

**I. OPENING**

**CALL TO ORDER:** The Planning Commission meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Thursday, October 19, 2006, 7:00 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. John Landis, Chair, presiding.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: John Landis, Chair; Gerry Szakmeister, Vice Chair; Fran LaBuda, Secretary; Hazem Hijazi; Tom Maxfield; Brien Kocher, Engineer; Chris Garges, Zoning Officer; Linc Treadwell, Solicitor; and Judy Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James. Absent - Craig Kologie.

Mr. Landis welcomed Steve Kircher, Jr. PC member, a Jr. at Saucon Valley High School.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS**

**III. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. CORNERSTONE DEVELOPERS INC./STEVE HEISS – ESTATES OF STONEHURST AT SAUCON VALLEY PRELIMINARY MAJOR SUBDIVISION - #MAJ-05-06 – 1905 WALDHEIM ROAD (TIME LIMIT 12/20/06)**

Arthur Swallow from Arthur Swallow, Associates and Steve Heiss, Owner, Developer and Builder, were present.

Mr. Swallow said his company prepared the plans for the Estates of Stonehurst. A sketch plan was presented months ago. They planned the property according to current township zoning regulations and it wasn't received very well at the PC. It was explained to develop the property in a cluster fashion according to provisions of the township's cluster ordinance. They went back to the drawing boards, and created a sketch plan that addressed the township's ordinance. From that direction, they've been working this summer on doing perk tests, surveying, design, layout, trying to meet regulation upon regulation in the ordinances as well as state and county regulations. The property is about 25-26 acres. The site capacity calculations show they can get six residential lots on a small cul-de-sac. There is about 14-1/2 acres that would be preserved as open space for the enjoyment of the residents of this small community. It's on lot water and on lot sewage.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said the real issues on this, from a planning and zoning perspective, are the disposition of the open space. The plan is contemplating deed restricted or not dedicating the open space to the township. The cluster ordinance requires the offer of dedication of the open space first. The 14-1/2 acres has no frontage or no access to the proposed cul-de-sac, which is problematic as the ordinance requires that it have access from a practical standpoint. In addition, just some of the buffering issues from the cluster subdivision requirement and the natural resource protection calculations still need to be provided. They still have other site capacity issues, but the natural resource protection is a separate set of calculations required to show their protected amounts of resources they are required.

Mr. Swallow said they didn't understand interpretations and concepts that they are not familiar with. He's been doing this 32 years and he's new to land development as it's presented this way in a cluster development. There were a couple of terms he wanted to clarify for future submissions. That's the site plan in both letters. They kept saying you need site plan and it confused him, as

**Planning Commission Meeting  
October 19, 2006**

based on his experience with site plans, it is a zoning term that they used years ago before land development was really thrust upon them. He didn't know if it required an additional application, an additional submission, and review at another forum. Maybe that can be explained to them. Ms. Judy Stern Goldstein said a site plan is defined in the zoning ordinance and there is a whole set of criteria that is required as part of that. This plan falls into the requirement of a site plan as they are in the carbonate overlay district. It's reviewed by the Zoning Officer and it comes to the PC and to Council. It's a separate application. The plans can be the same plans you are proposing to use for your subdivision land development if they have all of the information that is required on the site plan. You don't have to make a separate set of plans, but you have to include the usual information. It can be run concurrent as the same application review.

Ms. Szakmeister said any questions you have, please call Chris Garges, who is the Zoning Officer. You can also call Boucher & James.

Mr. Swallow said another issue is whether or not the township fully intends to accept dedication of this open space and if there's an indication he can get this evening on where the township would head. Mr. Landis said it's a council decision. The PC can't decide nor can they give a recommendation. Attorney Treadwell said you have to go to Council. What about the access issue that Judy brought up before? Ms. Stern Goldstein said if the access issue rolls into it and the design of the subdivision would not change as noted on the plan, and Council would not want to accept dedication, then the applicant needs to go through the selection of choices they have for the disposition of the open space, but the design of it doesn't change. The access is an issue regardless of open space or not. Mr. Swallow asked what Council has done in the past. Mr. Maxfield said it depends, and it's very site specific. Council would be concerned with, if they were going to accept it, monitoring or maintenance to insure that this remains open space and is not cleared or altered in any way.

Mr. LaBuda asked if Mr. Swallow must go to Council first with this dedication bit and why would he proceed with anything else and they won't take the property? Ms. Stern Goldstein said he wouldn't have to change the design of his plan. The decision on the open space would come once the plan goes to Council for preliminary plan approval, and at that point, Council would make their decision. Between preliminary and final, the applicant would work through their legal issues for any easements, deed restrictions, and covenants that go on the property. Until the plan gets to Council for preliminary approval, they won't have that opportunity. The design of the site will not change, it's the legal ratifications and the maintenance. The shape of that land are details on who is maintaining it, which come between preliminary and final, and that's a great reason for having a two step process. You wouldn't have to do that portion of it before preliminary. Ms. Szakmeister said if the township accepts it as a public park, then the Township maintains it. If the Township doesn't accept it because of many small parcels around, then your neighborhood people will have to maintain it, then it will be a neighborhood park, not a public park. Mr. Maxfield said think of it as you would the rec fee. You can propose whatever you can make your argument and nothing would stop you from going to Council and asking what is their preference. They wouldn't vote on it, but would give you preference.

Ms. Szakmeister said once it's dedicated as open space, it's going on the deed and it will not be developed further. It could also just be natural, and not swings, sliding boards, etc. Mr. Swallow said giving that particular lot some frontage, they thought that was probably the most problematic comment when they reviewed some of the other issues. Mr. Landis said in terms of frontage, that pretty much is a requirement. Mr. Swallow said access is required. Attorney Treadwell asked what their proposal was for access? Mr. Swallow said they were going to utilize an easement, but try to do whatever they can to comply. They had an easement at one place, and at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour, they saw a perk test fell too close to that easement. They had to relocate it. They are not happy with it themselves, so give him the opportunity to fix it.

**Planning Commission Meeting  
October 19, 2006**

Pertaining to the Boucher & James letter, Mr. Swallow said like Judy said, some are laundry items and are regulations that just need to be addressed.

Mr. Landis asked about the HEA letter. Mr. Kocher said there are two issues. The first one under Subdivision Ordinance No. 2, the police chief recommends a street light at the intersection. Mr. Maxfield said he said this last night at Council meeting, the police recommend a street light at every intersection wherever it is. He'd rather not see it personally. PC agreed with Mr. Maxfield. Mr. Kocher said Comment 22, curbing is not required along this road, although they are proposing it. At this density, they do not see curbing. Are you proposing conventional concrete curbing? Mr. Swallow said they are not certain. In his mind, he can see some Belgium block. Mr. Kocher said if you decide Belgium block, you will need a waiver from Council as it's not Township standard and Public Works generally does not favor it. Mr. Maxfield said traditional curb really fits out there. It wouldn't look right. Mr. Swallow said they are not proposing curb along Waldheim Road. Ms. Szakmeister said there will be plows going along there. Mr. Kocher said the other items he thought they needed to talk about were covered under Boucher & James. They have similar issues like the detention pond is on that open space lot, so that ownership does tie into some things he'll need to know.

Mr. Swallow said they have a good amount of work here to do to address both offices and will probably have to come back.

**MOTION BY:** Ms. Szakmeister moved to table.

**SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield

Mr. Landis asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

**ROLL CALL:** 6-0-1 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

**B. HOMEPRO ENTERPRISES – HIDDEN MEADOWS ESTATES PRELIMINARY MAJOR #MAJ-04-06 – 3588 LOWER SAUCON RAOD (TIME LIMIT 10/18/06)**

Paul Dreyer and Bob Kostival, Owners; and Michael Waldron from Ott Consulting were present. Mr. Waldron said this is a continuation of development on this property. The proposal is for five lots with the cul-de-sac somewhat incorporating the other piece on the other side which is pending recording for minor subdivision to separate the two parcels from the farmhouse. The farmhouse side is being utilized for the open space.

Mr. Landis said they will go over the Boucher & James letter. Ms. Stern Goldstein said she'll go over the major ones. The applicant did meet with them after they submitted their plans, so they know some of the revisions they are going to make. One of the major issues still outstanding, based on the plan that was submitted, is the open space. It doesn't yet meet the 50% requirement, but we know they intend to offer it to the township. You need to formally offer it to Council, and then Council will let you know. It's the rear of those three lots on the other side of PPL. Mr. Waldron said there are three that are all behind it. That's the area they talked about that they are not using. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it's not on the plan, but it is coming attractions on how they intend to do it.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said the second part under open space, is on the plans submitted, they are showing that 2,000 sq. foot of proposed recreation land on the conservation easement property – they now know that is not going to happen and they are going to offer recreation and that goes to Council. There are landscaping issues, additional buffering is required, and street trees along Lower Saucon Road are also required. There is some site capacity calculations and minor issues that still need to be addressed. The letter does have some smaller items in it. She said since you've been working on the plans for awhile, the issues are "we'll comply at this point". Mr. Waldron said

**Planning Commission Meeting  
October 19, 2006**

correct. He said the buffer yard in the back of Lots 3 and 4, they set aside the easement for the buffer yard, but weren't proposing any additional plantings back there. Ms. Stern Goldstein said you need to indicate that the existing plantings/vegetation meet the requirements without documenting that on the plan if there's nothing there.

Mr. Maxfield said he notices there are no major trees marked over on that edge, is it a scrubby line? Mr. Waldron said he did take some pictures for the PC to see. He's not skilled at which trees they are. Ms. Stern Goldstein said that's why you really need to show, on the plan, which trees are there because your plan wasn't showing vegetation there, but you are telling us there is existing vegetation, so you need to document it and summarize what is in that tree row and why it is worthy of being a buffer. Mr. Dreyer said Judy is looking for more detail and that is not a problem. Mr. Waldron said the big open spot in there is in the power line easement and they can't do anything anyway. So there's a big gap.

Mr. Maxfield asked Mr. Waldron if they received the EAC letter. Mr. Waldron said he doesn't recall seeing a specific EAC letter. Mr. Maxfield said he is having a problem with this. The problem is that this is the first time on the plan, and this has been at the EAC, who is looking at resources, and things like that, and now to the PC, who also looks at resources. The first time they saw the major trees marked, he couldn't help but notice the road is planned to plow through the only major stand of trees on the site. We're not talking small trees. It's the removal of 38 major trees. A lot of them are 24" to 40" diameter trunks. His first thought was why preserve property on one side of the road when you basically don't pay much attention to the resources on the other side. Mr. Waldron said the reason for the location of the cul-de-sac in that spot is it's severely impacted and chosen for that spot because of the slopes. It minimized the impact on the steep slopes. It's the only area along Lower Saucon Road that doesn't have a steep slope. Mr. Maxfield said he realizes the entrance definitely should be there. He doesn't know once you are in the site, where the road should go. If this is the only place the road can be, he can understand that, but he wants to hear a really good explanation of why they are asking to take out 38 major trees, some of the only trees on the site, and why they are seeing it at this late date? They really should have seen this before. In the EAC letter, when you receive it, will ask you to reconsider the removal of the majority of these trees. Mr. Waldron said they are only proposing removal of trees in areas that they have to. The road entrance has to pretty much be at that spot to void steep slopes coming up the bank. Mr. Maxfield said when you do cluster, you are supposed to look at natural resources as assets to the property and he doesn't feel the other side of the road, the trees were really looked at as assets. Mr. Waldron said on the other side of the road, they have a significant amount of wetlands to stay away from. If you are going to compare the two sides of the project, that's why they were put over here because of that. Mr. Maxfield said he doesn't know if they should have impacted the other side of the road. Mr. Waldron said there is not really another way to service lots and if they try to hook the cul-de-sac in another direction, they get limited where they can build with the PPL electric lines. Mr. Maxfield said if you are telling me that's the only way you can go in, so be it. If you develop in the township again, please, get this information early on so we can really see what we are dealing with. Mr. Waldron said there is an area that extends between Lot 3 and 4 where there are a lot of trees that aren't being disturbed.

Mr. Hijazi asked if they could modify that location of the entrance? Mr. Waldron said no, they looked at that extensively. Once they get in, they are limited by what size radius they can put for turning, etc. He's not sure what other alternatives there are to serve that property. Mr. Noble said they are proposing a 24' wide road, and if you overlay the road on the trees you propose to remove, he doesn't know if there is that big of a grade issue there. Mr. Waldron said it's either remove with the pavement or with grading the swales next to the road for drainage. Mr. Kocher said the width of some of the trees are outside of the roadway. Mr. Noble said you have some trees that are some 100 feet apart. Mr. Waldron said the ones further south, that's where the houses are going to go. Mr. Noble said you might ease some people's minds if you actually did an overlay so you can see

**Planning Commission Meeting  
October 19, 2006**

what you are doing is required. If it's not required, then minimize. You might be able to shift some things around. Ms. Stern Goldstein said if you are disturbing more than 25% over the drip line, you are seriously impacting the trees. When you look at your grading, please try to tighten up as much as possible. Mr. Waldron will double check on the trees.

Mr. Landis said they will go over the HEA letter. Mr. Kocher said there are two issues here. He has met with Mr. Waldron and gone over the entire letter, engineering wise, and he's straight on being able to fix everything. The two issues are No. 1 is the street light again. PC doesn't want a street light. No. 2 is the ordinance would allow you to require the cul-de-sac to go through to the property line. He thinks you're okay with the layout as is, but we didn't ever definitely say, the cul-de-sac is okay as it is. You can require the cul-de-sac to go through to the property line and require road access back through to the rear property. They wanted to make sure they didn't have any intention of that. Mr. Waldron said correct. Those were the only issues Mr. Kocher had. Mr. Waldron said they had discussions about the swale along Lower Saucon Road, but they are going to look at how to handle the run off from the swale down to the pipe that crosses under the PPL line. Mr. Kocher said they still have some drainage issues to work out along Lower Saucon Road.

Mr. Waldron asked if there were any problems with the waivers? Ms. Szakmeister said No. 22 is a waiver. Mr. Kocher said No. 4, is existing features within 500 feet. PC does not have a problem with that. Mr. Kocher said No. 14 is improvements to Lower Saucon Road. They would technically be required to widen and put curbs in. The only thing they are holding back is if there are grading things that we need to do in the right-of-way for drainage, they'd like to reserve the right to require them to do that. Other than that, they don't think paving is needed unless the PC has an objection. Mr. Maxfield said can we just add that as a condition to the waiver then? Mr. Landis said yes, when the waiver comes. Mr. Kocher said No. 22, technically if Pond Lane is a road, it's a private road, so the ordinance would require 400 foot setback from their new road to that existing road even though it's a private road. Out in the field, it appears to be a common driveway serving three properties. Mr. Kocher said rather than trying to make the legal argument that it's not a road, they thought it would be cleaner to ask for a waiver. Mr. Maxfield said since it actually functions as more of a driveway, could we reduce the width even more of the road, maybe another two feet, and recommend a 22' road? Mr. Kocher said the issue of this waiver is the separation distance between the Pond Lane and the new road. They are asking for a waiver down to 24', and he guesses they could go to 22'. Mr. Dreyer said they are fine with 22'. Mr. Kocher said PennDOT's minimum to get liquid fuels is 16'. Anything below 18' starts to be a public safety issue. Mr. Maxfield said that would help the trees also. Mr. Kocher said they need to change the 24' to 22'. They are discussion these waivers, they really are not for action. Mr. Waldron said they are proposing to show the area Lot 4 and 5 as recreation. Ms. Stern Goldstein said you were going to offer the fee in lieu of recreation fees as the land wasn't suitable for recreation. Mr. Kocher said that should come off your waiver request. No. 27 deals with the cart way width. They asked for 24' and we are asking to reduce it to 22'. The right-of-way should remain. Don't decrease the size of your infiltration areas. Keep those the same. No. 28 they would like to use plastic pipe. They are okay with that. No. 29 they are requesting a waiver from showing which existing trees will remain and showing the trees that are going to be removed. No. 30 actually has two waivers. They would like to not put street trees along some parts of Lower Saucon Road. Ms. Stern Goldstein said the street trees relate to the cluster and that's the edge of the road way and you were proposing street trees along there. The other portion is you were going to provide street trees along the existing roadway at the top of the bank. Street trees will be provided in all locations where required now. It's not on the plan yet. Mr. Kocher said that's a good point. Mr. Waldron said do they still need a waiver for the location then? Ms. Stern Goldstein said no, you don't. You just need to show the trees and you'll be fine. Mr. Kocher said on the internal roadway, are you still asking for a waiver to make them 5' to 8' from the cart way? Mr. Waldron said they have to be 5' to 8' for the cluster zoning ordinance. They would need a waiver from SALDO to allow them to be there. Mr. Kocher said you don't need a waiver on that. Mr. Waldron said No. 15, the planting

**Planning Commission Meeting  
October 19, 2006**

berm along Lower Saucon Road, they are going to put plantings there, but they do believe the existing side slopes there provide the berm part requirements. Mr. Kocher said as long as you put the landscaping on top of the side slopes.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. LaBuda moved to table.

**SECOND BY:** Ms. Szakmeister

Mr. Landis asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

**ROLL CALL:** 6-0-1 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

**C. REVIEW OF OPEN SPACE PLAN GUIDELINES**

Mr. Maxfield said they first started out with a point of view, and that was that they did not want to select specific properties. They wanted to have more freedom. Ms. Stern Goldstein said you have the draft copy of Lower Saucon Open Space Action Plan. The document is the open space guidelines. It was very important to the group and to the Township not to identify individual parcels, but to identify the attributes that a parcel would need to have to meet the open space plan. They felt it was very important to look at it at a purely analytical standpoint and look at the individual attributes. That's why you see that list of 27 items. The EAC and Rick Tralies worked on this. The check list of 27 items is the issue. Each parcel is owned by somebody now and each parcel has neighbors and each person of the township has sentimental and/or financial ties to different properties. So it was important to look at them all. The Committee and/or the consultants that the township appoints will look at the individual parcels. Mr. Maxfield said the committee is just proposed at this time. They all seem to think that three people would expedite the matter. One thing they were concerned about was not being locked in by a process, so they didn't want to give the check boxes a numerical value because in some cases, one property that has certain resources, those resources may actually be of a different value on another property being the same type of resources. It depends on the site and how specific they are to the site and the combination of resources. They are strictly guidelines and there's a lot of subjectivity in there. That's why the job of the three person committee is going to be really important. It's going to be people who keep up on what's going on, stay in communication with others, people who follow it all the way through. The process is then they will report to the EAC and the EAC will recommend the properties to Council and Council will vote. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it was a very strong opinion of both Boucher & James office and the individuals in the EAC not to rank the parcels in numerical order from highest to lowest on preservation value simply because the value changes constantly for preservation based on what is available. Mr. Maxfield said the way Rick Tralies explained it was in communities where there are specific properties, a lot of time they are agricultural properties or there just aren't that many properties left. In Lower Saucon, we seem to have a lot of parcels, some larger and some smaller. Mr. Landis said would this committee take the properties and do the checklist for each of the properties? Mr. Maxfield said it would be an inventory based on availability. Mr. Landis said would you take an inventory of them, and then when they came up you'd make a decision? Mr. Maxfield said that may occur with some, especially the natural resource inventory areas, he would hope they looked at those areas much more closely and advance any availabilities. Mr. LaBuda said under the goals, he doesn't see anything about saving the taxpayer money, like higher school taxes. With land preservation, you'd have less building going on which wouldn't increase taxes. Ms. Stern Goldstein said a good publication is written by Michael Frank in the mid-90's about the value of open space and how each acre of open space, depending on the school district and local taxes, does save in the long term. The value of open space saves you primarily because of the reduced impact on schools. Mr. Maxfield said they've been really stressing the aesthetic value and the value to the community without hitting on the finances right now. Ms. Stern Goldstein said this is the time to do this before you are over developed.

**Planning Commission Meeting  
October 19, 2006**

Mr. Noble said watching the first developer come through, we need to be able to give them more guidance when they do a cluster development. We have to come up with a general consensus here, if when you have a lot configured the way their lot was, where the back part is going to be your open space, they are not going to have frontage. If we give them guidance on cluster developments, we have to immediately give them guidance on how the ownership structure of this access land is going to go. Ms. Stern Goldstein said there are choices on the subdivision, but the first thing they have to do is offer it to Council. If Council doesn't want it, the options are all spelled out. They can be deed restricted on the lot with conservation easements, it can be HOA with conservation easements, but they still have to have access somehow. They were told that at a staff meeting. Mr. Kocher said they still don't know how the ownership is going to be. Ms. Stern Goldstein said they have been given guidance. Attorney Treadwell said they know, we've told them, and his guess is Council doesn't want it. They told them at a staff meeting that they can fix it and they haven't done it yet. They were told to get frontage. Mr. Noble said where do you put the frontage? Ms. Stern Goldstein said there is room for the frontage. They chose to ignore the advice and discussions with staff. They shorten the cul-de-sac, they make the lots a little bit smaller as they are all well oversize. There's room to get the 35' of frontage they need on the cul-de-sac. It's only 35'. They are trying to create a lot that is not land locked so there can be access. They are requiring that the lot actually require some access on the public street so somebody could get back there if they need to. They have been clearly given guidance and that's why Ms. Stern Goldstein was concerned with the attitude to start with. He was wrong in his tone, he chose to ignore all the information that was repeated at the staff meeting and chose to pretend he never heard any of this before. Mr. Noble said maybe we want to bring the PC up to speed on how this land is going to be handled so we know what is going on when they ask us a question. Mr. Landis said they thought they could come here and get a different opinion from us. Mr. Stern Goldstein said the design of the open space lot, there's open space design standards, whether the ownership is the township or the HOA, it's the same design standards, just a different entity owns it. He was trying to make it seem that he needed an answer on the disposition on it for ownership before he could revise the plan. Three times she stated that's not the case. He chose to ignore that also. Attorney Treadwell said they can fill out the purple sheet more for the PC and put more information on it as to what the background is. Mr. Maxfield said they always recommend conservation easements for these chunks because of the monitoring, because of the maintenance issue, but they are running into problems where small chunks like this, 14 acres of disconnected acres, conservation agencies may not want these properties. They are trying to come up with another way other than a HOA. Attorney Treadwell said the Township can do the conservation itself. They don't need Heritage or Wildlands. Mr. Maxfield said fine, but if you are going to hold the conservation easement, you've got to be willing to be the entity to go in with legal action if need be. Is the township ready to do that, he doesn't know. For instance, like Stonehurst, the township could hold an easement on it with the HO. Would that be a multiple entity? Attorney Treadwell said yes, and that easement would give the township the right, but not the obligation to go in and force whatever their restrictions are.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. LaBuda moved to recommend to Council the open space guidelines.

**SECOND BY:** Ms. Szakmeister

Mr. Landis asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

**ROLL CALL:** 6-0-1 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

**IV. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. HULETT MINOR PLANNING MODULE FOR APPROVAL AND SIGNATURE**

Mr. Kocher said they reviewed this last time with David Harte and the planning module is done. The SEO has reviewed it and is recommending you approve it.

**Planning Commission Meeting  
October 19, 2006**

**MOTION BY:** Ms. Maxfield moved for approval and signature for Hulett Minor Planning module.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. LaBuda  
Mr. Landis asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 6-0-1 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – AUGUST 17, 2006 & SEPTEMBER 21, 2006**

**August 17, 2006 Minutes:**

Ms. Szakmeister said on the August 17, 2006 minutes, add that Craig Kologie and John Noble were absent.

**MOTION BY:** Ms. Szakmeister moved for approval of the August 17, 2006 minutes, with correction.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. LaBuda  
Mr. Landis asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 6-0-1 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

**September 21, 2006 Minutes:**

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of the September 21, 2006 minutes.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Hijazi  
Mr. Landis asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 6-1-1 (Ms. Szakmeister – Abstained, she was absent. Mr. Kologie – Absent)

**V. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Mr. Landis asked if there was any public comment? No one raised their hand.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY:** Mr. LaBuda moved to adjourn. The time was 7:40 PM.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield  
Mr. Landis asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:**

Submitted by:

---

Mr. John Landis  
Chair