboo. The Board wanted some type of regulation but nothing too overbearing. He drafted an ordinance to discuss whether they want to move forward with a bamboo ordinance and whether they like this ordinance or want to move in a different direction. The ordinance, which is authorized by

the Township's ability to regulate nuisances, defines bamboo and regulates bamboo. He referred to section 4. Growing or maintaining bamboo in such a manner that the bamboo spreads, invades or grows on an adjoining or neighboring property is prohibited. Any property owner or resident who has planted or maintains bamboo shall be required to take such measures that are reasonably expected to prevent such bamboo from invading or growing onto adjoining or neighboring properties. Such bamboo measures shall include, but not be limited to, installation of sheathing comprised of metal or other material impenetrable by bamboo at sufficient depth within which it would stop the bamboo from crossing onto a neighbor's property line. If a neighbor complained, and Mr. Harhart saw there was bamboo without the property sheathing to stop it, the person would be given a notice to remedy the situation. If they don't, Mr. Harhart could cite the person and could go to the magistrate. It's a summary offense, non-traffic, and there is a scaled cost for the number of violations maxed at \$1,000. Mr. Shaffer thinks Attorney Backenstoe did a good job noting he doesn't think it's too restrictive. If a resident wants to have bamboo, they can. This is for purposes of making sure bamboo is kept on their property. He thanked Attorney Backenstoe. Mr. Gable thinks it is good the way it's written as does Mr. Piorkowski. Attorney Backenstoe asked if any residents had questions or concerns. Mr. Matt Flower said Attorney Backenstoe read him the bamboo ordinance. He thinks it is written fine, it's non-restrictive, pretty fantastic. He objects in principle only because short of a bamboo epidemic in Moore Township, they don't need a bamboo ordinance. If one property owner has an issue with another property owner, the person can file a complaint with the magistrate to be dealt with there. He doesn't think they should use limited resources of the local government to make bamboo ordinances. If they had a major problem with bamboo growing everywhere or it's invading the Township building, it then becomes an issue of public concern and an ordinance is fine. He doesn't think it's at that level and is necessary. It is a well written ordinance, not overly restrictive, and as far as bamboo ordinances go, it's pretty good. Attorney Backenstoe and Mr. Piorkowski thanked Mr. Flower. Mr. Andy Petric said bamboo is an invasive species and asked why they would introduce it to their neighborhood or state. It was brought in when they were young and didn't know what they were doing. It is an invasive species, and he's seen where they try to keep it under control, and it takes over. This issue is something to think about. Mr. Piorkowski thanked Mr. Petric.

**Mr. Shaffer made a motion to advertise the bamboo ordinance as written by Attorney Backenstoe
Mr. Gable seconded the motion**

Public Comments

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

Trapper Road

Attorney Backenstoe explained Trapper Road is a small, dirt and grass covered, back road. It's currently identified as a public Township road. The Township doesn't want to take responsibility for it because it hasn't been maintained or opened for thirty years. The Second Class Township Code allows the Township to prepare an ordinance to vacate. They'd have to hold a hearing and those affected by the closing can appear and discuss. Once it is vacated, from the center line east to west, or north to south, it becomes owned by the contiguous property owners. He needs to work with Mr. Horvath to get a description.

TOWNSHIP MANAGER

Mr. Steiner provided an update on the American Rescue Plan (ARP) funds. The Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development (PA DCED) required municipalities to apply for funding despite initial information to the contrary. They had five days to apply and were able to complete the application. Applying to reinstitute the federal SAM number was the biggest issue. They should receive the first half of funds in July. The total the Township is set to receive is over \$900,000. He

looked into updating the permitting system in the Zoning Office using ARP funds. He spoke to a company who contracted with Plainfield and East Allen. Mr. Steiner and Mr. Harhart think the costs are too high. With the ARP funds, they could pay for upfront costs of building and developing the Township specific solution, but they think annual costs are too prohibitive. The annual cost for permitting, inspections, codes, and rentals is \$12,375. For permitting and inspections, it is \$9,500 per year. Mr. Steiner feels it's lost money noting the Township is able to handle the workload right now. He will continue to look for solutions to allow online payments or create fillable forms that may not be as large a cost. If the Board does not want to move forward, he will let the vendor know. The Board chose not to move forward.

Mr. Steiner asked Attorney Backenstoe to look at Act 65 of 2021. This act would require agencies to post the agenda 24 hours in advance of the meeting. Any item not on the agenda, is de minimus, and does not require an expenditure of funds, can be added to the meeting to be voted upon. Within one business day, the agenda would need to be updated. He is trying to find out if this applies just to the BOS or all boards and commissions of the Township. If it does apply, they will need to communicate better. There is about two months until it is fully implemented. The BOS agenda is currently online, but they will need to coordinate with the rest of the boards.

RESOLUTIONS & ORDINANCES

Ordinance 2021-02 Livestock

Attorney Backenstoe said the livestock has been reviewed, modified, debated with residents, and is advertised to be voted upon tonight. The chief of police has had a problem in certain areas with goats wandering on the road as well as cows and possibly ostriches. He has determined it's a nuisance. While it seems funny, if a family turns around a windy road and encounters a goat, there could be a horrible accident. The chief asked if a livestock ordinance could be prepared. The ordinance defines livestock and includes suggestions from residents at the prior meeting. No owner, custodian, or keeper of livestock shall permit such livestock to run at large at any time either upon any of the streets or public grounds of the Township or upon any property of any person other than the owner, custodian or keeper of livestock unless the livestock is accompanied or under the control of the immediate owner. It also requires the owner, custodian, or keeper to house, stable, or fence the livestock in its grazing area so it doesn't go into the street. It does not affect the Right to Farm Act. It keeps farming on the property and doesn't let it go off the street where it can cause an automobile accident. The violation is a summary offense like most Township ordinances which are non-traffic. If the police have a problem, he assumes the police will give a warning. If the issue persists, they'll be given a citation and the chief will go to the magistrate who will fine the violator. The violator can be fined anywhere from \$1 to \$1,000. The magistrate, depending on the severity, may increase fines over time. Chief West said it has become a problem over the last few years with certain residents in the Township. They don't want to infringe on anyone's rights to own these animals. Unfortunately, some residents have not been responsible and the police are out there three to four times a week with the same problem. The goats or chickens get out, and they're wandering the roadway. It's a dangerous situation where the motoring public turns the curve and an animal is standing in the roadway. It gives the police something with a little teeth. A one-time incident, the person will get a warning. If it's a persistent act, they will cite the person.

Mr. Shaffer made a motion to adopt Ordinance 2021-02 Livestock

Mr. Gable seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

Zoning Hearing Board Alternate Member

Mr. Harhart said the Township received a letter from a resident, Zachary Zeitner, requesting he serve as an alternate member of the Zoning Hearing Board. He's interested in volunteering on any board noting he attended one of the Zoning Hearing Board meetings finding it extremely interesting. As an alternate, he would sit in on the hearings and serve as a member if anyone was absent. Mr. Zeitner introduced himself. He has been a resident of English Road for the last 21 years. He appreciates all the work the Board and committees do for the Township. He'd like to be a part of the Township noting he doesn't have a lot of experience but would like to help anyway he can. Mr. Shaffer had some conversations with Mr. Zeitner noting he cares about the Township and would be a great asset to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Gable made a motion to appoint Zachary Zeitner as an alternate member of the Zoning Hearing Board

Mr. Shaffer seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

Herd Property

Mr. Steiner explained the Herd property is 27 acres at Whitetail Deer Drive, parcel ID J5 16 1. It was preserved this past month and is ready to go out to bid. He has the advertisement prepared for review. Bids would be due 3pm Monday, August 2 and opened at the Tuesday, August 3 BOS meeting.

Mr. Shaffer made a motion to put the Herd property out to bid

Mr. Gable seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

Warehouse Ordinance

Mr. Piorkowski said in 2019 they had members of Planning and Zoning come to the Board of Supervisors noting a lot of warehouses are being built in the Lehigh Valley, and the Township doesn't have any ordinances. In 2019, they started to put together a comprehensive ordinance with help from the boards. Before they passed the ordinance, it was sent to the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (LVPC) for thoughts and approval. They thought it was good. Mr. Piorkowski was told other municipalities are using the ordinance as a template or starting point for them to create ordinances that can restrict warehousing. The BOS was proactive and moved it forward. Since the Planning meeting, they looked at a few things and are going to make an attempt to strengthen their current zoning ordinance.

Attorney Backenstoe provided a helpful presentation at the Planning Commission (PC) meeting. He gave a history of zoning in Pennsylvania. In the 1940s, 50s, and 60s, there really wasn't any type of regulatory zoning. Some cities had it, but most Townships didn't. In 1969, the legislature for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania passed the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC). This code dictated that all townships, boroughs, and cities create zoning ordinances and subdivision and land development ordinances and to provide for certain uses. Today, every township, borough, and city has a zoning ordinance with a different classification for zoning districts including residential, high density residential, village center, industrial, commercial, etc. Within those different districts are different uses. Each zoning district

probably has 30-40 uses. The reason is they must allow for any legitimate recognized use. There might be some exemptions for small municipalities such as Chapmans. In that case, they may fall under county zoning. They are required to allow broad uses. If an ordinance specifically prohibits a use or doesn't allow a use, and a property owner wants to undertake that use, such as an apartment building, quarry, or jail, they can file an exclusionary zoning challenge. They could argue the ordinance is unconstitutional because it doesn't include a recognized use, and the relief is concerning because it is site specific. For example, if apartments aren't allowed anywhere in the Township, a developer could put an apartment complex in a residential neighborhood. They filed an exclusionary zoning challenge and courts ruled this was allowed because the relief is site specific and zoning ordinance didn't allow for it. The municipalities wants to both allow the use and create criteria which properly regulates those uses to protect the residents. Another type of exclusionary zoning is de facto. De jure exclusionary zoning means a use isn't allowed. De facto means criteria that is so constraining that there is no real ability to use the property. It isn't specifically excluded, but the criteria are so strict de facto, it is excluded. The property owner then gets to do the use where they'd like it.

Attorney Backenstoe continued speaking specifically on Moore Township. In 1973, Moore Township adopted its first zoning ordinance. Like every other township in the area, they created districts including rural, residential, and a limited commercial and industrial district. That district is still on SR 512. The supervisors at that time created uses and defined them. One of the uses in the ordinance since 1973 is wholesale business, storage, warehousing establishments, truck and freight terminals, delivery and distribution centers, wholesale produce and meat markets, vehicle and equipment repair shops, and other uses of that nature. In 1980, the Township did another comprehensive re-write of its zoning ordinance. This expanded the industrial district to include the area that is encompassed by Southmoore Golf Course. The twenty seventh permitted use in the district since 1980 was warehousing. The problem was none of the ordinances prior to this Board acting had any kind of regulations. The Township must allow for uses, but they have a right to regulate those uses including rules and safeguards that protect the township and residents as much as possible. This BOS did that. The Zoning Officer and PC came forward noting there is a proliferation of warehouses, and there needs to be rules and regulations so they don't put up any kind of warehouse anyway they want. There needed to be limitations of height, limitations of impervious cover, limitations on trucking, and limitations on traffic and traffic patterns. This BOS had the foresight to direct its PC to spend several months putting together an ordinance which has now been incorporated in the Township zoning ordinance. It is the criteria for what the warehouse must follow and comply. Attorney Backenstoe gave credit to the BOS and read a paragraph from a LVPC letter praising the ordinance. "The proposed amendment significantly expands the use regulations for warehouses which are permitted exclusively in the industrial zone. The proposed amendment also adds traffic study criteria, residential traffic criteria, nonresidential criteria, and a combination of such for traffic studies. While this proposed amendment addresses a matter of great local concern, the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission commends the Township for proactively establishing such use, regulations, and traffic study criteria." He thinks the Township did a good job noting there are a lot of other ordinances similar to the Township's. However, things change. Warehouses proliferated more than anybody could imagine, so there's always time, and it's always important to re-review the ordinance and criteria, maybe expand the criteria and further define the regulations, and further hone the ordinance. The BOS authorized him to discuss the ordinance with other professionals. He asked Phil Malitsch at Hanover Engineering to look at the ordinance as he's experienced with warehouses to see if he had thoughts on how they may provide other regulations that are not unreasonable and don't completely preclude or restrict warehouses but nonetheless provide greater regulation which is appropriate. Hanover Engineering did that quickly and sent the letter dated July 2 to the Board. He thinks the Board should consider amendments to its ordinance. Another idea Attorney Backenstoe thought about when discussing regulating warehouses in a fair and legitimate way, but with some oversight, would be to permit as a conditional use as opposed to a

permitted use. A warehouse is currently a by right use. If it can comply with all the criteria, there can be a warehouse. Other types of uses include conditional uses or special exception uses. These are also permitted uses. However, they are uses to which further conditions can be placed if an appropriate situation arises. It requires the applicant, whether be for mineral extraction, trucking, warehouse, slaughterhouse, etc, go before the Zoning Hearing Board for a special exception or the Board of Supervisors if it is a conditional use. Special exception and conditional use are guided by the same law, but a conditional use is the one time in all of zoning when the BOS has some input regarding a proposed use aside from the ordinance. He thinks the Board should talk about the amendments suggested by Hanover Engineering and those by the Township engineer. They should consider making this a conditional use as opposed to a permitted use. He spoke to Mr. Flower at least once. Mr. Flower and a citizens group worked hard and reviewed the ordinance noting Mr. Flower thought there were a lot of good things. This citizens group also has some thoughts and ideas on how to further hone the ordinance. Attorney Backenstoe turned it over to the Board for the next step in the review and consideration of making amendments to the ordinance. Mr. Piorkowski said they would like to make some amendments noting they're interested in the conditional use. He asked if Attorney Backenstoe could go over the conditional use and Hanover Engineering recommendations. As a Board, they feel the current ordinance isn't a right fit at this time.

Attorney Backenstoe said a zoning ordinance is a living, breathing document that changes over time. As society changes, the zoning ordinance and subdivision and land development ordinances (SALDO) change. Zoning ordinances are constantly changed over time, and now seems as good a time as any to review the current warehouse criteria. One of the things to consider is conditional uses. Conditional uses are permitted; however, the BOS can have a formal hearing with a stenographer introducing testimony to confirm and prove they do indeed meet all the criteria. Another type of use is a special exception use that is the same but goes to the Zoning Hearing Board. This is seen more frequently. However, when something is such a magnitude like an airport or a warehouse, it's sometimes better to go in front of the Board of Supervisors as they are the elected officials who oversee the Township and regulations. His thought is to remove warehouses from a by right use and make it a conditional use. They aren't violating the law as they still allow the use. Another thought set in the Hanover review letter is the Township may want to adjust acreage based on the size of the warehouse. For instance, they may want a minimum lot area of 25 acres when the proposed building has a proposed footprint larger than 100,000 square feet. Mr. Malitsch's first suggestion is if a warehouse is over 100,000 square feet, they need to have a 25-acre lot. He also suggested when they have a footprint greater than 100,000 sq ft, all access points should be toward arterial roads. The ordinance currently requires this. All access points shall be a minimum of 250 feet from any dwelling and any drive aisle, loading or unloading area. Outdoor storage or parking areas related to tractor-trailers shall be a minimum of 250 feet from any dwelling. Attorney Backenstoe thinks these are important improvements and aren't unreasonable. Mr. Malitsch discusses the maximum height. The ordinance currently has a height limit of 44 feet. Attorney Backenstoe thinks it's reasonable noting in other townships warehouse owners try to get variances because they want them higher. He isn't sure why they want it higher. Hanover also commented on the berm requirements. Mr. Malitsch liked the berm requirements but thought it should go further. At the time the ordinance was drafted, along an arterial or collector road they wouldn't have a huge berm to stop the visual screening of the roads. They should have it along the entire route as there might be neighbors very close depending on the location of the warehouse. They should have a significant, screened berm which would be several feet high with thick trees up ten to fourteen feet high to screen the warehouse from the residential properties. Mr. Malitsch provided a lot of helpful criteria in that regard. He also went further with the buffer and planting describing how it would be helpful and better visual screens. It was also recommended they have dimensions for the loading spaces noting there are currently dimensions for the loading docks. This is not unreasonable and provides greater protection to the community keeping the trucks on site taking care of

their business and not leaving the site doing it somewhere else. He also recommended looking at the facilities parking and driveway layout to reduce mixing of truck and car traffic. He'd like to see a scheme in which trucks flow instead of backing up. There currently is a provision for this, but it was recommended to further define. He also recommended another traffic study which would look at the current state of roads in the Township. He also talked about some other items Attorney Backenstoe doesn't think existed a couple years ago and were brought up by residents at the PC meeting. Mr. Malitsch suggested they require a lounge so truck drivers aren't doing their business where people can see. They wouldn't have their trucks parked overnight waiting to be serviced. He talked about several loading and unloading requirements so there's less traffic in addition to other parking amenities. He talked about guard shacks or checkpoints at the entrance of the facilities to ensure adequate queuing, and a minimum of 5% total tractor-trailer parking spaces be reserved for outbound trucks required for layovers due to hours of travel to help keep trucks from idling and bothering neighbors while helping maneuver. Attorney Backenstoe thinks changing the use from a permitted use to a conditional use in addition to adding these regulations would bolster the ordinance. This is not illegal or inappropriate but provides more benefit and protection to the community. It doesn't make it any easier for the warehouse, but they're all legitimate. He knows there are representatives for the warehouse who would love to hear him say they're doing something inappropriate to stop the warehouses. This is not what they're trying to do. They're trying to properly regulate warehouses within the law.

Mr. Piorkowski thinks the Board agrees the changes are sound and good. He also thinks the height restriction should be dropped to 42 feet as it conforms with rest of the industrial district. Mr. Shaffer asked Mr. Horvath if he has anything to add. Mr. Horvath looked at the ordinance noting he and Attorney Backenstoe spoke the prior week. He also looked at Hanover's recommendations. There are several improvements that can be made, most of which were discussed. The ordinance as is touches on most, if not all, of these items already and can be tweaked to be more appropriate to warehouses seen today. He agrees with the requirement to buffer or increase setbacks from not only front yards or roadways but also residential properties as the Township's industrial districts are surrounded by residentially zoned properties or residential uses. There's also a section of the current ordinance that can be strengthened by defaulting to the underlining zoning district. There's a provision in the industrial district limiting impervious cover to 55% of a lot area. The warehouse ordinance could fall back to the industrial district instead of requiring something different for warehouses. The 44 ft building height versus 42 ft will be fine either way as someone will likely be seeking relief either way. The current ordinance allows a berm to be reduced to 4 feet if the property fronts a collector or arterial road. In this case, the ordinance requires it to front an arterial or collector road, so the ordinance limits itself to a 4-foot-high berm whereas other places in the ordinance have a 14-foot-high berm. Further clarification would be helpful for surrounding residential properties. There's a lot of tweaks in the ordinance that can be made to make it more current in terms of what can be expected in terms of a warehouse development. The traffic study referred to is pretty well called out in the current ordinance, but it is explicitly required by the SALDO so may want to look at whether there are conflicts that need to be resolved or adjusted. Some of the Hanover Engineering comments hit the mark, and he thinks some are covered in other ways. For example, the minimum lot area suggested by Hanover to be 25 acres per 1,000 sq ft warehouse is going to result in potentially a 20% max in impervious cover. He doesn't think it's advisable to go that low considering the industrial coverage allowances, but it is possible for discussion. He thinks the impervious coverage does the same thing continuing if you need a big warehouse, you need a big property proportional to the size of the warehouse. In that sense, it may be covered or straightforward but certainly something worth discussing. Mr. Piorkowski asked clarification from Attorney Backenstoe that one of their ordinances requires they tell the Township who the tenant will be. Mr. Piorkowski also asked if they can be more restrictive with hours of operation. Attorney Backenstoe said his understanding is when a warehouse is built, it is a spec warehouse and the owner doesn't know for whom they're building the warehouse. He

doesn't know if the Township could require them to produce an owner when they don't know. Rather, they're permitted to have a use. One of the ways they try to handle it is in subsection N. They require off street parking and loading as required under section 257 of the ordinance. However, the supervisors shall have discretion to impose additional requirements. When going to this provision, it is difficult for a warehouse to meet. It's one space for every 500 square feet which is a lot. The Township anticipated a developer might come in and not know who the potential tenant will be. If you knew who the tenant will be, more consistent with standards in the industry and most township parking regulations, would be subsection U. It appears to be inconsistent, but it is not. One would be for if you don't know who the tenant is going to be, they require one space for every 500 sq ft. The other, which is consistent throughout the industry and seems to be the standard when looking at other township regulations regarding warehouse, is off street parking, loading spaces, staging spaces, and docks require off street parking of 1.2 parking spaces for every one employee at peak periods of operation. Number of staging spaces is two, 10' x 80' truck staging spaces for every one loading dock, and the number of loading docks should have at least one loading space for every dock. He knows it's unpopular, but he doesn't know if they can force someone to name a tenant. All they can do is plan a tenant for whatever tenant it might be. There is a provision in which they're supposed to list the nature of the activities in section W when submitting a land development application including a detailed proposed use description of the nature of on-site activities and operation, types of materials stored, the frequency of distribution and restocking, the retention period for storage of materials, general scale of operation, specific floor space, environmental impacts, etc. This was the Township's effort to pigeonhole who the user will be without making them disclose who it was. If he were in court arguing this, he would argue this is absolutely legitimate criteria. He doesn't know who the corporation is, but these are legitimate criteria for which the Township has a right to be aware. Mr. Piorkowski asked about the hours of operation. Attorney Backenstoe deferred to Mr. Harhart. Mr. Harhart said it depends on the use noting they need to know what the use is. For everything they do in zoning, they need to know the use. Attorney Backenstoe asked what it would be for a warehouse. Mr. Harhart referred to section W noting they shall require those answers regarding the use. If they cannot provide the proposed use, they need a variance from the section which means it would need to go to the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Piorkowski asked the Board for any comments before asking questions of the audience.

Mr. Flower of W. Scenic Drive said a meeting was held at the Recreation Center Monday evening with residents concerned about the warehouse ordinance in its current form and the potential Southmoore Golf Course project. He drafted a letter as a result of the meeting. He's thrilled to hear Attorney Backenstoe's suggestions as some of them mirror their suggestions. He read a letter from Moore Township residents concerned with the impact. They request the following amendments to the warehouse ordinance: warehouse criteria total maximum lot coverage be reduced from 75% to 50%, 100 ft wide berm buffer yard required on all sides of the warehouse in addition to the requirement for the berm in front as currently specified, add requirement for a solid wall or barrier with visibility screening to be installed around the entire area of warehousing operation in such a way to minimize visibility from all surrounding properties, all street employee parking increased from 1.2 spaces per employee at peak period of operation to 1.5 spaces per employee; maximum study area increased from two miles of the proposed project boundaries to five miles of the proposed project boundaries, a project projected to generate more than 3,000 trips per day shall have a maximum study area increased from three miles to include the entire Township, line item seven specifying the Township supervisors require a fee in lieu of a study shall be removed. The letter from the Moore Township Warehouse Harm Reduction Coalition concluded by thanking the Board for consideration and efforts to facilitate changes they think is in the best interest of the Township and its residents. The letter was circulated prior and during the meeting, and Mr. Flower asked for a show of hands for those who signed the letter or showed up for the meeting at the Recreation Center. Mr. Flower was pleased to hear this was on the agenda prior to them bringing it up.

Attorney Backenstoe likes the suggestions and noted how they mirror many of the suggestions from Hanover previously discussed.

Mr. Dave Zackey of Cherrywood Lane is concerned with our first responders. He listens to what they're going through now and last week they brought up how much it costs to train. They didn't say how much their equipment would need to change to reach 44 ft. He also asked whether or not our first responders can handle the number of employees rushing to work around all the truck traffic and whether they need an ordinance noting they need so many people or equipment before allowing a certain size of any kind of industrial improvements or installations in the Township. Mr. Piorkowski said that's a good point. Attorney Backenstoe said these are good points. He thought it would be important to include an access stair tower which is required by the uniform construction code but not included in every warehouse study. This would allow and help the firefighters facilitate an emergency. The second point is one often asked. When a developer brings in a large development whether large number of homes or large building, the residents ask who is going to pay for the fire protection and extra police protection. Unfortunately, the Municipal Planning Code does not allow the Township to charge the developer for those services. It can be changed if they got the state legislatures to amend the code allowing townships to assess fees for police, fire, or any other services. Townships are creatures of statute. Dylan's law says government giveth townships authority, and it taketh. Townships have no more authority than that which is set forth in the Second Class Township Code and corresponding legislation such as the MPC. The legislature allows for offsite improvements if they perform certain studies and can establish a particular development will have such extraordinary impact because of traffic that they can get fees. This usually must be done years in advance and are only fruitful when there's a large housing development with many cars traveling to and from the development per day. The developer would then be responsible for fees associated with those trips, known as capital improvement fees, which would allow the township, borough, or city to construct roads, build intersections, and maybe add lighting. There is a provision for capital improvements, but it is a costly undertaking that may be \$60,000-\$100,000. He reiterated they should contact the representatives and senators as the only way for the Township to assess this type of emergency responders impact fee on a developer is to have a law authorizing the Township to assess such a fee on a developer. Mr. Zackey asked if they could make a requirement that they be prepared regardless of fee. Even if they do have the money, he asked how they can prepare for 500 cars coming in and out every day noting the strain the on the Township. Attorney Backenstoe understands noting that's why they'd like to assess the fee on the developer and it's a great point.

Joyce of Keeler Road asked what benefit the Township would gain from the development of this warehouse including taxes. Attorney Backenstoe said beauty is in the eye of the beholder. Some people will say there is no benefit, but the courts don't hold that analysis. If he must come up with a benefit, he guesses it would be taxes including transfer taxes from the sale of the property and real estate taxes. Attorney Backenstoe provided this answer only because he had to strain to come up with an answer. He isn't saying that's enough but that is the only thing he can think of. Perhaps jobs, but he doesn't know about this or any other proposed warehouse in the area.

Mr. Jim Sikora of Derhammer Road loves the passion and enthusiasm of everyone in the audience commending them noting it's their and his community. He asked if the potential buyer signed an agreement of sale with the owner of the current property. He understands the desired changes to the warehouse ordinance, but wouldn't the potential buyer note the conditions of the ordinance when he signed the agreement of sale. If they're changed in the future, he asked if that would apply. Attorney Backenstoe doesn't know what the agreement says. Agreements of sale he has been involved with included provisions where a property owner bought subject to being able to use the land in a particular fashion. Many, or most, agreement of sale, especially when an attorney is involved, puts a specific

provision that closing will only occur once the buyer receives approval, usually an unappealable approval. This is because an approval that can be appealed could take five or more years before he knows if the property can be used in accordance with the agreement. He doesn't know what the agreement says, and it would be pure speculation. He would think the buyer has provisions that require he get certain approvals before he can close as that is usually the procedure.

Mr. Aubrey Brown of Hamilton Township attended with his two sons. They come down from Stroudsburg to play golf. He doesn't know all the details but has seen signs and heard chatter. He is speaking on behalf of Southmoore, the staff, and how they treat families, junior golfers in particular. They make Mr. Brown and his family feel welcome. They enjoy the course, and the course is challenging. They play a lot of courses in other areas, but they come back to Moore Township to play this golf course. He doesn't know how this will play out, but the staff at Southmoore is tremendous. He would support keeping a golf course. It's a good environment to bring families and would assume other businesses would like more families coming to Moore Township. Attorney Backenstoe made note the supervisors cannot make somebody do something with their land for which they may or may not want to do. He played at Southmoore when he played golf, and it's a great course noting it was like a big league course. If the owner wants to sell it, the Township can't do anything to stop it. Mr. Brown said it seems like there's a few people interested in seeing the sale stopped, so he encouraged those voices to continue speaking.

Mr. Anthony Maniscalco of Jones Road lives adjacent to the driving range, so this is of big interest to him and his family. Great points were made regarding possible changes that may impact the sale, and he understands the Township doesn't have any bearing on the sale. The Township does have bearing on whether they approve it or not. It's obvious they don't want it to go through. His request is they request the potential purchaser to do a study through the PA Game Commission. They stated a study was done through the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), but they didn't do one through the PA Game Commission as he spoke to the Game Commission regarding bald eagles and the impact on the area. That needs to be done because a bald eagle flies over the golf course. Under the regulations, he read if it does affect the breeding area, the building cannot proceed. He requests the Board look into that.

Mr. Steve Neslko loves the eagles and takes pictures of them. He said technically, the EPA oversees the permit from the government. He isn't sure what they're talking in terms of feet for warehouses, but they can't move within 600 feet without a permit. Attorney Backenstoe said they'll look into it noting Mr. Maniscalco's suggestion was excellent.

Ms. Dianne Sheffield of Southmoore Drive sees two different factions. She sees everything they can't do to stop it, and the people who would like to stop what's happening. She asks what can be done to delay asking how soon Mr. Muschlitz needs an answer. She asked if they can request certain studies such as environmental protection and reach out to legislators as that will take time. She also asked if there's a format they can pass around to send to legislators. If they have time, there might be something they can do to put off doing this immediately. Mr. Piorkowski said they need to provide a site plan which they haven't done yet. Once they provide that, the steps are then put into motion. Mr. Piorkowski asked if a site plan has been provided, and Mr. Harhart said one has not. Ms. Sheffield asked if there's a time period for when the Township receives the plan. Attorney Backenstoe isn't sure it's a site plan, but they have to submit a formal land development plan, and they have not done that. He doesn't know if they will submit and if so, when. Under the MPC, once a land development plan is submitted, the Township has 90 days to review to determine whether they comply with all regulations in the zoning ordinance. If the Township finds they don't comply with any regulation in the ordinance, the Township could deny a land development plan because it doesn't comply with something in the ordinance. Ms. Sheffield asked

confirmation they have 90 days. Attorney Backenstoe said technically, yes. He has never seen a large scale come through and get approval or denied in 90 days. There's usually so much information to review that it usually takes months and the applicant requests an extension of time from the Township. Courts have indicated they have to be reasonable in their reviews. The actual process, in its purest form, is a land development and subdivision plan is submitted, and the Township must review it. The 90 days starts on the first PC meeting which meets after the formal submission of the plan or 30 days, whichever occurs first. This starts the 90-day clock and it's imperative the Township watch the time limit. If the Township doesn't act in appropriate fashion, it would be deemed approved. Ms. Sheffield asked if the zoning changes are made, do those changes affect the current plan or are they retroactive possibly adding another issue for zoning. Attorney Backenstoe said there is a court created doctrine called the pending ordinance doctrine. If an ordinance is advertised for adoption, any submission after that would fall under the new ordinance. There are instances where townships take affirmative action and resolve to modify a particular zoning ordinance when it can be argued the new ordinance takes effect. It is something that will need to be decided by a court. Ms. Sheffield liked the comment Mr. Flower made in his letter and was wondering if they can form a group and send letters to representatives not knowing how effective it would be. Attorney Backenstoe doesn't know how effective it would be noting they need to get the entire state legislature to adopt legislation which would allow townships, boroughs, or cities to impose fees noting he's not just talking about changing laws concerning this issue but all issues. Ms. Sheffield asked confirmation that isn't an immediate resolve. Attorney Backenstoe said that isn't an immediate resolve. He can't understate how important it would be to allow townships, boroughs, and cities to assess fees on a developer for the impact they'll have on police, fire, and EMS. Ms. Sheffield asked if they could delay because the Township doesn't have appropriate resources to respond to an emergency. Attorney Backenstoe said no. If they don't review the plan in accordance with the dictates of the MPC within 90 days or pursuant to an extension, then it is deemed approval. The reason is boards may not have liked somebody who submitted a plan and sat on a plan for years. The person who wanted to get the development properly through couldn't, so the law changed to put the municipality on a short leash with submissions. Ms. Sheffield said there's a number of people she doesn't know but would like to get together on this issue. Attorney Backenstoe said he's been around Moore Township a long time and Moore Township people are good people. Ms. Sheffield said she knows as she's a Moore Township person and it's why she moved here. Attorney Backenstoe reiterated Moore Township people are extraordinary and kind. Ms. Sheffield is asking because they might be in a group that she doesn't know about and would like to participate. Attorney Backenstoe suggest she call Mr. Flower. Ms. Sheffield asked about delaying a project, and Attorney Backenstoe said it is honestly up to the developer when and if they submit a plan that starts the process.

Mr. Flower said the last comment made was pertinent. The plan could be submitted tomorrow or next week. Is the Board prepared to make a motion to modify the warehouse ordinance so they can have a pending ordinance change as of tonight? Mr. Piorkowski isn't sure if he didn't say it, but it is their intention to authorize the solicitor to move forward with creating an ordinance that they can start the process. Mr. Flower wants to make sure it takes effect tonight. Mr. Piorkowski said Attorney Backenstoe has been working on this since the PC meeting, so yes, they'll be making the recommendation.

Mr. Matt Billard of Jones Road said some of the members are young, and this plan is 40 years old. The golf course is 29 years old. He isn't sure if there's a state mandated acreage, but once the golf course was built the zoning should have been shrunk. It shouldn't have included the golf course. They have one of the best public golf courses in the Township, and they should keep it. Attorney Backenstoe explained they need to have a certain amount of area for industrial, business, village center, etc. If they have too small an area, it can be challenged in court. It would be considered exclusionary. The fact the golf course was there was a wonderful thing. He doesn't think the golf course was a permitted use and thinks

they needed to get relief as a special exception. The Township allowed it, and it is a beautiful golf course. It's not up to the Township but the owner of the golf course to keep it a golf course. Someone said the owner stated he wants to back out and Board should take consideration in their decision as far as approval of the warehouse. Attorney Backenstoe said the Township can't look at it from the terms of a private sale noting they don't know the terms of a private sale. The Township has to follow its ordinances, regulations, and the MPC. If residents know the people involved, talk to them, and can undo that sale, terrific. Ms. Sheffield asked what if they did it as a group. Attorney Backenstoe said it's a private arrangement between an owner and equitable buyer. The Township cannot interfere in any fashion. Residents can do as they wish. Someone from the audience said the buyer, Muschlitz, has until November to back out. Even though the current owner asked him to back out, he has until November per their agreement. Attorney Backenstoe said he wouldn't know that.

Joyce heard at the last meeting that changing Jones Road was not acceptable. Attorney Backenstoe said the sketch plan shows the proposed warehouse straddling Jones Road, so Jones Road couldn't be there. The only way Jones Road could be vacated would be an action by the Board of Supervisors. The developer could file an action in court to make it happen, but he doesn't think the Board has to vacate a road which they feel is important, useful, and practical. Someone asked if Mr. Horvath thought the collector road from Jones Road to the private road was too short. Mr. Horvath said at the PC meeting Jones Road is classified as a local road, and the current Township zoning ordinance requires a warehouse access directly to either a collector or arterial road. In his opinion, based on the information he has right now, Jones Road wouldn't classify as a collector road and therefore wouldn't be eligible for access by the warehouse.

Mr. Larry Burns said if they're proposing 1,000 sq ft of warehousing that fire suppression will probably be required. Where are they going to get the water, store the water, and what kind of impact taking the water from the ground will that have? Will they be required to do a study? Mr. Horvath said typically for a warehouse, if public water is not available or adequate to provide fire protection, there would be provisions made for groundwater supply of a fire protection system which would be a tank that would supply water to the fire suppression system. The Township's SALDO has a section stating that any subdivision and land development in excess of a certain size, and this would qualify as in excess of the size, would be required to do studies for impact assessments on the various Township facilities as well as environmental or other resources. The developer would be required to assess the impacts of the development on Township fire services, public schools, public police protection, groundwater quality, availability of groundwater, and traffic to name a few. There are provisions in the ordinance that protect or prevent the development from improperly affecting groundwater supply in the surrounding area. Joyce asked if groundwater refers to wells. Members of the crowd said yes. She asked if the development could affect the groundwater and wells for those across from the golf course. Members of crowd said yes. Mr. Horvath said the reason for the study is to make a determination as to whether that's likely to occur. The impact assessments are to provide assurances that what they're proposing will not negatively impact ground wells. Joyce said the houses on Keeler Road were already affected when the development went in, so that's a big concern for her.

Mr. Gable made a motion authorizing the solicitor to draft an ordinance amending the current ordinance 2019-07 which provides regulations of warehouse first by changing warehouses from a by right, or permitted, use to conditional use, and second by incorporating all of the comments set forth in Hanover Engineering review letter of July 2, 2021 which include requirements associated with acreage; access points; berm requirements; buffer requirements; loading space requirements; facility parking, driving, and layout design requirements; sections associated with traffic studies; and additional requirements set forth regarding amenities including minimum suitable lounge for

drivers and operators, at least one amenity shall be provided for every thirty truck loading/unloading docks/doorways of the use, size of each amenity shall be proportionate to the size of the loading dock, parking for amenities shall be provided in close proximity to amenities in the suitable, safe, and separately defined location; and the other criteria set forth in sections 9, 10, 11, and 12, altogether 12 requirements in the Hanover Engineering review letter. In addition, parking requirements be amended so they are consistent and have the maximum plot area be reduced from 75% to 55% as well as the other conditions discussed in detail. Finally, the solicitor is to consider and incorporate where appropriate the provisions submitted by the residents group.

Mr. Shaffer seconded the motion

Public comment

Mr. Lenny Beltz said the warehouse is going to be in proximity to his house from where he stands to the Rangers parking lot. Diesel trucks are going to run, and he knows the government is going to say they burn clean. If they get fifty trucks running in the parking lot, from where the house is located, he's going to smell the diesel. He also asked about the light pollution noting he has a disabled son, and the light and noise will affect him. They have a 14-foot berm plus trees, but it isn't going to block the noise. They need to watch the noise and light pollution. His farm has been in the family for eighty to a hundred years. This is what they're going to do, and they don't have enough decency to talk to him. They sent other people to talk to him. He wanted to know if he can take his diesel truck to Mr. Jack Muschlitz's home and have it run all night long. He would be called and arrested. He also asked about the trucks that are going to run and chill all night long to chill the food. Mr. Piorkowski said there are provisions regarding idling and adding electric stations. Mr. Beltz said they're going to run. Another person said the electric runs off same diesel that trucks run on, so they're going to have to stay on if they're going to be overnight or picked up in the morning. Mr. Piorkowski said they'll look into it. Someone else said they work at a warehouse, and no trucks are allowed to come in during off hours that way they need to be there when opening. Mr. Piorkowski said they spoke about the hours of operations, so Attorney Backenstoe will look at it. He continued, other townships have problems with trucks parking and drivers urinating in the streets and dropping off containers of urine because parking isn't provided. He said Attorney Backenstoe will do research on idling.

Ms. Tina Stranzel of Serpent Circle said Northampton and Catsauqua are having problems because trucks are coming through their town. Our roads are not good to start. What are they going to do with the roads? Her understanding is they don't have enough police officers. How are they going to keep trucks from going on roads where they have people running and biking every day? She asked if they looked at Northampton and Catsauqua. Mr. Piorkowski said they would take this under advisement.

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

Mr. Shaffer made a motion to direct the revised ordinance be placed on the next Planning Commission agenda for review by the Planning Commission and recommendation be provided to the Board of Supervisors

Mr. Gable seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMOS

Emergency Management Coordinator Resignation

Mr. Piorkowski said they received correspondence from the Emergency Management Coordinator (EMC) who resigned effective June 11. They will be looking for a new EMC. The former EMC will help the new EMC get acclimated to the responsibilities.

Mr. Shaffer made a motion to accept the resignation of David Ohl as the Emergency Management Coordinator

Mr. Gable seconded the motion

Public comment

Mr. Piorkowski thanked Mr. Ohl for the work he did in getting them up to date with their emergency management plan.

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

OPEN TO THE FLOOR

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Shaffer made a motion adjourn the meeting at 8:03 PM

Mr. Gable seconded the motion

Public comment

None

Motion carried with all Supervisors present voting aye

Respectfully submitted,

Nicholas C. Steiner
Township Manager

Not intended to be word for word, but a synopsis of the meeting.