

Special/Public Meeting
Thurs., March 2, 2006, 7:15 PM
Lynnport, PA

A special/public meeting was called to order in the Municipal Building by Chairman, Thomas Creighton III at 7:15p.m. This was a meeting for public comment on the proposed ordinance 2006-1, which would repeal Ord. 2005-2.

Present were Chairman Thomas Creighton III, Vice Chairman David Najarian, Charles Lenhart III Member, Solicitor Edmund Healy, Administrator Kenneth Bleiler, Treasurer Robert P. Sadler, Secretary Tina Everett, Thomas M. Gallagher, Stenographer from Gallagher Reporting, Debi Palmari, Shawn Sostack and Elsa Kerschner from the Northwestern Press and approximately 70 citizens.

A pledge of allegiance was conducted.

Solicitor Edmund Healy explained that this meeting was to take public comment required by the PA MPC (Municipalities Planning Code) concerning the proposed ordinance, which would be referenced as 2006-1 which proposed to repeal Ordinance 2005-2. This meeting was advertised as required by the MPC. This ordinance allowed active adult residential communities to exist by right in the LDRR (Low Density Rural Residential) District with a mix of dwelling types, requiring every dwelling to be regularly occupied by one person 55 yrs. or older and not less than 19 yrs. old, with regulations on density, yard, setbacks, minimum dwelling size, recreational uses and other requirements. The Board will take public comment to decide whether they want to repeal Ordinance 2005-2 with the proposed Ordinance 2006-1. Solicitor Healy suggested that Thomas Creighton, Chairman recognize each person in some organized fashion.

Thomas Creighton asked that the public keep their comments to five (5) minutes per person and to be polite.

Public Comment-

Michael Lessa, Zator Law Office, Attorney for Olde Homestead- Asked why the Ordinance was passed in the first place. The Board asked the public in the past what they wanted. They wanted the Active Adult Community. What makes sense for the township? The Active Adult Community or the by right use. The result was Active Adult Community. The Ordinance was passed Dec. 1, 2005, because of the benefits the Boards recognized, which were, preservation of green space, significant tax benefit to the township and school district, no children (which will benefit the school) private ownership of roads(no maintenance), traffic impact on state and local roads during peak hours, reduced use of municipal services and recreational services relative to the by right uses. The AARC concept is consistent with the comprehensive plan. If the Board goes by the by right uses, then it would mean no preservation of green space, increase in student population, greater tax burden on the residents of Lynn Township, greater impact on municipal services, and increased traffic on state and local roads. He suggested that the Board not be narrow minded on their consideration of the repeal of this ordinance.

Michael Straughn(Lochland Rd.)-He doesn't understand why the Board is rescinding the ordinance instead of just amending it.

Solicitor Edmund Healy- tried to explain this to Mr. Straughn, but he didn't understand his explanation of this. Mr. Straughn then asked if the AARC is grandfathered in under the old ordinance they submitted the plans for?

Solicitor Healy explained that the plans submitted as of Dec. 21st, 2005 are grandfathered and protected against any ordinance change, including the repeal, so long as those plans receive preliminary approval. If the developer fails to get preliminary approval from the Board, or the challenge which has been filed against the

AARC is successful, then it would mean the plan could not go forward. If the zoning challenge filed is successful.

Michael Straughn-Read a letter/statement on behalf of him and his wife, they wanted to voice their support once again on the AARC and keeping the existing ordinance. They feel the AARC makes good sense, and to take the smart growth concept into consideration and the provisions which increase the tax base and better the community. They wanted to remind the Board that they had been elected to plan for the future of Lynn Township. The letter stated some of the advantages they felt would be gained from an AARC. They hope that if the ordinance is no good, that the Board will amend it and correct it. The letter also stated that the Board represents 5,000 residents, not just a few self proclaimed experts on everything. They felt that an itemized list of the incurred expenditures by the township from the last several years as of result of the concerned citizens should be released to the residents of the township. They also wanted to encourage the Board to retain this ordinance as open as it is, in the effort to keep Lynn Township. If the ordinance is no good, they ask that the Board amend and correct the ordinance.

Rick Walters (Gun Club Rd.)-He spoke in favor of the AARC. He feels they are not self serving and they are best for our community. He wants the tax burden to be as small as possible. He's traveled a lot and has seen a lot of these communities. He feels there isn't any mystery as to why they are being built.

Joe Tetz- (Bausch Rd.)-He is in favor of the AARC project as the way it stands. He feels its only common sense that we don't need 200 single-family homes with all the kids with the increase in school taxes. He hopes the Board feels the same way and that spite doesn't get into the way of making their decision.

Karen Freeman-(Dresher Rd.)- Expressed her support to the AARC and would like to see it move forward. She thinks it makes the most sense to this township fiscally, and to do anything else doesn't make sense.

Anthony Lowery- (Ulrich Mill Rd.)-Expressed his support for the way it is, feels it's common sense, it's cheaper, why spend the extra money in taxes. He also felt that if we go with an older group there will be less crime versus a bunch of young adolescents running around. If we keep changing the rules how can we develop something if every month or so we change the rules.

Willard Wanamaker- (Decatur St.)- He's in favor of supporting the AARC. He doesn't want to see the community torn apart over this and that's what he feels is going to happen if the board keeps changing the rules. The sewer plant needs updating and we can't stop it. He'd rather see the developer of the community and other developments pay for the sewer plant upgrade and not the residents of the township and that's what'll happen. The residents that aren't on sewer will not want to pay for the upgrade.

Robert Sadler- (Allemaengel Rd.)- Speaking as a resident, not an officer on his comments. He spoke extensively against the proposal last year. He is not against an AARC, he's against the provisions for it. It's too dense and still is. Our Planning Commission was against the original plan and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission was also against it. The planning commission voted recently in favor of the repealer, and Mr. Sadler feels the ordinance we have on the books is flawed and needs to be removed.

William Dellicker (Sechler Rd.)- Asked to make public comment after he heard what everyone else had to say. He doesn't understand why the Board is rescinding an ordinance already approved last year. He's afraid the Board will twist this into an outcome that's not good for the community.

Michael Straughn (Lochland Rd.)-Along with what Mr. Sadler said about the ordinance not being correct isn't important, he'd still rather see a retirement community over residential housing as to the obvious benefit to the township. It seems that the whole rescinding thing is about a piece of paper missing in the courthouse.

David Najarian informed him that there is a challenge to the ordinance, which will go to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Michael Straughn. Asked why do we want to rescind it rather than correct it. Can we go to Mr. Smith and fix it. Otherwise he feels we will end up with residential homes.

Solicitor Healy- Commented that this is solely for taking public comment .

Joe Tetz- asked if this would be decided tonight.

Thomas Creighton informed Mr. Tetz that it was on the agenda for the regular meeting to be considered.

Thomas Cormier(Kings Hgwy.)- He's in agreement with Rob Sadler on the density, this concerns him the most, but he's not against an adult community as long as it's within the limits of the area that's available.

Michael Bell- (Leh Ct.) Agrees with Mr. Straughn's comments. He wants the retirement community instead of single family homes. He feels the board should come to an agreement that's in the best interest of the township, which it seems is the AARC. So he feels if there's a problem with the ordinance we should get it fixed. He would like the Board to come to an agreement in the best interest of the township.

Lawrence Heintzeman (Gun Club Rd.) – He's in favor of the adult community. He's known Carl Snyder all his life and he doesn't feels the man would do anything that would hurt the community.

David Najarian made a motion, seconded by Charles Lenhart to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Regular Meeting
Thurs., March 2, 2006, 7:30 PM
Lynnport, PA

The regular meeting was called to order in the Municipal Building by Chairman, Thomas Creighton III at 7:47 p.m.

Present were Chairman Thomas Creighton III, Vice Chairman David Najarian, Charles Lenhart III Member, Solicitor Edmund Healy, Administrator Kenneth Bleiler, Treasurer Robert P. Sadler, Secretary Tina Everett, Debi Palmari, Shawn Sostack and Elsa Kerschner from the Northwestern Press and approximately 70 citizens.

Public Comment- Mr. Gary Armstrong (Baker Co.) discussed the fact that they dropped off their revised plans from the comments they received from Kenneth Bleiler and Engineer Roy Stewart for the Ovarions Land Development Plan. Their new plans are showing .33 acres with 4 tenths of an acre for open space. This is about $\frac{3}{4}$ acre for each unit. Due to the density talk, he felt it was important to comment.

A motion was made by Charles Lenhart, seconded by David Najarian to accept the minutes of the regular meeting of February 2nd,2006 and the workshop meeting of February 27th, 2006 and to direct the Treasurer to pay the bills. Motion carried.

Discussion on the proposed ordinance, which would repeal the existing ordinance, 2005-2. David Najarian questioned Solicitor Healy on how the growth of that use is accomplished within a non-conforming use. How could that best be addressed?

Solicitor Healy responded that assuming the plan filed Dec. 21st, 2005 gets preliminary approval, the zoning challenge is unsuccessful and you do in fact repeal the Ordinance, #2005-2, then the proposed use envisioned in those plans would be protected as a non-conforming use. As per a provision in the MPC, plans that receive preliminary plan approval are protected from changes in the zoning ordinance for a period of 5 years from the date of approval of the preliminary plan. The more complicated question is what Mr. Najarian asked. Can they put in more units than allowed under the proposed plan filed Dec. 21, 2005. It gets into distinction between non-conforming uses and the right to expand non-conforming uses by certain degree and some other limitations. Solicitor Healy wasn't in the position to give the Board some good solid advice at this meeting.

David Najarian questioned as to the confusion on this issue, is there a way the Board could address that and make it clearer to go forward in the event of the three phases happening.

Solicitor Healy – One thing is to eliminate the extent of which the non-conforming use could be changed or altered. The Board could enact an ordinance declaring an AARC be a permitted use or special exception use or conditional use in that Zoning District.

If the Board would want to eliminate potential complications, one option the board could exercise is to enact a new AARC use, which would be allowed by right or by special exception use, which in turn could eliminate substantially the gray areas.

David Najarian commented that this was by right, not special exception, so they could revisit this issue in the event that the challenge fails, the repeal is enacted and the preliminary plan is approved.

Solicitor Healy agreed that this was correct and felt there were some advantages to doing this, but that would be the board's judgement.

David Najarian-Addressed some of Mike Straughn's comments. David Najarian does not think, and when he reads the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission comments, does not feel it's consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. As far as the reduced traffic impact and the reduce use of municipal facilities, he's not sure he agrees with him, due to the fact that a traffic study has not been done. Mr. Najarian is not convinced that there will be less traffic, since many people at age 55 are not retired. He's also concerned about the age restriction not being enforced properly. If the age would be challenged and lifted, this could possibly mean the township would end up with town homes and eliminate the perceived benefit that this may have. He feels if the repealer goes through and the challenge fails, the Board will have the opportunity to revisit the situation, and he feels this would be to the township's best interest.

David Najarian addressed some of Mr. Lowery's comments. As for lesser crime, he doesn't feel he can agree or disagree with him on this matter. He feels older folks won't be a part of crime, but anyone age 19 or above can reside in the AARC and they could commit crime.

David Najarian addressed Mr. Heintzelman's comments. David agrees with him on Carl Snyder that he's a great guy, but this is not about Mr. Carl Snyder. This is about what is best for the township and it's not a reflection on Carl Snyder.

Glenn Smith was upset with the Board's lack of communication. He informed the board that a traffic study was done. The reason the PC was against this being developed was because it's not sewerred. He wanted to point out that the property is sewerred. He also wanted to state that the letter sent out to all the residents in the area of the AARC was not true. The 27 people on letter are not paying for the Challenge, it's only the Charles's who are paying for the cost of the challenge. Mr. Smith wanted to point out that his lots are bigger than what's on Camp Meeting Road now.

David Najarian discussed his views on the existing ordinance that was passed for the AARC. He had problems with the ordinance when it was written and passed, and did not think the benefit to the community was shown. He felt that if one feels that the ordinance did not provide a benefit or harm the community, then the proper thing to do is repeal it, then the Board could revisit the issue.

Glen Smith questioned what harm will the AARC create?

David Najarian was afraid we might end up with town homes. He also was afraid that shifting the burden of property to earned income tax, we could hurt the school's funding, due to the fact that retired people don't have as much earned income tax. Mr. Najarian doesn't feel the burden was established.

Justin Smith informed the Board that if they repeal it, most likely it'll end up being single-family homes due to the delay and that no matter what happens they will develop the land.

Rob Sadler was confused with the choice of doing away with the development or leaving it. Appealing it or doing away with the development has no effect, since the

development was already submitted. Repealing the ordinance has no effect on the development.

Glen Smith commented that if the challenge passes, because a sheet was missing from the ordinance and wasn't sent to the law library. He doesn't feel there's anyway to untie any of this.

Charles Lenhart III commented that he's been in favor of the ordinance since it was adopted and is still in favor of it. He feels the Board should look into amending it.

Thomas Creighton III, discussed his opinions on an AARC. He pointed out that this started in February of last year. Mr. Creighton is in favor of an AARC, and feels we only went half way and didn't finish. He feels the ordinance was rushed through in December, despite to the fact that the Planning Commission, Zoning Officer and Engineer all found problems with the ordinance. He felt that a professional should of given us the green light. He's not worried about Carl Snyder, he's got a lot of respect for him. He feels we need an ordinance to protect the people and protects Mr. Snyder from selling to a builder. He feels builders only look at one thing. Mr. Creighton wants to make sure it's 99% bullet proof and stays senior housing. The other issue he's concerned about is the density of the development and the possibility of needing a police force.

Glen Smith pointed out that they threw in 4tenths of an acre of green space. He feels there is no ordinance out there that does that. They are at about $\frac{3}{4}$ acre per house.

Lawrence Heintzelman- asked what happened to the ordinance they started.

Thomas Creighton felt it was rushed through in December, due to no professionals giving the green light.

Willard Wanamaker asked if they could write-up an ordinance right now that states what the already approved for the AARC and change the other items they are worried about.

Thomas Creighton didn't feel this was possible due to planning and time.

Joseph Tetz felt the Board should just admit that they don't want the AARC and would rather have the 600 additional kids in the school district.

David Najarian has concerns with the enforcement on the AARC not being consistent.

Mike Straughn questioned the Board if they wouldn't repeal the ordinance tonight, is there a better chance that there would be an AARC? If they repeal it tonight, then there's less chance of getting an AARC. He just wants the board to do the right thing for the community.

Lawrence Heintzelman questioned who would enforce it? He also asked how long it would take to get the ordinance specifics to their liking.

Sally Smith commented that it seems that the majority of the community want the AARC, so why not work together as a township and work things out and not repeal it.

David Najarian discussed his views, which he pointed out were out there prior to his election. He will also not discount the fact there are a lot of people in favor of the AARC and there are a lot of people not in favor of it. He's also not opposed to revisiting this ordinance later if it gets repealed. Another view he had was that they didn't go as far as they should have to benefit all of the community, not just one side or another.

Edmund Healy, Solicitor informed the Board that they could decide tonight if they are in favor of repealing the ordinance, opposed to repealing it or they could table the issue until a later date.

Michael Bell questioned if he could have the word from the Supervisors that they will come up with an alternative ordinance in the best interest of the township and do this in a timely manner.

David Najarian felt he had a great question. He's willing to work for an AARC plan. He's got concerns on the timely manner with all that's going on with the challenge.

Edmund Healy, Solicitor felt that if the challenge to Ordinance 2005-2 is successful, then the ordinance would be invalid and the Board could take steps to make it to their liking.

Williard Wanamaker questioned how long the challenge would take.

The Board and Solicitor Healy informed Mr. Wanamaker that it could go on for a year or even longer if it would go to the PA Supreme Court.

Richard Metzger- Questioned the board why not table the matter until next month.

David Najarian- informed him that what's before them is the existing ordinance and he has a problem with it, but he doesn't have a problem looking at another ordinance.

Solicitor Healy discussed that if the developer would want to withdraw the plan for the AARC and submit a new plan for the single family dwellings they could do that. If they would choose to continue with the existing AARC development, then the repealer would have no immediate effect provided that the challenge is unsuccessful and the preliminary plans meet the requirements that exist in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance as it is now. The plans filed on Dec. 21st for Ovations haven't been seen yet by the planning commission or the Board, due to the developer asking for extensions of time.

Gary Armstrong (Baker Res.)- Discussed that the request for extensions was due to them not having the comments from the Township Engineer and Zoning Officer. The new plans, in which they submitted today (3/2) show 359 units on plan, which is less than their original plan submitted on (12/21).

Solicitor Healy discussed the process of submitting plans to the PC for their review. Since his original plans were submitted Dec. 21st and he requested extensions of time, then these are the plans to be seen at the next planning commission meeting on March 21st, not the newly revised plans in which the developer submitted March 2nd. This is not the correct procedure and the Planning Commission must follow the timelines in the SALDO.

Gary Armstrong discussed that he didn't feel it made sense to review his original plans. He felt that since he addressed the comments from the Zoning Officer and Township Engineer, he felt they shouldn't bother looking at the plans filed on Dec. 21st, 2005.

Ed Healy, Solicitor stated that these plans were not withdrawn, and the Planning Commission and Board has timelines that must be followed.

Mr. Armstrong just wanted the comments to their plan, so they could respond.

Thomas Creighton commented that he felt the AARC was good for the community and he's willing to work on the plan to make it good for everyone, but he feels that were only 1/2 way there.

Solicitor Healy feels that it's appropriate to assign the project to one individual, such as the zoning officer, engineer, etc. and then they could bring in various drafts on their plan.

Willard Snyder commented that he feels the board is missing the important part of the AARC. He feels it's either going to be a retirement community or they will develop the land with single-family homes. He's been with the sewer authority for 20 years and he's been in court for 3 years. He senses that this challenge will go the same way. He doesn't feel that Glen Smith will have such time to wait for his AARC, so he'll develop his land if this happens, meaning he'll be forced to build single-family homes. Mr. Snyder is concerned what is good for the community 250 homes or a retirement community? He's seen no problems with Grim's Mobile Home Park, which is mostly senior living. He has concerns that no one will have a place to live when they turn 55 yrs. old, due to the fact that land prices just keep going up and people won't be able to afford this. Mr. Snyder feels it's important that the Board decide whether or not they want the retirement community to move forward or do they want the single-family residents. He feels the board should be careful about making their decision.

David Najarian commented that he feels they have the opportunity to reconcile their differences through the Planning Commission and see what they can do.

Thomas Creighton III made a motion, seconded by David Najarian to adopt **ORDINANCE 2006-1- AN ORDINANCE OF LYNN TOWNSHIP, LEHIGH COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA REPEALING ORDINANCE 2005-2.** Charles E. Lenhart voted against. Motion carried.

The Board recessed for a 5-minute break at 8:45p.m. The Board reconvened at 8:50 p.m.

Discussion was made on how to go about working on an ordinance allowing an AARC.

A motion was made by David Najarian, seconded by Charles Lenhart III to direct Solicitor Healy to begin the rough draft of an ordinance allowing an AARC type use. Motion carried.

Solicitor Healy requested two months to work on this. He would like this on the agenda for May.

Subdivisions-

Kelson/Gallagher-Minor Subdivision-2 lots for final conditional approval-Springhouse Rd., New Tripoli- Represented by Francis Cardano from Lehigh Engineering. The planning module still hasn't been received but was submitted to DEP. There is a note needed on the flag lot that must be submitted on revised plan. Rec. fee of \$2,000 is needed and \$1,518.75 for road improvements.

A motion was made by David Najarian, seconded by Charles Lenhart to provide conditional final approval, conditions being outlined in Engineer Roy Stewart's letter of Feb. 14, 2006 and Zoning Officer's letter of Feb. 2nd, 2006. The applicant has 90 days to meet the conditions specified in the letters. Motion carried.

Ovations @ Olde Homestead-Major Subdivision-481 lots for preliminary approval- Rte 143 & Rte 309 & Log Cabin Rd.- The board discussed Ovations request for a time extension. The planning commission granted their extension request until March 21, 2006 for their review and June 1st, 2006 for the Board of Supervisors review.

A motion was made by David Najarian to grant the request for an extension deadline for the Baker plan through Thurs., June 1st, 2006 as per their letter dated February 21st, 2006. Charles Lenhart III seconded the motion. Thereafter, a discussion was led by Solicitor Ed Healy as to whether the second Baker plan might come before the Board ahead of the first Baker plan. Thereafter, David Najarian withdrew his previous motion on granting the extension through Thurs., June 1st, 2006.

A next motion was made by David Najarian, seconded by Charles Lenhart to grant the extension through Thurs., April 6th, 2006. Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion on Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan in regards to the fact that DEP wanted a revised plan by March 20th, 2006. The Board didn't get Arro's comments until Feb. 27th around 4:30pm via fax and they don't appear to be in final form. There are concerns about all the information on the comments from Arro which contain a lot of information concerning a Penn's Vest Loan, in which the Board thought that wasn't there best option.

David Najarian commented that, due to the fact that they didn't receive the final revisions in a timely fashion, there was no time left to advertise 30 days in advance, then hold a public meeting and still meet the March 20th, 2006 deadline which was required by DEP was just not possible.

Solicitor Healy discussed the board's options with the 537 Plan. He felt they had two choices, one being to withdraw the plan all together or request another extension from DEP.

David Najarian didn't feel they could request another extension, since the state has a deadline to meet.

Willard Snyder discussed the options they would have in regards to the 537 Plan. They could get bond financing, which could cost three million dollars, which was

impractical, so the better option would be a qualified municipal loan, which would be tax free with a financial institution. He was rather surprised that Arro didn't discuss this in their comments, but Willard hadn't seen the comments yet. David Najarian gave a copy of the comments received from Arro to Mr. Snyder to look over, then later in the meeting he will check back with him.

Thomas Creighton questioned Mr. Snyder if it was a potentially a phased project divided into two phases, could the first phase be a Penn's Vest loan.

Willard Snyder commented that this could not be done. It would have to be independent financing through an institution.

A motion was made by David Najarian, seconded by Charles Lenhart III to closeout the Livingstone Fellowship Church escrow account as per Engineer, Roy Stewart's letter dated December 22, 2005, which was to release the money. Motion carried.

A motion was made by David Najarian, seconded by Charles Lenhart III to closeout the Saw Mill Estates escrow account with the 18 month maintenance period starting September 14th, 2004 and ending March 13, 2006. Motion carried.

Discussion on the closeout of the Persing Subdivision escrow account. Robert P. Sadler, Treasurer requested that the Board table this matter.

Solicitor Healy discussed the draft stop sign ordinance. He circulated a copy of the ordinance to all board members for their review and if they are satisfied with it he will advertise the ordinance as required.

A motion was made by David Najarian, seconded by Charles Lenhart III directing Solicitor Healy to advertise the stop sign ordinance. Motion carried.

Solicitor Healy discussed that this ordinance will be advertised once, since it's not a zoning or saldo amendment and he'll have it ready for next regular meeting on April 6th, 2006.

Willard Snyder commented that he had a chance to look over Arro's comments and he did not find anything about getting a municipal loan, only information about a Penn's Vest Loan.

Solicitor Healy questioned Mr. Snyder, why would the bank require the township to pledge its taxing power to pay a loan, when it's fully funded by the authority?

Willard Snyder's response was to get a lower rate and due to the fact of less risk.

Solicitor Healy discussed that the board was in a fix due to deadlines required by DEP, and didn't feel there was much they could do except start over or request an extension. Healy questioned Mr. Snyder what would this do to the sewer authority.

Willard Snyder commented that this will make a mess of things and he was disappointed that Arro didn't come through with better comments.

Solicitor Healy felt the board may want to consider asking the Engineer to request another extension from DEP, but this would be putting a burden on Roy Stewart, Engineer.

A motion was made by David Najarian, seconded by Charles Lenhart III to direct Roy Stewart, Engineer to request for another extension from DEP on the Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan and report back to the Board by March 10th, 2006. Motion carried.

Discussion on advertising the position of Zoning Officer/Administrator/Manager in the Township News magazine in the April 2006 issue. The advertisement consists of about 30 lines @ the cost of \$4 per line with a total cost of approx. \$ 120.00. Thomas Creighton felt that it targets people with township skills and that compared to the money spent on the morning call, that this was nothing. After discussion David Najarian felt this was not necessary and Charles Lenhart felt the same. David Najarian felt it was interesting to google some of the applicants.

The board discussed the progress of Ken Bleiler's replacement. They discussed the resumes they received and decided which ones, by number they would like to interview. After discussing this, they picked nine applicants.

David Najarian suggested that Tina Everett, Secy. ask Sherry Selig to finish filling out the remainder of the chart with salary requirements, etc.

Harry Gruber commented that this position was an important job and must be filled with someone who is open minded. He also felt the person they hire should have a knowledge on agricultural business.

The Board directed Kenneth Bleiler to call the nine applicants they picked and get additional information, such as salary requirements, then report back to the Board.

Discussion on the estimates received for the additional parking lot lights needed in the parking lot of the township zoning office. The estimates received were as follows: Selig Electric- \$3,620, Wright Electric- \$3,775 & Greg Snyder- \$3,701.62 . Also during the discussion on this matter, Tina Everett suggested maybe looking into putting a timer on these lights to come on by themselves every night. After discussing this further, the board decided they didn't want to get quotes again.

A motion was made by David Najarian, seconded by Charles Lenhart III to accept the lowest quote from Selig Electric. Motion carried.

The Board directed Tina Everett, Secy. to call Selig Electric informing them they were the lowest bidder and got the job.

Discussion on accepting land into the Agricultural Security Area of Lynn Township. The Applicants are as follows: John & Tereza Scully, Gregory and Lynn Rassler, Charles L. & Patt J. Bealer and Robert and Amy Mende.

Harry Gruber asked where some of the applicants were located.

A motion made by Charles Lenhart III, seconded by David Najarian to accept The following applicants: John & Tereza Scully (5451 Bachman Rd.), Gregory & Lynn Rassler (7195 Cedar Dr.), Charles L. & Patt J. Bealer(6387 Mountain Rd.) and Robert & Amy Mende (8951 Slateville Rd.) into the Agricultural Security Area and to record these by resolution in 180 days which would be at our regular meeting in September 2006. Motion carried.

Discussion on the updated user fee schedule. A few of the changes were as follows: consultation with building inspector-\$50, request for Preliminary Opinion per MPC-\$400 and Zoning Maps - \$3.00 ea.

A motion was made by David Najarian, seconded by Charles Lenhart III to adopt **RESOLUTION 2006-7-RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE TOWNSHIP OF LYNN,COUNTY OF LEHIGH, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA TO ESTABLISH A USER FEE SCHEDULE, LYNN TOWNSHIP BUILDING, ZONING AND SEWAGE.** Motion carried.

Discussion on animal control services by the Humane Society. Tina Everett, Secy. informed the board that the cost was \$28.00 per stray animal delivered to the Humane Society and \$34.00 per animal picked up. After discussing this matter, the board decided to keep it the way it was for now at \$385.00/year for these services.

A motion was made by David Najarian, seconded by Charles Lenhart III to approve and sign the agreement for the Humane Society Animal Control Services and to direct the treasurer to pay the invoice for last year's services of \$385.00. Motion carried.

Discussion on the concerns with the alley in the New Tripoli Fire Company parking lot. The township was questioned if the alley was a public alley or not by Richard Snyder at the workshop meeting on Feb. 27th, 2006. The other issue was whether or not this alley was owned by Lynn Township or not. David Najarian agreed to research this matter and report back to the Board and Solicitor.

Harry Gruber discussed with the Board what he could remember on this alley from years ago.

Discussion on the Emergency Action Plan and the NIMS (National Incident Management System) training, which is required by township officials and employees

to take the IS100 course and IS700 course. Training dates are set-up as follows: Monday, May 22nd, 2006 @ 6:30pm @ the New Tripoli Fire Company for the IS100 class and Tuesday, June 6th, 2006 @ 6:30pm @ the Lynn Township Municipal Bldg. Tina Everett, Secretary will try to coordinate with Heidelberg Township to get all available township officials together for these training classes.

Discussion on the Spring Clean-up which is sponsored by RPA (Rural Preservation Association) is set-up for Saturday, April 1st, 2006 from 8:00am until 12noon at the Lowhill Township Building on Rte. 100.

The Board convened to an executive session at 10:07 p.m. The Board reconvened at 10:17 p.m. Solicitor Healy explained the session was for discussing matters on employee personnel files and the contents in them.

Misc.- Discussion on meeting pay procedures as to who is paid and not paid. After discussion it was decided that Ken Bleiler and Tina are to be paid \$50.00 per advertised meeting. Any meetings that are attended by Tina Everett, Secretary and are not advertised, the board agreed that this should be charged by her hourly rate.

Discussion was brought up by David Najarian on attending the PSATS Convention in April. He had concerns because he's a non-working supervisor, so he felt he should be reimbursed partially for his lost time of work. Thomas Creighton felt we should set-up a policy that's simple and straight forward, so this doesn't come up again. After discussion the Board agreed to paying David Najarian \$16.50/hr. and also to be reimbursed for his expenses while attending these conventions.

A motion was made by Charles Lenhart III, seconded by Thomas Creighton III to allow all non-working supervisors to be reimbursed for their loss of work at the rate of \$16.50/hr., up to an 8 hour day when attending the PSATS Convention. Motion carried, with Supervisor David Najarian abstaining. **(Note: Abstention Memorandum filed with Township Secretary.)**

Public Comment-Harry Gruber- Was curious if you have a road master, he felt the road master should be at all Supervisor's meetings in case there are questions from the public on road issues. After discussion the Board felt the road master only needed to attend the workshop meetings and they could report back to the public at the regular meetings.

Mary Jane Cole questioned if the website for the township was working. After discussion they believe residents with dial-up will have a problem. Thomas Creighton will look into this. Thomas Creighton will redo the website so residents with dial-up don't have problems getting onto the website.

Solicitor Healy discussed the status of the codified ordinance draft. He asked the board to see if any of them had a chance to look this over, so they could discuss it.

Solicitor Healy discussed the status of the regional plan and his suggestions. He informed the Board that he and Ken Bleiler did all they can do to implement the regional plan and the Board will need to act on this. It's been 14 months since it was adopted. He feels the Board should consider requesting a status report from Roy Stewart, Engineer for an upcoming meeting.

A motion was made by David Najarian, seconded by Charles Lenhart III to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned 10:36 p.m.

**Lynn Township Transaction Detail by Account
February 2006**

Type	Date	Num	Name	Paid Amount
100 General Fund Checking				
Check	02/02/2006	2519	Plaza Hardware	-17.93
Bill Pmt -Check	02/02/2006	2520	Cash	-66.70
Check	02/02/2006	2521	Robert Eschbach	-10.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/02/2006	2531	Suburban Propane	-1,124.24
Check	02/02/2006	1	Kenneth A. Bleiler	-1,526.72
Check	02/02/2006	2	Thomas C. Creighton III	-244.30
Check	02/02/2006	4	Tina M. Everett	-1,186.66
Check	02/02/2006	3	Thomas C. Creighton III	-137.79
Check	02/02/2006	5	Charles E Lenhart III	-137.93
Check	02/02/2006	6	David C. Najarian	-127.93
Check	02/02/2006	7	Robert P. Sadler	-1,407.40
Check	02/02/2006	8	Sherry L. Selig	-895.03
Check	02/02/2006	9	Dawn A. Straughn	0.00
Check	02/02/2006	10	Sandra Acker	-162.85
Check	02/02/2006	11	Charles E Lenhart III	-1,132.08
Check	02/02/2006	12	Richard Matthias	-232.52
Check	02/02/2006	13	Bruce W. Raber	0.00
Check	02/02/2006	14	Joseph H. Wisser	0.00
Check	02/02/2006	15	Ronald Fillis	-35.31
Check	02/02/2006	16	Ray B. Moyer	-25.31
Check	02/02/2006	17	Richard Snyder	-29.73
Check	02/02/2006	18	Stanley W. Billig	-245.03
Check	02/02/2006	19	Robert Eschbach	-1,523.02
Check	02/02/2006	20	Carl A. Wolfe, Jr.	-2,750.56
Check	02/02/2006	21	Linda L. Tyson	-175.52
Check	02/02/2006	25	Dawn A. Straughn	-2,739.45
Check	02/02/2006	22	Dawn A. Straughn	0.00
Check	02/02/2006	23	Bruce W. Raber	-1,142.99
Check	02/02/2006	24	Joseph H. Wisser	-1,155.33
Check	02/03/2006	EFT	A D Computer Corporation	-111.00
Check	02/03/2006	EFT	A D Computer Corporation	-35.50
Check	02/03/2006	2522	Kenneth A. Bleiler	-1,447.60
Check	02/03/2006	2523	Internal Revenue Service	-117.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/03/2006	2524	Chemung Supply Corp.	-103.80
Bill Pmt -Check	02/03/2006	2525	Northern Valley Auto Parts	-18.96
Check	02/03/2006	2526	County of Lehigh	-160.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/08/2006	2527	Christman's Septic System	-290.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/08/2006	2528	Citgo Petroleum Corporation	-110.33
Bill Pmt -Check	02/08/2006	2529	Eastern Industries, Inc.	-91.20
Bill Pmt -Check	02/08/2006	2530	MET-ED	0.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/08/2006	2532	MET-ED	-359.62
Bill Pmt -Check	02/10/2006	2534	E.M. Kutz, Inc.	-2,396.71
Bill Pmt -Check	02/10/2006	2535	Nextel Communications Pennsylvania One Call System, Inc.	-208.67
Bill Pmt -Check	02/10/2006	2533	System, Inc.	-7.65
Bill Pmt -Check	02/10/2006	2536	Team Office Products, Inc.	-24.99
Bill Pmt -Check	02/10/2006	2537	Viking	-51.53
Bill Pmt -Check	02/10/2006	2538	Wright Electric	-69.44
Bill Pmt -Check	02/14/2006	2539	Eastern Industries, Inc.	-176.16
Bill Pmt -Check	02/14/2006	2540	PCI Insurance, Inc.	-7,178.25

Bill Pmt -Check	02/14/2006	2541	Prints & Impressions, Inc.	-29.30
Check	02/15/2006	2542	Bruce W. Raber	-1,130.00
Check	02/15/2006	2543	Charles E Lenhart III	-1,190.00
Check	02/15/2006	2544	Joseph H. Wisser	-1,090.00
Check	02/15/2006	2545	Sherry L. Selig	-940.00
Check	02/15/2006	2546	Stanley W. Billig	-320.00
Check	02/15/2006	2547	Tina M. Everett	-1,030.00
Check	02/15/2006	2548	Kenneth A. Bleiler	-940.00
Check	02/15/2006	2549	Kenneth A. Bleiler	-250.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/15/2006	2550	Heidelberg/Lynn EIT Bureau	-2,177.17
Check	02/15/2006	2551	Dawn A. Straughn	-66.82
Bill Pmt -Check	02/21/2006	2552	Kings Supermarket	-66.46
Bill Pmt -Check	02/21/2006	2553	Suburban Propane	-764.58
Bill Pmt -Check	02/21/2006	2554	The Morning Call	-939.72
Bill Pmt -Check	02/21/2006	2555	MET-ED	-24.30
Bill Pmt -Check	02/22/2006	2556	Blue Ridge Communications	-53.95
Bill Pmt -Check	02/22/2006	2557	Cogle's Recycling Inc. Gallagher Reporting and Video, LLC.	-50.00 -232.50
Bill Pmt -Check	02/22/2006	2559	Keystone Mutual Insurance	-3,381.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/22/2006	2560	Time News	-180.04
Bill Pmt -Check	02/22/2006	2561	Waste Management	-368.08
Bill Pmt -Check	02/24/2006	2562	Cash	-70.77
Bill Pmt -Check	02/24/2006	2563	Heidelberg/Lynn EIT Bureau	-4,308.25
Bill Pmt -Check	02/24/2006	2564	Horwith Fuel Oil	-876.86
Bill Pmt -Check	02/24/2006	2565	Miller's Auto Body	-530.79
Bill Pmt -Check	02/24/2006	2566	The Morning Call	-325.49
Bill Pmt -Check	02/27/2006	2567	Steckel & Stopp Law Offices	-4,212.49
Total 100 General Fund Checking				-56,739.31
102 Lynn Ontelaunee Park				
Bill Pmt -Check	02/01/2006	441	National Waterworks	-234.34
Bill Pmt -Check	02/03/2006	442	Steckel & Stopp Law Offices	-50.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/08/2006	443	MET-ED	-24.69
Bill Pmt -Check	02/10/2006	444	Brownmiller Design Corp.	-256.25
Bill Pmt -Check	02/15/2006	445	Eastern Industries, Inc.	-380.20
Bill Pmt -Check	02/27/2006	446	Brownmiller Design Corp.	0.00
Total 102 Lynn Ontelaunee Park				-945.48
103 Lynn Recreation Fund				
Bill Pmt -Check	02/27/2006	117	Brownmiller Design Corp.	-900.00
Total 103 Lynn Recreation Fund				-900.00
105 Lynn Subdivision/Zoning				
Check	02/08/2006	170	New Tripoli National Bank	-48,600.00
Total 105 Lynn Subdivision/Zoning				-48,600.00
107 Lynn Twship Electric Light				
Bill Pmt -Check	02/21/2006	642	MET-ED	-709.30
Check	02/21/2006	641	MET-ED	0.00
Total 107 Lynn Twship Electric Light				-709.30
TOTAL				-107,894.09