

PALMER TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
February 26, 2024
7:00 PM
GENERAL BUSINESS MEETING

The Palmer Township Board of Supervisors held a general business meeting on Tuesday, February 26, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. in the Municipal Building meeting room. The following were in attendance: Chair Michael Brett, Vice Chair Joseph Armato, and Supervisor Charles E. Bellis III. Supervisors K. Michael Mitchell and Jeffrey Young were absent. Also in attendance were the Township Manager, Planning Director, Assistant Planning Director, Police Chief and Police Captains, Director of Public Services, and the Assistant Township Manager.

1. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approval of Minutes - February 20, 2024

INFORMATION

The Board needs to approve/disapprove the minutes of February 20, 2024.

Motion: Approve, Moved by Supervisor Joseph Armato, Seconded by Charles Bellis III. Passed. 3-0.

Supervisors voting Ayes: Armato, Bellis III, Brett

Supervisors Absent: Mitchell, Young

B. Disbursement of Funds - February 26, 2024

INFORMATION

The Board needs to approve/disapprove the Disbursement of Funds for February 26, 2024.

Motion: Approve, Moved by Charles Bellis III, Seconded by Supervisor Joseph Armato. Passed. 3-0.

Supervisors voting Ayes: Armato, Bellis III, Brett

Supervisors Absent: Mitchell, Young

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. Feasibility Study for New Police Station Proposals

INFORMATION

Phil Godbout presented the Request for Proposals received to the Board at the February 20, 2024, meeting. The Board requested additional time to review the proposals and to return it to tonight's meeting agenda.

Board action is requested.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Brett said we spoke about this at our last meeting and it is back for us to take action tonight.

Public Services Director, Phillip Godbout said he reviewed each proposal and his recommendation would be awarding to Alloy5. The police staff is also here to support the Alloy5 proposal. If you have any questions for them or myself you can ask them now. Otherwise we are requesting your approval to award to Alloy5.

Supervisor Charles Bellis made a motion to award the feasibility study to Alloy5.

Chief Smith said, on behalf of the police department, we thank you.

Williams said, the next item on the agenda will take awhile and he told township staff members they could leave.

Brett said, we have two students from Easton High School here tonight. Brett explained the governmental process and explained the various township boards and commissions.

Motion: Approve, Moved by Charles Bellis III, Seconded by Supervisor Joseph Armato. Passed. 3-0.

Supervisors voting Ayes: Armato, Bellis III, Brett

Supervisors Absent: Mitchell, Young

B. Villages at Wolf's Run Phase 3 - Final Subdivision Plan

INFORMATION

Wolf's Run Land, LLC, requests additional public hearing time for the Board of Supervisors to consider Final Subdivision Plan approval of Villages at Wolf's Run, Phase 3.

If approved, Phase 3 would consist of 139 attached townhouses and one (1) single family residential dwelling.

This public hearing has been ongoing since September 26, 2023.

DISCUSSION

Township Solicitor Will Oetinger said, we can go back on the record for the Land Development Application for Villages at Wolf's Run, Phase 3, final approval. I believe at the last meeting the applicant went through testimony from Mr. Malitsch and Mr. Woods. I believe they are ready to open up for resident cross examination tonight.

Attorney John McShea said we still have Rob Hoffman as our final witness, but he is

not available tonight. We do have two housekeeping items. At the end of the December discussion Mr. Armato requested we submit renderings to the Board. I'm adding that as Exhibit A62. Related to that, Exhibit A33 was a February 2 email to members of the township with similar renderings and plans. The email is in the record and there is an attachment that wasn't included. I'm supplementing Exhibit A33 to include the attachment and marking it Exhibit A33a.

Oetinger reminding Mr. Graack this is the time he may ask questions of Mr. Malitsch and Mr. Woods. There will be another opportunity to present.

Harry Graack, 1380 Van Buren Road, said he researched many issues with this and I have five exhibits. I do not believe Mr. Woods finished his testimony. Oetinger said he believes that he did and McShea confirmed his testimony was completed.

Graack said he had a visual cross examination listing with questions he has based on Mr. Malitsch's previous testimony and the large exhibit book. Graack provided his document to Solicitor Oetinger and the Tuskes Attorneys.

Graack said his first question comes from renderings provided to me and the township of the original Tuskes plan. He asked if this rendering (Exhibit A3) was a way to just overlook what was wanted by Harry Graack? Malitsch said no. I asked for a lower bridge profile regarding the bridge deck, which is too wide. Malitsch said, we have tried to address those concerns. We had the reduction from its original size of 80 x 80 down to 60 x 60. The width of the road was dictated by the previous township engineer. We were to provide for a future three lane road. The profile of Van Buren Road is the same as what was on the preliminary plan. The design profile of Van Buren Road was held.

Graack said, we had a meeting on October 22 and the answer you gave was not in response to what we asked at that meeting. We asked for a further reduction than your 50% reduction, which impacts the properties on Van Buren Road. Why didn't you adhere to that? Malitsch said, we adhered to what was requested by the township.

Graack asked, why have you not performed a new comprehensive traffic impact analysis? Malitsch said, the developer that we inherited the project from agreed to off site improvements to the road and bridge. It was agreed if they did these improvements a traffic impact study would not be required. We provided trip generation reports to the township and the township put that into a northern tier traffic study. Graack asked, are you aware there are several kinds of traffic studies? The one you ventured into was one of lesser results. Please clarify why you did that and not a more extensive study. Malitsch said, we were asked for a trip generation study and that got incorporated into a township regional study.

Graack asked, what happened to the twin box bridge design proposed back in 2008? Malitsch said, I don't know. Graack asked, what happened to the three precast concrete design? Malitsch said, the precast arch design was a consideration that was removed. He talked about the tailwater for the project. Graack said, we asked for you to relook at that and reconsider the design or cosmetics of a three arch bridge. Do you think you have bridged the gap to replace the culverts other than raising its heights? Malitsch said, for regulatory criteria, yes.

Graack asked, why is Tuskes pursuing an errored consensus for which the current 2023 Board of Supervisors still denies a legal vote ever occurred to condemn any property for the bridge project? Malitsch said, this is a legal question. Oetinger said, does the current proposal require right-of-way that you do not have? Malitsch said, yes. We don't have the right-of-way.

Graack asked, when was the single span bridge concept proposed? Malitsch said, it was conceived when the preliminary plan was approved. We advanced that design and started in September 2022. He went on to elaborate on the process taken. Graack asked, what kind of permits were applied for in 2006, 2007 or 2008? Malitsch said, I believe they were the same and he explained the current compliance requirements. It was always a general permit type project. Graack said, you testified permits expired in 2006, 2007, and 2008. Are you suggesting they expired and you had to reissue? Malitsch said, I never saw that a permit expired. The NPDES permit expired and we had to reapply for that. In the fall of last year, we did it for Phase 3. Graack asked about a GP11 permit? Malitsch said, we started from scratch and submitted for a permit. Graack said, I'm told GP11 permits do not expire.

Graack asked, why and by who was this concept forced into the current plans without standing agreements by myself and the Hartins? Malitsch said, it took awhile for us to get together. We met in October 2022, but we were trying to set up the meeting since February. We had standing plans in place for a single span bridge that was required by the township and we worked with the township professionals on that. We tried to address your comments and Mr. Hartin's regarding sidewalks, berms and fill. Graack said, we had many questions and you testified you didn't have an opportunity to ask questions and you got up and left the meeting with out asking questions. Malitsch said that he didn't have any questions. I took notes at that meeting. Graack asked, are you aware the meeting was not over. Malitsch said, no.

Graack said, I know your diagrams show two lanes. Why weren't three lanes discussed? Malitsch said, it shows two, but it could be restriped for three.

Graack said, this is related to the emails with Bob Williams that were referenced. You suggested you wanted to move forward and there still were no agreements and you were ignoring land owners. There is no record of a motion with the landowners about the right-of-ways, so why are you saying you're moving forward. Malitsch asked, moving forward with what? Graack said, with the landowner agreements you suggested you were moving forward. Piperato objected. Oetinger asked, did you continue to pursue the bridge design without the agreements with the property owners? Graack asked, why wasn't a meeting setup? Malitsch said, at the last meeting before this Board we provided a lot of information on how many times we tried to get a meeting together. We tried to address the comments from the property owners and we were moving in that direction. We met with Mr. Hartin regarding his agreement and we felt it went well. We didn't have signed agreements. Graack said, why was no meeting setup? Piperato objected and said he can testify that he attempted many times to setup meetings.

Graack asked, did Mr. Tuskes think the landowners would sign agreements if the DEP permit was awarded? Malitsch said, I didn't connect getting a permit as it satisfying the

agreement requirement. Malitsch said, the permit we received was covered at township meetings. Graack asked, why didn't you tell us that you got a permit? Malitsch said, I don't recall not telling you. Graack asked, are you aware DEP has an appeal period? Malitsch said, yes I'm generally aware. Oetinger asked, did you inform Mr. Graack you obtained the PA DEP permit? Malitsch said, I don't recall when I spoke to him about that. Malitsch said, when we got it, we sent it to the township.

Graack said going back to the October 22 meeting, did you ever produce a grading plan for both sides of the road, specifically my side. Malitsch said, we provided a lot of materials starting in January and February. In the fall of 2022 it had to do with conditions on the Meilinger property and on your property and it is reflected in the document we sent you in early 2023, and it is shown on the township plans. Graack asked, why did you not get back to me? Malitsch said, I think our team reached out to you multiple times and those efforts were unsuccessful. Malitsch said, we produced documents to you in early 2023. Graack asked, why did you not address my verbal list of questions from the October 22 meeting? Malitsch said, I believe we provided all the requests. Graack said, this concludes my questions for Mr. Malitsch.

Oetinger said we can move on to Mr. Woods. Graack provided Solicitor Oetinger with his written questions for Mr. Woods. Oetinger said, I do not intend to admit as reference, I'm using them to follow along.

Graack said, this is on Mr. Hartin's side, but I'll ask anyway. There were discussions held about stormwater related to Wolf's Run Phase 3, and you testified it was rerouted from the northern floodplain to south of the Schoeneck. Woods said, it was to satisfy the NPDES permit and we felt it had less impact on the Meilinger property and it met SALDO and DEP requirements. Graack asked, did you ever discuss with Mr. Hartin? Woods said, no. Graack asked why. Woods said it was up to Mr. Tuskes, not his engineer.

Oetinger asked Mr. Woods, do you have knowledge that right-of-ways were required for building permits or Certificate of Occupancy permits to be issues? Woods said, I don't remember. That is more of a legal item. Woods said, I don't recall when those changes happened.

Graack asked, how or when was this approval requirement met? Woods said, we needed to get the answers because it impacted the timeline of the project.

Graack asked, how can a proposed bikepath and Van Buren Road improvements be accepted for the final Phase 1 approval by the township when all the required right-of-way agreements were not yet negotiated and satisfied? Why has this been ongoing from an engineering standpoint and the agreements not been addressed? Woods said, from the engineering side, we've done all our client has asked about the bridge, roadway and bike path. You'd have to ask the solicitors.

Graack said, this question relates to Mr. Hartin's driveway. Why was the driveway moved closer to the bridge? Woods said, I'm not aware we moved it significantly closer to the bridge. Wood said, we looked at different options for the Meilinger property. Graack asked, are you aware the Meilingers didn't like it? Woods said, I'm not aware. Graack asked, why did you state the Hartin/Meilinger property needed to be

resolved first? Woods said, I don't understand the question. Oetinger asked, did you ever state the Hartin/Meilinger access point were bridge design concerns. Woods said, yes. Graack asked, why was that first? Woods said, it was all together when we designed this. Graack asked, were my concerns overlooked. Woods said, no.

Graack asked, why did Tuskes delay in not getting the land owner agreements enacted? Woods said, my understanding is they tried to get a hold of the landowners to work on the agreements. Graack asked, why did Tuskes refuse to make any changes per landowner requests and DEP also identified as deficiencies. Woods asked for the deficiencies? Oetinger asked, are you aware of deficiencies? Woods said, I'm aware of a letter. Woods said, the deficiencies refer to a type of permit we were trying to get from DEP. We had a preapplication meeting and they told us to apply for a general permit and the township agreed. Woods said, we responded to that letter and then the permit was issued. Graack asked, are you aware DEP noted for regulatory and statutory requirements? Woods said yes, and we responded to DEP and they issued the permit.

Graack asked, why did Tuskes refuse to make any changes and responded with unauthorized landowner drawings (Appendix J)? Woods said you will have to ask Tuskes that. Piperato asked, what do you mean unauthorized landowner drawings? Oetinger asked, do you mean it shows acquisition of your land that you didn't agree to? Graack said yes, it presumed acquisition of my land. Oetinger asked, did Tuskes make any changes or respond to drawings submitted to DEP to deem acceptance? Woods said, the plans clearly show existing and proposed right-of-way. They just approved per Chapter 105 requirements. Graack asked, are you aware that DEP has a preapplication conference available if an appeal is by a landowner of a project? Woods said, I am now. Graack asked, the drawings you provided, to your knowledge, do they represent right-of-ways that there are no agreements in existence for? Woods said, I'm not aware.

Graack asked why Mr. Woods disagreed with Carroll Engineering's assessment of the three arch bridge concept? Woods said, they didn't do a final design or have an opportunity to look into the full design. I have no objection to what Carroll said. Graack said, you were tasked with a single span bridge concept. You weren't asked to do anything about other kinds of bridges. Woods said, at the beginning, I looked at an arch bridge and worked with that content and upon receipt of the geotechnical report, I said it wouldn't work. Graack asked, what geotech? Woods said, Kleinfelder. Graack asked if it was given to DEP? Woods said DEP did not require a geotech report, the township did. Woods said, we did a Geotech report for the single span bridge. Graack said, and you did for the three arch. Graack asked, are you aware there is a double arch concrete structure in the area? Piperato said, I don't understand the questions.

Graack asked, what length bridge did you give to StreamStats. Woods said, StreamStats is an equation where anyone can go online and use it. I used it for peak flows only. Graack asked, what parameters were you provided. Woods said, we used it for hydrologic only.

Graack said, you said that you didn't include the geotech report for the DEP application and that they didn't require it. Woods said, correct. Graack asked, why is it

not required in a sinkhole area? Woods said, DEP regulates through Chapter 105 for flows and elevation. They don't regulate the foundation. Woods said, we had to meet PennDOT regulations and Palmer requirements.

Graack asked, why were the questions never answered by Tuskes from the meetings with the landowners? You seem to want to keep to just your own design and elude other concepts that could satisfy the landowners? Woods said, it is well documented that they tried to get a hold of you for meetings.

Oetinger said before we move on to Mr. Graack's direct testimony we can adjourn for a five minute break. I know the Board prefers to cut off tonight at 9:30 p.m.

Graack said, I'm going to go through remarks associated with my questions. My first question to Mr. Malitsch was about their renderings depicting their engineering drawings. We received those early in 2023 at the request of Mr. Armato that came out of to October 22 meeting, which wasn't productive for myself or for Mr. Hartin. Mr. Armato cordially wanted to clarify the dimensions of the proposed plans. Months passed, and when I saw these, my first impression was the dimensional depth of the field was missing. It looked like everything was flat. We were concerned about the roadway raised above the existing roadway that would cause problems for the Hartin driveway. These drawings were supposed to clarify that. Were the renderings effective? They weren't for me. They didn't solve my issues or the Hartin's issues. I heard tonight there are new renderings being proposed. Tuskes must have thought there was a problem and now they are trying to amend them. Oetinger said, I don't know that there are new renderings. Graack said, in that respect they haven't clarified anything to me at all. We still have issues regarding the right-of-ways and the height of things.

Graack said, the northern tier traffic study was mentioned as a basis for not doing other traffic studies for Wolf's Run. The northern tier study is pretty old. I've seen a lot of changes and a lot of traffic that has come here. In my opinion, a traffic study is necessary for any property along Van Buren Road including Wolf's Run Phase 1, 2 and 3. Phase 3 is only going to add to the problem. We have bad intersections at Corriere Road North and South. Both are busy and problematic. I would like to cross examine the traffic expert in more detail on traffic.

Graack said, I want to talk about the design or concept that should have been considered for the replacement of the existing culverts. The road still floods. We may have bought ourselves 15 years with the recent emergency repairs, but it will flood again. I felt after we found out from DEP that Tuskes had already gotten a permit, after the appeal period expired, was that planned by Tuskes or just circumstances. I've had many conversations with DEP about this project. I had them research prior DEP permits about the culvert replacement project on the Schoeneck Creek in 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008. They couldn't find any permits were given out. When Tuskes said they are doing what was previously approved, they are only saying what might have been approved by the Township Engineer, not DEP. Piperato objected this was hearsay. Graack said that he has something from DEP. DEP gave Tuskes a GP11 authorization letter in September 2022. We had our meeting in October. It was an adventure to get all parties together. Mike Tuskes in early 2022 wanted to have landowner meetings and we did too. The Tuskes organization communicated to me

they didn't want to make any changes to their plan and they already had the permit. Graack said, then we contracted with Mr. Roger Ruggles. We tried to get a meeting together and we had no changes coming from the Tuskes organization. So why have a meeting. If they weren't going to address new concepts, why should we have a meeting. We didn't want what is defined by you now. We are at a stalemate. There are no agreements, but Tuskes goes ahead with Phase 1, and Phase 2, and they are stage planning for Phase 3. The township gets nothing, Mr. Graack gets no satisfaction and the Hartin's get nothing for their driveway. I want a bridge more than anybody. My land floods with three inches of rain. I do not believe the Tuskes designed bridge meets the needs of the floodplain there. It only heightens the gateway of water to go through. Piperato said, these are the opinions of Mr. Graack and I have a standing objection. Graack said, I'm putting concepts out that could be addressed. There are needs of other landowners and you would not discuss it. This is the dilemma.

Graack said, I want to talk about land condemnation. Developers, including Tuskes, might think they can get a permit or plan approved and assume condemnation. It is possible, but in this circumstance it was made clear that the landowners have to be satisfied by the developer to build this bridge. Was this their plan? My land is minuscule compared to the Hartin's. I tried to help them in many ways over two summers to discuss and maybe rectify it. They rejected several attempts from Tuskes to provide another driveway solution. There is nothing to further discuss, if they won't look at other alternatives. This is why there were no further meetings. I wasted my time trying to get this done for people who don't want to make an attempt. I'm not going to sign any agreement.

Graack said, going back to the April 5, 2023 meeting when the township granted me time to hold a meeting, we invited Tuskes, Malitsch and Piperato. I gave a presentation. A representative from Carroll Engineering was there, Chuck Diefenderfer, Bob Lammi, Bob Blanchfield, Kent Baird and Bob Williams was in and out. The township has been gracious trying to resolve the questions. Tuskes folks just got up and walked out. Tonight Malitsch said there was a time constraint for the meeting. I don't feel they wanted to ask questions because of some situation they didn't want to address. After that meeting I felt the Tuskes organization was the problem, not the township. Ever since that meeting there has been nothing but delays.

Graack said, I did a lot of research on this and I felt bad for the Hartin's and Nancy Meilinger. The only way into their property is the driveway off Van Buren Road. Piperato objected. Graack said, on my side of the highway I had a list of things from the October 22 meeting that were never addressed. I'm concerned about the final look because it floods. I don't want any more flooding. I've heard it will be better with this bridge. It might and it might not. There are other concepts that will mitigate flooding less than what is proposed. Somebody will build a bridge that will satisfy everything. It affects our right-of-ways and it is not necessary. To sum it up, and show the simple list I asked for, it isn't hard to achieve. It's been denied by the Tuskes organization. I don't want a highway higher than my land now. None of this is hard or expensive, but I was ignored. Graack said, I want to give credit to Mr. Piperato. He did contact me several times and I gave him the same response. Does the Tuskes organization want to listen to changes. He didn't know the answer to that. So I assume the answer was they didn't want to. He did try.

Graack said, I have figures and engineering drawings that suggest Tuskes could have done something different with this bridge. I have some reliable data I'm not going to introduce because it is boring for everybody. My understanding is Ryan Holmes is now involved in the development through the Tuskes Phase 1, 2 and 3 project. I see construction signs saying Ryan Holmes. Are we now going to again have this situation come up about a bridge or replacement with somebody else? Are we going to go through the same thing again? It should have taken me about an hour to get an agreement, not months and months and nothing in response. How much of my time has been wasted by the Tuskes organization. One last comment, Andy Woods did a pretty good job on the engineering aspect on what he was contracted to do. I blame Tuskes for pushing this style bridge and I think he built one like this before at Mill Race. I marked up renderings so people could see drawings and what it does to my property and others.

Your prior Director had my right-to-know and sat with me regarding the Wolf's Run project. My last comment is that I was never notified back then about agreements. I was bypassed. Someone planned to do that back then. Once I found that out, I was very mad and that is why I have this information today. Back in 2006/2007 permits were the leverage from the township not CO's. That changed when the Tuskes organization got a hold of this. This is what the developer has done. I wasn't involved back then, but I am now and I'm not going away. Thank you.

Oetinger said, we have two Board members not present tonight and we also have a newly elected supervisor that wasn't involved previously. Oetinger asked Mr. Piperato, providing the assumption they are reviewing transcripts, do you agree they are able to attend and participate. Piperato said he had no objection to that. Oetinger announced the next hearing on this matter will be held March 25, 2024, and this will be the only notice of the continuation.

Graack asked, when will the traffic testimony be made. Piperato said, March 25th.

Supervisor Bellis made a motion to adjourn tonight's hearing.

Motion: Adjourn, Moved by Charles Bellis III, Seconded by Supervisor Michael Brett. Passed. 3-0.

Supervisors voting Ayes: Armato, Bellis III, Brett

Supervisors Absent: Mitchell, Young

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Dismissal of Planning Commission Member

INFORMATION

The Board of Supervisors appointed a new member to the Planning Commission on July 25, 2023. The member has not attended a meeting or responded to communication attempts by Board of Supervisor members, the Planning Commission Chair, or the

township staff.

Solicitor Oetinger sent a letter on January 17, 2024, to the member inquiring if the member is interested in serving on the Commission and received no response. The Board of Supervisors authorized the Solicitor to communicate final notification to the member on February 6, 2024, that it is their intent to vote at tonight's meeting to remove the member from the Planning Commission.

Board action is requested.

Motion: Approve, Moved by Charles Bellis III, Seconded by Supervisor Joseph Armato. Passed. 3-0.

Supervisors voting Ayes: Armato, Bellis III, Brett

Supervisors Absent: Mitchell, Young

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Melanie Christopher, 28 Northview Avenue, said I missed the Police Department presentation. I'd like to expand to thinking about how the Fire Department is run. Right now it is a volunteer department. I had put in a right-to-know request and received a quick response. It may have been my error in the way I asked for information. The documents didn't indicate who is first on scene. At my house fire it was a fireman in a personal vehicle. He couldn't do anything and it took 15 minutes for everyone to get there. My husband is a firefighter in Allentown and he got the fire out. According to the National Fire Protection Agency six and half minutes is an average response time. If my house sat there without water on it, it would have been in worse condition. It was brought up that Palmer is a Second Class Township. Wilson is about one and a quarter square miles. We are about 10 square miles. Wilson doesn't have warehouses, high rises or the multi-dwelling units that we have. They have seven full time firefighters that include a Chief. They have 18 part-time paid drivers and five on-time paid firefighters. We have better apparatus and I appreciate our department, but I think maybe we should be looking at a hybrid model that may be ready to go out when a call comes in. Based on the numbers on the Fire Department website they will be close to 1,000 calls by the end of the year. As the township continues to grow I ask that you consider a better way to perhaps run the fire department so we have someone available that can respond.

Williams said, we appreciate your comments and we continue to evaluate the personnel requirements and we will continue having those conversations. We understand your concerns.

6. REPORTS

Supervisor Bellis reported he attended his final PSATS class this past Saturday. I highly recommend it especially for novice supervisor. I'd like to thank the township for paying for the classes.

Bellis said, a former township supervisor, Robert Wasser, recently passed away. He served

a term in 1993 when Bob Lammi resigned his position. He served until Bill Voight took the seat in January 1994. He passed away at the age of 100. He served in WWII, was involved in the D-Day invasion of Omaha Beach and was awarded a Bronze Star and Purple Heart. He was the Postmaster of Northampton. Gravesite services will be held at Northampton Memorial Shrine on March 2nd at 1:00 p.m.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

Motion: Adjourn, Moved by Charles Bellis III, Seconded by Supervisor Joseph Armato. Passed. 3-0.

Supervisors voting Ayes: Armato, Bellis III, Brett

Supervisors Absent: Mitchell, Young

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda DeGerolamo
Assistant Township Manager