

BETHLEHEM CITY COUNCIL MEETING
10 East Church Street – Town Hall
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
Tuesday, March 17, 2015 – 7:00 PM

INVOCATION

Pastor Hopeton Clennon, of the Central Moravian Church, offered the invocation which was followed by the pledge to the flag.

PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

1. ROLL CALL

President Reynolds called the meeting to order. Present were Bryan G. Callahan, Eric R. Evans, Michael D. Recchiuti, Cathy Reuscher, Louis N. Stellato, Adam Waldron, and J. William Reynolds, 7.

CITATION

Honoring Jeremy R. Alleshouse

President Reynolds presented a Citation to Jeremy R. Alleshouse on the occasion of his retirement from the Bethlehem Police Department after 20 years of service. The Members of Council applauded Mr. Alleshouse and wished him well in his retirement.

PUBLIC HEARING

5A. *Lehigh Valley Planning Commission – Various Zoning Ordinance Amendments*

Prior to the consideration of the regular Agenda items, President Reynolds called to order a Public Hearing to consider Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to include regulations for Solar Energy Devices, adding definitions and regulations; amending Section 1306.01(a), creating a Maximum Impervious Coverage in the R-R and R-S Districts; and amending Section 1319 entitled Required Off-Street Parking Spaces.

Darlene Heller, Director of Planning and Zoning, stated the first item is the provision to amend the regulations for Solar Energy Collection Systems. We received a proposed draft amendment from the Environmental Advisory Council (EAC) and met with them a few times and came up with the draft Ordinance that is before Council tonight. Ms. Heller reported this has been to the Planning Commission and to the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. Ms. Heller noted the purpose is to promote the opportunity for people to be able to have solar energy devices on their properties to reduce consumption of energy, and to also create provisions so that these devices are in keeping with Historic District provisions and other provisions that we might have in the City. Ms. Heller informed this applies to any new solar devices in the City; any upgrade or modification, and is permitted as an accessory use in any zoning district. There is a list of provisions that the Zoning Hearing Board can review and assess the variance if someone needs a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board. Ms. Heller noted it requires that all of the submissions would comply with the Uniform Building Code and has provisions for low slope and high slope roofs so that visibility of the devices or panels would be minimized from the public streets. Any new devices must comply with any of the accessory use provisions in the district where a device is installed. Ms. Heller remarked they are permitted to be up to 15 feet above the maximum height of any zoning district where they are permitted and that is in case the building is at the maximum height. The solar energy system cannot allow any advertising and once they are abandoned they are required to be removed. Ms. Heller noted that last provision was a discussion point for the Planning Commission but there was a 3-1 vote to move that amendment forward with a recommendation for approval.

Ms. Heller continued on to the subject of Impervious Coverage and remarked this amendment also came to the Planning Commission from the public. There was a request that the City consider including an impervious coverage requirement in our Residential Zoning Districts. As of now we do not have any requirement. Ms. Heller mentioned we have an impervious coverage limit for any of our Non-Residential Zoning Districts but nothing for Residential. We did take a look at what other communities are doing and we discussed this briefly with the Community Development Committee. We looked at nine other communities in the State of Pennsylvania that are similar to Bethlehem. Ms. Heller pointed out four of those had no limitations, so just like Bethlehem; they had 100% maximum

impervious coverage. We also looked at Lancaster, Easton, York, Scranton and Harrisburg, and their provisions vary. Ms. Heller mentioned they tried to create some type of table or scale to come up with an average. From that information they determined, the amendment proposal that is before Council, which is a 75% maximum impervious coverage, would be permitted in the RR Zone, the City's lowest density Residential Zoning District. Ms. Heller stated this would also include the RS Zone which is medium density residential. Ms. Heller mentioned they still recommend that we have no impervious coverage limit or 100% maximum in RG and RT Districts. These districts are our high density development districts for residential. She continued, we felt like it would be too restrictive to have a cap on impervious coverage in those districts. Ms. Heller added, we allow row homes, which, sometimes, are very small lots. She added, in some cases there is a garage in the rear yard or covered parking, allowing very little leeway for other development or impervious coverage. Ms. Heller informed they tried to find provisions that would be reasonable for the public. She reported, previously we have not had an issue. We do not have a lot of variances coming to the Zoning Hearing Board for impervious coverage and we do not see a lot of violations, thus it has not been an issue. We wanted to create a limit that would be reasonable, but not an imposition on residential property owners.

Ms. Heller continued with the third item which is parking in the CB Zoning District. The CB Zone is Commercial Business and is our downtown zoning district, where we allow the greatest density and want the most flexibility for development. Typically we have always not required any off street parking for any development in CB. We have parking garages and surface parking lots that are shared and typically managed by the Parking Authority or some other public entity, so we have eliminated any requirement in CB Zoning District. Ms. Heller mentioned somehow when we adopted the Zoning Ordinance in 2012 there was a provision in there that if you have residential units over a certain amount, we require parking, and we felt that was an oversight. It is really something we do not want to encourage because that is where we want dense development and we want shared parking. Ms. Heller noted the recommendation for this amendment was just to eliminate that provision and we would go back to the original provision that states that parking is not required off street in the CB Zoning District.

President Reynolds then asked the Clerk to read Communication 5A into the record.

The Clerk read a communication from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission dated February 27, 2015. The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission Comprehensive Planning Committee considered the subject amendments at its February 26, 2015 meeting pursuant to the requirements of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. The commission finds that the amendments do not conflict with the County Comprehensive Plan. Concerning the amendment on maximum impervious coverage for residential districts, we suggest including a "Maximum Impervious Coverage" column for all residential zoning districts in addition to the proposed RR and RS district changes. The recommendation is simply that a "Maximum Impervious Coverage" amount exists for all districts in the Ordinance. The amendment that eliminates off-street parking requirements for the CB zoning district is a positive change as the reduction of excess parking helps foster a more walkable, multi-modal urban condition.

Mr. Callahan related that they spoke about this in Committee but he just wanted to thank Ms. Heller for all the work she did on these Ordinances.

Mr. Evans asked if we are voting on this later tonight.

President Reynolds replied yes, as a First Reading.

Mr. Evans queried about the table Ms. Heller spoke of and if she had any more copies of that with her this evening.

Ms. Heller noted she has some copies if Council wants those and stated this would be copies of the schedule they created for impervious coverage in other communities.

Mr. Evans mentioned that she referenced the Table in speaking tonight and this was discussed at the Community Development Committee Meeting. He continued he had a few questions related to this information. Mr. Evans noted on this schedule Bethlehem is listed at the top under the RR District, which is our most Rural Residential area with a lot size of 15,000 square feet, and in RS District, which is medium density and is 8,000 square feet. Mr. Evans noted his thinking was to move the maximum impervious coverage to 50% in RR and keep this at 75% for RS because in RR the minimum lot size is almost twice the size. He added, what we are talking about is covering 75% of

15,000 square feet which is quite a large space and a big difference. Mr. Evans mentioned given the fact that we have the opportunity to do that, it might make more sense to keep maximum impervious coverage at 50% in the RR District and 75% in the RS District, and go to 100% in the high density areas which the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission also recommended and Ms. Heller supports. Mr. Evans expressed these are his thoughts since there is a First Reading on this tonight and the Second Reading at the next Council Meeting. Mr. Evans believes the change is a good thing to add. He continued, due to so much going on in any City, there are many things that come up in Zoning that generally we do not think about and it always takes something to happen where we realize adjustments need to be made in our Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Evans mentioned that impervious coverage does not come up much and we have not had many issues or applications for variances on this matter, but it will be good to put limitations in place. He added that some cities have already taken that step and others have not, but someday they may wish they had if an issue would arise that would make an impact on a neighborhood. Mr. Evans thinks this will be a good step forward for Zoning.

Ms. Reuscher thanked Ms. Heller for taking this on and addressing this concern. She would like to echo what Mr. Evans had to say about reducing it to 50% for Rural Residential because we are talking about water quality for the City of Bethlehem and she does not think we can put a price on that. Ms. Reuscher pointed out moving that down to 50% would be tremendously beneficial.

President Reynolds asked Ms. Heller if she had any comments on this possible proposal to move the RR Zone to 50%.

Ms. Heller stated they did talk about this a little bit at the Community Development Committee Meeting. One of the other suggestions that came about was that these are the minimum lot sizes. There are parcels that have much larger lot sizes, and some felt that for the larger lot sizes, such as over an acre, then it could be greater, but for 15,000 square feet we would still leave it at 75%. Ms. Heller mentioned they did do some close analysis of what would a reasonable development and taking into consideration an average home size, driveway, and adding a pool and a shed for example, she still thinks that 50% could be a reasonable number if Council is inclined to support that number. This is something that would still be reasonable for most residents in the RR Zone.

Mr. Recchiuti stated he thinks most of the RR Zone sits in North Bethlehem and asked Ms. Heller if that is correct.

Ms. Heller stated most of the RR Zone is in North Bethlehem, but there is some on the South Side of South Mountain as well. Those sections of the City are the two largest areas.

Mr. Recchiuti knows in the past one of our problems that we have dealt with is the overflowing of the Monocacy Creek. There has been much talked about with overdevelopment in Bethlehem Township and Lower Nazareth Township. Mr. Recchiuti asked if impervious coverage runoff was looked at during discussions.

Ms. Heller stated yes, she believes that is the whole purpose of having the impervious coverage section. Ms. Heller stated that when the Zoning Ordinance was revised in 2012, additional environmental provisions were included to tightened up provisions for steeply sloped lots and lots that are naturally wooded areas. Those lots typically are in the RR Zone. Ms. Heller pointed out it is not as if you can really build out a lot in the RR Zone due to having to meet steep slope provisions and tree conservation provisions for naturally wooded lots.

Referring to the chart handed out by Ms. Heller, Mr. Recchiuti mentioned he sees cities on the chart that have impervious coverage for the RR Zone at 50%, 45%, or 100%. Ms. Heller pointed out half of them do not have any provision at all. Mr. Recchiuti queried whether when it states 100% there is just no provision on the chart. Ms. Heller replied that is correct.

Mr. Recchiuti stated he believes that 50% seemed reasonable when we are looking at 12,000 or 11,000 square feet of paved surface with a big home. Mr. Recchiuti asked Ms. Heller's position on the 50% impervious coverage.

Ms. Heller stated if that is what City Council is inclined to do then we will go with the 50% impervious coverage in the RR Zone and we would make that work. She pointed out that they have not had a problem with impervious coverage in any of the zoning districts. People that move to parcels in the RR Zone are not looking to build out their parcel, rather they are moving there for green space and open space. Ms. Heller stated they have not had an issue but she thinks that they can

accommodate the 50% coverage in the RR Zone if that is the wish of City Council.

President Reynolds mentioned there seems to be some support for this, but wanted to ask Ms. Heller and Ms. Karner, that since this does require two readings, whether or not it would be beneficial for them, to have Council consider this at either the First or Second Reading. President Reynolds asked if this is something we can vote on today or can we vote on this two weeks from now or is this something they would rather talk about more. He recognized that they have spent more time considering this than City Council and if it is something that does not matter to the department, then maybe it can wait.

Ms. Heller would not say it does not matter. She continued they forwarded to Council a recommendation of 75% in two zoning districts and felt that was a good recommendation. Certainly City Council is inclined to amend recommendations when they come from us, so if Council is inclined to do that, they can, and we can work with that. Ms. Heller does not think that 50% impervious coverage is unreasonable and she does not believe it would be burdensome to the public or to the Zoning Officer.

Ms. Karner remarked they took the average of the communities that had and did not have impervious coverage limitations. We talked about how much of an issue this is for the City. She added, it is certainly something that was raised by the public and we wanted to be responsive to the public. Ms. Karner continued they do not want to find themselves in a position where we have paved lots and it is too late to do something about it. Ms. Karner stated she agrees with Ms. Heller in that if 50% is desired by Council, then we can certainly work with that number. She stated the question we need to ask is what if someone runs into a situation where they need more space, what has to take place, and then the added cost to the property owner to go through the Zoning Hearing Board to obtain a variance. Ms. Karner pointed out Council has to weigh whether or not it is appropriate for the residents to take those extra steps, or if we think 75% coverage might be enough to contain impervious surface.

Mr. Stellato remarked that the general consensus is that 50% would be the best number but inquired what would happen if we went down to a maximum coverage of 25%.

Ms. Heller stated that they were really trying to find a balance where we have some limitation but where we did not create a burden on a property owner where they cannot reasonably use their property. When we get down to 25%, even in the RR Zone, she believes we would be sending too many people to the Zoning Hearing Board for variances. Ms. Heller stated at some point it would get too restrictive for people to use their parcel.

Mr. Callahan noted one of the things discussed in Committee was that we need to take into consideration that the house is sitting on a 15,000 square foot lot along with the driveway. If we add anything else, such as a pool, we are not talking about a lot of leeway. Mr. Callahan remarked that is why we went with 75%. However, if the will of Council is to go to 50% coverage, he does not have a problem with that number. Mr. Callahan pointed out it is not 15,000 square feet of grass. It is a 15,000 square foot lot with a house, driveway, maybe a pool and patio. Mr. Callahan believes what Ms. Heller is saying is that they can work with 50% if that is the will of Council, but at the same time he does not want to create a situation where many residents will be coming to the Zoning Hearing Board for variances, which could happen if we go below 50%.

Ms. Reuscher noted while we are looking at this she wanted to revisit something important said by Mr. Recchiuti. Referencing the chart handed out by Ms. Heller, she commented that when we are looking at these four cities - Allentown, Erie, Wilkes-Barre, and Williamsport - we are considering that they have a 100% impervious standard coverage. However, what we are seeing is that they do not have an impervious coverage. She continued, if you look at the cities that do have those standards and average those, what we are proposing is actually far above their requirements. Ms. Reuscher thinks that reducing this to 50% is more than reasonable, and she suggests we may want to minimize what we have for the RS District as well.

President Reynolds queried if the change to 50% coverage would affect this enough by which we would have to advertise another Public Hearing.

Ms. Heller stated her understanding is that whenever a change is made, it has to go back and be advertised and go back to the LVPC and back to Council.

Council Solicitor John J. Spirk, Esq. recommended that if Council wishes to change this sooner rather than later, it is better to do this now, so that whatever necessary restarting and re-advertising and resubmission could begin now rather than waiting to the Second Reading. Solicitor Spirk added if the consensus were to do something it would be his recommendation to do it now and make it easier to accomplish.

Ms. Reuscher stated she would make the motion if other Council Members were interested in supporting it but was uncertain if others are interested in supporting a change.

President Reynolds noted that if there is one change, and maybe a second change, this would have to go back as well. President Reynolds mentioned if Council is unsure of what change to make, or multiple changes to make, it might be better to take a step back and consider either Ms. Reuscher's change, or the 50% change, rather than trying to do one thing and then coming back and not be certain of it. He queried if anyone else on Council had any thoughts on this matter.

Ms. Reuscher thinks it would be valuable to look at the percentages in the cities that have impervious coverage standards. She commented that Mr. Evan's suggestion of 50% for RR is entirely reasonable when looking at the 45% and 50% in other cities that have standards. In addition, Ms. Reuscher raised the possibility of 50% in the RS Zone because 50%, 40% and 60% is noted on the chart for other cities. Ms. Reuscher pointed out for high density we might want to look at 60% because the chart shows Lancaster as having high density between 50-60%, Easton at 50%, York at 60% and Scranton between 60-80%.

Mr. Callahan stated he can support the RR going down to 50%, but he would not be in favor or support making changes to the medium density or the high density.

Mr. Evans then queried about the high density and how Ms. Heller would feel about changing that because we do have this at 100%. He finds it interesting that Lancaster, Easton and York are in that 50-60% range but that may be difficult for their residents as well in those areas.

Ms. Heller informed she does not know how they do it because with row homes, just a house and a garage would cover more than 50% of the lot.

Mr. Waldron asked if Council makes these changes and brings down the RR zone from 75% to 50%, do we know how many properties that would affect.

Ms. Heller reported this would affect any property owner in RR, but she would not know how to calculate that number.

Mr. Waldron queried as to what would happen to those property owners.

Ms. Heller stated if a property owner already covers 60% of their parcel with impervious coverage, they would be non-conforming. They would be allowed to continue that way, but anytime they make a change, they would have to go to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Waldron mentioned that with all these proposed changes people would be grandfathered in.

Ms. Heller confirmed if current property owners exceeded the percentage of impervious coverage, they then are grandfathered in.

Mr. Waldron remarked that City Council Members are not planning professionals. He commented Ms. Heller's department put a lot of time into this would and would be hesitant to start picking these numbers apart. He noted he is comfortable with taking the RR down to 50%, but cautioned once we start tinkering with these other numbers, we are not really sure how this will affect the City. Mr. Waldron noted we are talking about thousands of properties. He will support the RR at a 50% coverage, but he is not sure until the Planning Commission might take a look at this and see if they want to bring some of the medium or high density down as well.

President Reynolds reminded Council that they are able to postpone the vote on this particular Ordinance until the next meeting on April 7, 2015. If there are no changes made, we would be able to vote on the Ordinance at that point. Council could still vote on the other two Zoning Ordinances on the Agenda tonight and allow more time for consideration on this percentage issue with impervious coverage.

Ms. Karner mentioned because we have no coverage limitations at this point, we do not really have good data on what we are talking about in the City. She added, it may be an option for City Council to vote on the Ordinance before Council at this meeting and the next meeting so that we begin the process of truly analyzing the data. With the Ordinance in place at 75%, Ms. Karner noted they will have to ask residents when they come in for permits, for information on patios, driveways and pools, to determine what their impervious surface looks like. A reduction to 50% might be a great thing, but we are not quite sure how many residents this is going to affect. Ms. Karner stated passing the Ordinance at 75% and letting us test the waters for six months or a year would perhaps be the best avenue to truly understand what the impact is in these zones within the City. Ms. Karner continued she would hate to see the process derailed just in the off chance that we want to take a shot in the dark on what we may think to be a good number. We may find we have an issue or we may find we are so far from an issue it may not be worth revisiting.

President Reynolds thanked Ms. Heller for her presentation.

Public Comment

Impervious Coverage

Albert Bernotas, 1004 Johnston Drive, informed that he handed out a worksheet to City Council Members that illustrates his research to calculate impervious coverage and building coverage. He noted the worksheet is not perfect for the City of Bethlehem but with some minor modification he felt that it would be useful for the Planning and Zoning Bureau. He remarked he did a major amount of research on this and is delighted that there is so much conversation going on about impervious surface. Mr. Bernotas noted that he attended a Planning Commission Meeting where Ms. Heller spoke about impervious coverage but the Planning Commission did not discuss this matter. He remarked City Council spoke ten times more than the Planning Commission did on this subject. Mr. Bernotas pointed out that 75% is disappointing but he is happy this came up as an amendment. Mr. Bernotas believes that 75% is too much and commented, if you want our City to look like Allentown and Erie and others that are mostly paved surface, then do not modify this Ordinance. Mr. Bernotas suggests that 75% impervious coverage is not good and this amount should be voted down. He suggested that this Ordinance be Tabled to allow the Planning Bureau to do more work on this and have time for more research, especially regarding cities that have paid attention to this issue. Mr. Bernotas referenced he is not interested in this being like Manhattan. He continued, the RR district is Rural Residential, and if you go to 75%, there will be more water runoff into Monocacy Creek. We cannot control the other towns north of Bethlehem that run into the Monocacy Creek, he added. Mr. Bernotas stated although he does appreciate the work the Planning Bureau has done, he does not agree with the Ordinance. He concluded by saying he wishes Council would Table this and look at this in more detail.

Peter Crownfield, 407 Delaware Avenue, stated he is glad to see the 50% change mentioned by several Council Members and believes that is quite feasible and the measures are a good step forward for Bethlehem. He noted, we need to remember that 15,000 square feet is a minimum lot and atypical in a Rural Residential zone, thus it is not likely we will have a lot that is full of pervious surface. Mr. Crownfield thinks there would be very few exceptions to this where anyone would even be applying for a variance. He does not know with the medium density, but as Ms. Karner suggested, perhaps Council should pass a law, which would allow the Planning Bureau to start tracking and analyzing this because currently there is no information at this time. Mr. Crownfield noted many cities, that we would like in some ways to think are similar to Bethlehem, have these 45%, 50%, 60% limits of medium density guideline. He stated he thinks these percentages are doable but he does not know enough to actually make a recommendation.

Al Wurth, 525 Sixth Avenue, stated he is supportive of setting as generous a standard to limit impervious surface or to maximize pervious surface as possible for the reasons given by people who spoke about this matter. He suggested that some of the recommendations of the LVPC might be paid attention to because some of the areas around Lehigh University have relatively high density lots. He continued, it has become a common practice to turn most of the potential surface into parking lots for student cars, which dramatically changes the nature of the neighborhood. Mr. Wurth thinks that having some small standard for pervious surface, perhaps 90% in the higher density areas, might also contribute to making the neighborhood a little more agreeable. Mr. Wurth stated he lives on the west side of Bethlehem on a very small lot, and Council might come up with a standard that his home would not meet. The neighbors that he believes have the most negative impact on the neighborhood are the ones that pave their entire

backyard for parking. He believes that is what we are talking about tonight. Mr. Wurth noted if you think about what you would like to live next door to, which is what zoning is about, we do want to think about having as much pervious surface and as much green space. He feels we should try to be on the more ambitious side of limiting the amount of paving we do.

Stephen Antalics, 737 Ridge Street, mentioned Dr. Wurth touched on something that is very important. Mr. Antalics mentioned this at an earlier City Council Meeting in terms of a property such as a student property. Mr. Antalics recalled that years ago single family homes on the south side had lots in the back and they had victory gardens. He continued, those properties are now student housing and the back lot is totally macadamized because every student in the house, might have a car. Mr. Antalics noted street parking is not available to the students renting the property so they park in the back of the house. He feels this now prevents that property from becoming a single family home again because no one would want to buy a property with a backyard of all macadam. Mr. Antalics mentioned we will keep that type of mentality on the south side consistently because it will not go back to single families. He thinks Council needs to carefully look at this situation.

President Reynolds remarked these three Ordinances are on the agenda tonight for First Reading.

The Public Hearing was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from February 3, 2015, February 17, 2015 and February 23, 2015 were approved.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

PennEast Pipeline Resolution

President Reynolds added that there will be a Resolution added to the agenda later on opposing the PennEast Pipeline project as currently proposed. He noted that anyone who wishes to speak on that subject is welcome to do so during Public Comment.

PennEast Pipeline

Peter Crownfield, 407 Delaware Avenue, stated he read this Resolution, and believes it is a good Resolution. He reported he supports this entirely. Mr. Crownfield mentioned when people speak about this being an environmental disaster he thinks they may be missing the point. He noted it would be a disaster from a public health point of view. He is concerned about what a year-long construction project traveling across the watershed would do, and the deforestation of a certain amount of land. Mr. Crownfield noted pipelines themselves are known to have problems with leakage. This is tallied and statistically tracked. He noted that you cannot smell the methane gas and since no one can detect this, they do not know they are being exposed to methane. The methane is not odorized until it is delivered from the high volume long distance pipelines. Mr. Crownfield pointed out it is something that is dangerous to the environment and it is dangerous to public health. He added, it would definitely affect not only Bethlehem's watershed but the watershed for millions of people because it continues and crosses the Delaware River. Mr. Crownfield believes this would be a disaster and noted the Delaware River Basin Commission is going to be strongly opposed to this as well.

Nancy Tate, LEPOCO Peace Center, 313 West Fourth Street, remarked she looked at this PennEast Resolution and she sees many strong points in it and hopes Council will adopt this Resolution. She called attention to the fact that in the Resolution it states that it threatens the City's access to safe and pristine drinking water and presents serious risk to public health. Ms. Tate informed she especially likes the part where it speaks about the fragmentation of the forest, the concern about the wildlife habitats and the sensitive watershed lands. Ms. Tate mentioned she attended two of the scoping meetings that Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) held; one in Bethlehem and one in New Jersey. She urged Council if they pass this Resolution to not stop at this point. Ms. Tate continued, this is a really serious threat to people up and down the pipeline route. Ms. Tate does not think we know what is coming at us in many ways and expressed it is a train that is running through our area that is going to have serious implications if it is allowed to go forward. She added that from everything she read and witnessed at the hearings she attended, the FERC does not

have our best interest at heart. They have the interest of the oil and gas companies at heart and they do not care about the things that we care about. Ms. Tate pointed out people spoke with deep concern at both meetings she attended regarding what is going to be happening to the land, and their communities. Officials in New Jersey and environmental groups in New Jersey have done extensive work and extensive research. She recommended that Council should look to them to be able to obtain a great deal of information. Ms. Tate brought some handouts to the Council meeting to share with Council Members. One is a statement that LEPOCO presented at the Northampton Community College scoping meeting where they do mention Bethlehem's water supply. Ms. Tate stated she also brought a piece that is produced by the Delaware River Keepers, one of the lead organizations in speaking out in concern about this project. They have a pamphlet about pipelines she hopes Council will look at and take into consideration. Ms. Tate also brought copies of a recent article in The Morning Call for the Members of Council. Ms. Tate thinks it is very interesting that the person who is behind and interviewed in the article, has been pushing this next to the Bethlehem's Water Authority property and she is deeply concerned. The people who live on these properties have been very vocal and active in trying to speak out and trying to address this deep concern. Ms. Tate urges Council to adopt this Resolution and encouraged them to go further in education and think of measures to stop this project.

Frank Baran, 36 West Spruce Street, stated he supports the Resolution that has been proposed and scheduled for consideration this evening. Mr. Baran did prepare a memo dealing with some of the issues that were raised in the Resolution and he has a few copies of the memo. The one thing that he wanted to stress is that he is not too concerned about pipelines per se; he is concerned about the City of Bethlehem and its drinking water. Mr. Baran believes that is the only thing we should be concerned about at this stage. This is a very high priority for the City. Mr. Baran pointed out the City of Bethlehem has one of the best quality water services in the Lehigh Valley and this is according to information that the Bethlehem Authority states on its website. One of the three issues that he wants to call attention to is the need to follow the FERC intervention procedure. Mr. Baran noted it is one thing for the City to pass a Resolution stating its opinion but we need to get more deeply involved in the process. He suggests that the City file as an intervener in the proceeding because this would put the City in the position of having legal standing in the process and be able to appear at hearings, file briefs, and be heard by the courts if necessary to appeal the FERC's ruling if it goes against the City. Mr. Baran mentioned the City of Bethlehem needs to make sure it is properly covered legally in case PennEast prevails. He continued, filing an intervener status is not that difficult. There are a number of individuals who have done so and a number of organizations large and small who have done so, as well. Mr. Baran pointed out it is within the City's capability to do. In addition, Mr. Baran pointed out that the Bethlehem Authority has hired a consultant to work on this situation. He also suggests the possibility of getting legal counsel specifically trained in FERC related litigation or environmental law. Mr. Baran mentioned this is something that will be very important in the FERC proceedings and the City needs to have complete legal representation as well as the intervener status. Mr. Baran stated that Lower Saucon already has hired an environmental attorney who specializes in this work because they are concerned about their homes and their businesses. He noted, we have a lot more at stake than just land and businesses. We have our water at stake and he thinks that with something that vital it demands the attention of Council. Mr. Baran added this ought to be the first priority of Council for this year because of what the implications of a bad decision on the part of FERC would mean for our drinking water. Mr. Baran pointed out this is important for the residents of our City and for the restaurateurs, commercial establishments, even industrial facilities, who, because of the good quality of water we have, do not necessarily pre-treat for industrial processes. Mr. Baran wanted to emphasize that this is critical.

Al Wurth, 525 Sixth Avenue, remarked that this is a very important issue and he strongly supports Council endorsing this Resolution for all the reasons the previous speakers mentioned tonight. This is a huge issue because we have everything at stake and absolutely nothing to gain from cooperating with the pipeline process.

Mr. Wurth noted most of this gas will be brought to market down on the coast and the likely outcome is that this gas will be shipped to overseas. There are already plans for liquefied natural gas facilities in Baltimore and are being discussed in New Jersey. He continued, this is a way for people who want to buy gas to give it to other countries, to bring it to market as inexpensively as possible and is a great cost to us at a risk to our water system. Mr. Wurth noted the fragmentation of the watershed is precisely what we do not want. Mr. Wurth stated, we just spent a lot of time and money with timbering plans and other measures to make certain that whole area has been protected. He continued, to let someone do the equivalent of building a huge right-of-way through that area is like an assault on the City. Mr. Wurth stated there is no interest for the City in this, only potential risk and harm. The amount of energy we spend in trying to redirect or

prevent this would be very well spent. Mr. Wurth encouraged Council to do everything they can to stop this including some of the measures stated by the previous speaker.

4. OLD BUSINESS.

A. Members of Council

None.

B. Tabled Items

None.

C. Unfinished Business

None.

5. COMMUNICATIONS

B. *Director of Water and Sewer Resources – Recommendation of Award – Steven G. Lowry & Associates*

The Clerk read a memorandum from Edward J. Boscola, Director of Water and Sewer Resources recommending approval for a contract with Steven G. Lowry & Associates to provide service for the Penn Forest Dam SCADA System. The cost of the initial term is \$33,600 and the term of the contract is from the notice to proceed until December 31, 2015.

President Reynolds stated Resolution 9 D is on the agenda.

C. *Director of Public Works– Recommendation of Award – Let’s Think Wireless*

The Clerk read a memorandum from Michael Alkhal, Director of Public Works recommending approval for a contract with Let’s Think Wireless for the replacement of the Microwave system which is used for the connectivity of the Trunking Radio System Sites as well as the data links to the Fire Stations throughout the City. The total estimated cost is \$187,740 and the term of the contract is 120 days from the notice to proceed.

President Reynolds stated Resolution 9 E is on the agenda.

D. *Director of Parks and Public Property – DCNR Community Conservation Partnerships Program Grant Application*

The Clerk read a memorandum from Ralph Carp, Director of Parks & Public Property requesting a Resolution to apply for a \$200,000 DCNR Community Partnership Program Grant for a new Monocacy Creek Bridge. The Resolution is a requirement for the application.

President Reynolds stated Resolution 9 K is on the agenda.

E. *Director of Parks and Public Property – Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor Grant Application*

The Clerk read a memorandum from Ralph Carp, Director of Parks & Public Property requesting a Resolution to apply for a \$10,000 Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor mini-grant for a feasibility study for a new Monocacy Creek Bridge. The Resolution is a requirement for the application.

President Reynolds stated Resolution 9 L is on the agenda.

F. *Director of Parks and Public Property – Northampton County Open Space Initiative Grant Application*

The Clerk read a memorandum from Ralph Carp, Director of Parks & Public Property requesting a Resolution to apply for a \$210,000 Northampton County Open Space Initiative Grant for a new Monocacy Creek Bridge. The Resolution is a requirement for the application.

President Reynolds stated Resolution 9 M is on the agenda.

- G. *City Solicitor – Use Permit Agreement – Work to Live d/b/a Run Lehigh Valley – Brew to Brew Run Event*

The Clerk read a memorandum from City Solicitor William P. Leeson, Esq. attached to which is a Use Permit Agreement and proposed Resolution for the Brew to Brew Run Event. The Permittee is Work to Live, LLC doing business as a Run Lehigh Valley. The duration of the lease is one day, April 18, 2015 and the location is Nevin Place.

President Reynolds stated the Resolution 9 N is on the agenda.

- H. *Director of Public Works – Recommendation for Award – Motorola Solutions.*

The Clerk read a memorandum from Michael Alkhal, Director of Public Works recommending a contract with Motorola Solutions, Inc. to update the radio system software. The total estimated cost is \$891,050 and the term of the contact is 120 days from notice to proceed.

President Reynolds stated Resolution 9 O is on the agenda.

6. REPORTS

- A. *President of Council*

- B. *Mayor*

1. *Administrative Order – Eric R. Evans – Recreation Board*

Mayor Donchez reappointed Eric R. Evans to membership on the Recreation Commission effective through August 2019. Mr. Recchiuti and Ms. Reuscher sponsored Resolution No. 2015-47 to confirm the reappointment.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, Mr. Reynolds, 6. Abstaining: Mr. Evans, 1. The Resolution passed.

Paramedic William Guth

Mayor Donchez informed this past weekend we lost William Guth, another great public servant who dedicated many years to the City of Bethlehem as a paramedic. Mayor Donchez commented that Mr. Guth served the City with integrity and professionalism for many years and was the Master of Ceremonies for the City for several events, especially the Christmas tree lighting ceremony. Mayor Donchez noted that Mr. Guth will certainly be missed. He added, Mr. Guth was an example of a very good public servant. His passing was unexpected, as was the unfortunate passing of our Controller David DiGiacinto a few months ago. Mayor Donchez informed it was also unfortunate because Mr. Guth just retired in December.

President Reynolds added that this is a sad day for the City of Bethlehem and noted Mr. Guth's years of service to the City. He added that there was rarely a City event where you would not see Mr. Guth working or walking around and enjoying the festivities. President Reynolds pointed out that Mr. Guth will certainly be missed.

Mayor Donchez stated he agrees.

Deputy Director of Community and Economic Development

Mayor Donchez mentioned that he sent a memo to the City Clerk and he respectfully requests the name of Justin Poremba for the position of Deputy Director of Community and Economic Development and his replacement, the Chief of Staff, to be placed on the next Council Meeting Agenda. Mr. Poremba will be making phone calls to all Members of Council and will be present at the next Council Meeting.

7. ORDINANCES FOR FINAL READING

A. *Bill No. 11 – 2015 – Amending Article 725 - Weapons*

The Clerk read Bill No. 11 – 2015 – Amending Article 725 – Weapons, on Final Reading.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. Bill No. 11-2015 now known as Ordinance No. 2015-11 was adopted on Final Reading.

B. *Bill No. 12 – 2015 – Amending Article 941, Parks*

The Clerk read Bill No. 12 – 2015 Amending Article 941, Parks, on Final Reading.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. Bill No. 12-2015 now known as Ordinance No. 2015-12 was adopted on Final Reading.

C. *Bill No. 13 – 2015 – Intergovernmental Cooperation Agreement – Lower Nazareth Sewer Service Agreement*

The Clerk read Bill No. 13 – 2015 – Intergovernmental Cooperation Agreement – Lower Nazareth Sewer Service Agreement, on Final Reading.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. Bill No. 13-2015 now known as Ordinance No. 2015-13 was adopted on Final Reading.

D. *Bill No. 14 – 2015 – Amending Article 927 – Sewer Rental*

The Clerk read Bill No. 14 – 2015 – Amending Article 927 – Sewer Rental, on Final Reading.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. Bill No. 14-2015 now known as Ordinance No. 2015-14 was adopted on Final Reading.

E. *Bill No. 15 – 2015 – Authorizing 2015 GO Bonds – Capital Improvement Projects; 2010 General Obligation Bond – Refunding Portion of Remaining Bond*

The Clerk read Bill No. 15 – 2015 – Authorizing 2015 GO Bonds – Capital Improvement Projects; 2010 General Obligation Bond – Refunding Portion of Remaining Bond, on Final Reading.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. Bill No. 15-2015 now known as Ordinance No. 2015-15 was adopted on Final Reading.

8. NEW ORDINANCES.

A. *Bill No. 16 – 2015 – Amending Zoning Ordinance – Articles 1302 and 1318 – Solar Energy Devices*

The Clerk read Bill No. 16 – 2015 – Amending Zoning Ordinance – Articles 1302 and 1318 – Solar Energy Devices, sponsored by Mr. Recchiuti and Mr. Stellato and titled:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE
OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM, PENNSYLVANIA, AS AMENDED,
TO INCLUDE REGULATIONS FOR SOLAR ENERGY DEVICES,
ADDING DEFINITIONS AND REGULATIONS

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. Bill No. 16 – 2015 was passed on First Reading.

B. *Bill No. 17 - 2015 - Amending Zoning Ordinance - Article 1306.01(a) - Maximum Impervious Coverage*

The Clerk read Bill No. 17 - 2015 - Amending Zoning Ordinance - Article 1306.01(a) - Maximum Impervious Coverage, sponsored by Mr. Recchiuti and Mr. Stellato and titled:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ARTICLE 1306.01(a) OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM, PENNSYLVANIA, AS AMENDED, ENTITLED DIMENSIONAL REGULATIONS FOR THE R-R RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, CREATING A MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS COVERAGE IN THE R-R AND R-S DISTRICTS

Mr. Evans made the motion for an amendment as discussed earlier and stated what was talked about seemed to have support from all on Council, support from the Administration and support from the public. Mr. Evans believes we can move forward and vote on the change in the RR for now. He stated he believes that is where the consensus is for this Ordinance. Mr. Evans continued from there it can go back to the Administration and the Community Development Department who can advise us how 50% coverage in the RR Districts is working in a year from now. He noted, if it needs to be adjusted we can go back and take a look at that at a later date. Mr. Evans stated the amendment he would like to make would be to strike the words **RR and** under Maximum Impervious Coverage so it would read: **The following amount shall be added to the uses in the RS Residential District Category: 75%.** Mr. Evans noted in the line below that we could add: **The following amount shall be added to the uses in the RR Residential District category: 50%.** Mr. Evans mentioned by making that change it would cover what we are looking to do tonight.

Ms. Reuscher seconded the motion.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The amendment passed.

President Reynolds remarked they will have discussion on the bill.

Mr. Evans asked if this will go back to our Planning Commission and then to the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission and then come back to Council, in that order.

President Reynolds queried if this is a situation by which we would need to vote to send this back and for clarification what Council would be voting on in this matter.

Solicitor Spirk replied it is to vote on First Reading for this proposed Ordinance as amended and nothing more need be done by this Council.

President Reynolds inquired if a vote to either Table the Bill or vote against the Bill would restart the process of considering the bill as well.

Solicitor Spirk replied no. He continued, to Table the Ordinance or to continue it until a future date or a certain date, would just merely stop everything. If the Administration chose to proceed or initiate the process they could, but it would not be dependent on this Council's action.

President Reynolds remarked he is not entirely comfortable voting on the Ordinance as amended at the moment based on the amount of discussion that has taken place tonight. There were several questions and what this amendment would mean. President Reynolds stated he did vote for the amendment because he does think there is some promise here as far as making a change. He continued, if it is the will of Council to move forward and vote on the Bill as amended tonight, he understands, but noted that in voting on the Bill as amended requires the Ordinance to go through the entire process again as required by the Pennsylvania Municipal Code. President Reynolds does not think this is a bad idea and ultimately this is something Council should consider. In addition, he also felt that with Council's questions this evening, and Ms. Heller's and Ms. Karner's answers, while supportive, it still left the window open for some things they were not sure of because they did not have the time to consider this amendment.

Mr. Recchiuti asked for clarification of the process. He queried if the Ordinance was voted on tonight for the first time, would it go back to our Planning Commission and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission, and thereafter Council would vote on it a second time for final passage?

Solicitor Spirk replied yes, it would have to go through the Planning Commission.

Mr. Recchiuti noted that Council would then have to vote on this again for final passage before the 50% maximum impervious coverage in the RR District would be the law.

Solicitor Spirk stated absolutely.

Mr. Recchiuti stated he shares President Reynolds' concerns. He does believe 50% is reasonable but he is not sure if we should be rushing this process without vetting it through the Planning Commission further. He does not know how many lots we have that can be developed in an RR district. He pointed out that existing development would be grandfathered in unless you are going to be adding onto a house, building a garage or adding other amenities. Mr. Recchiuti mentioned even adding a patio would have an impact, thus these are all things to consider. He continued before we vote on this tonight, we need to consider that we are in the Spring construction season and how the Ordinance would impact existing permits. Mr. Recchiuti pointed out we do have a second opportunity to vote on this before it is finalized but queried if we would have to hold a public hearing again.

Solicitor Spirk replied yes.

President Reynolds inquired if Council would postpone the first vote until April 7 would we need to vote once to amend this or would we have to vote twice.

Solicitor Spirk noted if Council were amending the Ordinance, it would vote once on April 7.

President Reynolds pointed out if they were amending the Ordinance on April 7 it would allow the three weeks between meetings for further exploration. President Reynolds noted if it was a situation by which the Administration came back after looking at this more closely and thought the current number was accurate, we could then vote on it on April 7 and April 21 without having to start the whole process over. If it is something that is agreed upon by the Administration and Council on April 7 that 50% is a workable percentage, then we could start that process over. President Reynolds noted if we vote on this tonight to amend the Ordinance and send the process back, then it is worth waiting three weeks for the Administration to come back to Council after there has been more exploration of these questions. He understands that they could not answer all the questions this evening and after further review, they could suggest the current number they recommend is the appropriate percentage. President Reynolds mentioned it is his feeling that action on the Ordinance be postponed until April 7, with no real loss, and it would keep all the options open for Council and the Administration.

Mr. Evans stated he is not interested in rushing the Ordinance either. He feels confident with the 50% in the RR District and the 75% in the RS District, and that they will work but he wants to make sure we hear all the answers and do all the due diligence with this matter. Mr. Evans then wondered if the Planning Commission and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission would have met, had this on their agenda to discuss, and have an answer for us by April 7.

Ms. Heller stated no, not by April 7th. She added that City Planning Commission meets on the second Thursday of every month so that will not be before the April 7 Council Meeting. Ms. Heller added that the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission has 30 days to review because they only meet once a month and are bound by the PA Municipal Planning Code to have 30 days to review. We would not have those comments before April 7th. Ms. Heller stated they have done some research into what other communities do and what we thought were reasonable impervious coverage percentages. We put forth what the City Planning Commission felt was a reasonable proposal. She continued, if Council is inclined to revise the percentage of impervious coverage then is what the City would follow in the future.

Ms. Karner pointed out until they have some kind of limitation, and have the ability to collect the data as people come in for permits, they will not have the answers for Council. She noted, at 75% they at least have a reason to ask for the information. If we do nothing, the property owners have unlimited coverage. She continued, if it takes us another four months to get through the process again, the impervious coverage remains unlimited, and then we will still not have the data for Council on a recommendation of 50% or 75%. Ms. Karner remarked they are caught in a

loop of not having the ability to collect the necessary data to really show Council what the coverage is today; who is coming in to ask for greater coverage, and the reason for the request.

President Reynolds mentioned they could postpone this to a future date or they could Table the Ordinance.

Mr. Evans related with the amendment that they now voted on, the Planning Commission now has something to look at and provide feedback even if we do not vote on the Ordinance tonight. He added, we could get the thoughts from the Planning Commission and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. Mr. Evans believes that Council needs to look at what is in place in the surrounding communities. There are some communities that do not have impervious coverage limitations and those that do have provisions have it around 50%, thus it makes sense to take the maximum impervious coverage in the RR District to 50%. Mr. Evans thinks the 50% in RR Districts and the 75% in RS Districts are good numbers and this is what he would support. He noted, he understands the timeline and concerns. Mr. Evans concluded, we need to come up with a date to bring this back to Council after we hear from the Planning Commission.

President Reynolds thinks there are several options and requested Solicitor Spirk to review them as far as Tabling, Postponing or choosing a specific date for the Ordinance to come back to Council. He stated, if it were not such a cumbersome process, as far as going to the Planning Commissions, it would not be as important for us to keep open all of our options.

Solicitor Spirk explained if there is a Motion and a second to Table that would merely freeze the status quo and the Bill as amended would just remain until Council chose to put it back on the agenda, if ever. If Council moves and seconds to Table then that Motion is not debatable. Once there is a motion and a second to Table, they would have to vote immediately. Solicitor Spirk noted, on the other hand, if Council would move to postpone to a future date, they would not have to pick that date; they could just move to postpone this until a future date. If there is a second to that motion, this would be debatable. Both options have the same affect in terms of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Waldron asked if it would be possible to pass the Ordinance as is for First Reading this evening and have only the amendment reviewed by the Planning Commission. He inquired if we passed the Ordinance at 75%, could we then have the Commission review the amendment at 50%, or does it have to be reviewed in its entirety.

Solicitor Spirk stated Council would have to re-amend it because as it stands right now it is 50% in the RR District because Council has already made an amendment to the Ordinance. If Council would vote on this tonight they would be voting on the amended version, which is at 50%.

Mr. Waldron noted they should have had this discussion before hand.

President Reynolds remarked they could vote to Table the Ordinance or Postpone action and if we wanted to go back on April 7, we could just amend it at that time.

Mr. Callahan made the motion to Table the Ordinance and President Reynolds seconded the motion.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. Bill No. 17-2015 was Tabled.

C. *Bill No. 18 - 2015 - Amending Zoning Ordinance - Article 1319.01 - Off Street Parking*

The Clerk read Bill No. 18 - 2015 - Amending Zoning Ordinance - Article 1319.01 - Off Street Parking, sponsored by Ms. Reuscher and Mr. Stellato and titled:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ARTICLE 1319.01
OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE
CITY OF BETHLEHEM, PENNSYLVANIA, AS AMENDED,
ENTITLED REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. Bill No. 18 - 2015 was passed on First Reading.

D. *Bill No. 19 – 2015 – Amending Community & Economic Development Budget*

The Clerk read Bill No. 19 – 2015 – Amending Community & Economic sponsored by Ms. Reuscher and Mr. Stellato and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, AMENDING
THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BUDGET FOR 2015

Mr. Recchiuti stated later on he will be announcing a Finance Committee Meeting where this will be reviewed. Historically this would have been reviewed at a Finance Committee Meeting before First Reading. However, the Community and Economic Development Department sent this to Council on Wednesday and there was not enough time since they have a deadline of April 10, 2015 to comply with Federal Regulations. Mr. Recchiuti noted, since Ordinances are required to have two readings it will be voted on tonight at First Reading and then we will have the Finance Committee Meeting. Mr. Recchiuti asked that in the future he hopes we can avoid this problem and get this to Council sooner.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. Bill No. 19 – 2015 was passed on First Reading.

9. RESOLUTIONS

A. *Approve Hiring – Water Filtration Maintenance Supervisor*

Mr. Recchiuti and Mr. Stellato sponsored Resolution No. 2015-48 that approves the filling of the position of Maintenance Supervisor at the Water Filtration Plant in the Water and Sewer Bureau.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. the Resolution passed.

B. *Approve Hiring – Wastewater Treatment Plant Maintenance Supervisor*

Mr. Recchiuti and Mr. Stellato sponsored Resolution No. 2015-49 that approves the filling of the position of Maintenance Supervisor at the Wastewater Treatment Plant in the Water and Sewer Bureau.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. the Resolution passed.

C. *Approve Hiring – Meter Shop Foreman*

Mr. Recchiuti and Mr. Stellato sponsored Resolution No. 2015-50 that approves the filling of the position of the Meter Shop Foreman in Water and Sewer Resources.

Mr. Recchiuti recalled during the budget discussions when this position became open due to retirement there was potential for a contraction in this position. He continued there was going to be another position that was changed and inquired if that is what is before us now.

Edward Boscola, Director of Water and Sewer replied yes. The impetus for doing some reorganization in the Meter Shop is going to be when we move to the Radio Read project, which is installing all new water meters that will have the capability for automatic meter reading. Mr. Boscola reported as of now we have a group of meter readers that still go around the City and read the meters. We are starting to investigate the program this year and foresee this will take a few years to implement the program. Mr. Boscola added the City has been talking to some of our neighboring utilities that have already implemented this program. The City has 35,000 water utility customers so it will take several years to replace all of those meters and transition over to a new organization. In the interim, they still need to staff that department and at the moment the Customer Service Manager is trying to juggle customer billing as well as the Meter Shop. He continued, it is getting cumbersome for her to manage both responsibilities. Mr. Boscola stated this individual needs help at the Meter Repair Shop.

Mr. Recchiuti recalls the plan was for the Customer Service Supervisor to take over both departments to see if it would be viable to manage both roles.

Mr. Boscola stated the one thing they did was to downsize the pay scale for the Meter Shop Supervisor. The pay rate was a 25TAMS and now it is a 23TAMS position. This is to bring it more in line with the other Supervisor in the Billing Department. Mr. Boscola noted this way they have two Supervisors at the same pay scale. The vision is that ultimately when we get the Radio Read water meters, there will perhaps be some cross training and some consolidation of staffing in both the meter and billing departments. He noted, they will be starting a pilot program this year to install some of the Radio Read meters with some of the large customers to see how it will work, but the transition for the entire City will take a few years. Mr. Boscola mentioned it took Easton Suburban, which is a comparable size utility, about 10 years to do that transition. He noted, part of their delay was because they use to be a suburban company and then they bought the Easton City proper utility, which took a few years to complete that transition. Mr. Boscola stated we hope it does not take that long for us but it will give us an idea that it will take a few years.

President Reynolds stated he had a question about some of these hiring positions. He mentioned, when we had our budget conversations last year there was discussion of the elimination of some of these positions. It was the Administration's request, followed through by Council, that as we proceeded through 2015, the Administration would review what positions may or may not be necessary. President Reynolds queried if someone might be able to comment on what positions have been left open.

David Brong, Business Administrator stated it is safe to say that they have all been left open with the exception of those that have been approved by Council since the beginning of the year.

President Reynolds asked which positions are open.

Mr. Brong informed he does not have those details but we are obligated to come forth and propose these hires to Council, which we have done consistently. He continued, he is not certain if there are any positions still open but believes they have all come before Council. Mr. Brong added as part of the budget, we did budget seven fewer staff members in the City than in 2014 and have been consistently and diligently getting as lean as practical with the workforce. Mr. Brong stated he was the one who represented to Council that there was potential in that Meter Shop Supervisor position and this is something we were going to look at. Mr. Brong informed what Council has heard from Mr. Boscola was something we do not hear enough of, and that is a management expectation of investment and efficiency. From his standpoint it does not get better than that to hear of a vision that is going to lead to efficiency. Mr. Brong noted, unfortunately, it is not immediate, but there is a plan and that is far better than no plan, and far better than no expectation of change in efficiency.

President Reynolds stated this was not so much about this particular position. He noted, during the 2015 budget process, due to the time constraints, the budget was released before the early retirement date had been set, and there were more retirements that came in after that time. It had been the will of Council to see if we could find a further way to reduce that tax increase. There was not necessarily the reduction as expected by the Administration. Mr. Reynolds requested a list of the budgeted open positions from Mr. Brong to be sent to Council in the next few days.

Mr. Recchiuti mentioned that he would like to have a discussion on this at the next Finance Committee Meeting, which is scheduled for March 31, 2015.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The Resolution passed.

D. Authorize Contract – Steven G. Lowry & Associates – Penn Forest Dam SCADA System

Mr. Stellato and Mr. Recchiuti sponsored Resolution No. 2015-51 that authorized the execution of a contract with Steven G. Lowry & Associates, Inc. for the Pen Forest Dam SCADA System.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The Resolution passed.

E. *Authorize Contract – Let’s Think Wireless – Trunking Radio System – Microwave Replacement Project*

Ms. Reuscher and Mr. Stellato sponsored Resolution No. 2015-52 that authorized the execution of a contract with Let’s Think Wireless, Inc. for the microwave replacement for the radio system and city data network.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The Resolution passed.

Motion – Considering Resolutions 9 F through 9 J as a Group – Certificates of Appropriateness

Mr. Waldron and Mr. Callahan moved to consider Resolutions 9 F through 9 J as a group.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The Motion passed.

F. *Certificate of Appropriateness – 701 East Fourth Street*

Mr. Stellato and Mr. Recchiuti sponsored Resolution 2015-53 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new signage in the display window at 701 East Fourth Street.

G. *Certificate of Appropriateness – 328 Polk Street*

Mr. Stellato and Mr. Recchiuti sponsored Resolution 2015-54 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows, re-roof the rear portion of the house and re-stucco areas on the front and rear of the house at 328 Polk Street.

H. *Certificate of Appropriateness – 220 East Third Street*

Mr. Stellato and Mr. Recchiuti sponsored Resolution 2015-55 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a new sign on the exterior of the building and vinyl door lettering at 220 East Third Street.

I. *Certificate of Appropriateness – 208 East Fourth Street*

Mr. Stellato and Mr. Recchiuti sponsored Resolution 2015-56 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a dormer addition to the rear portion of the third floor of a single family residential structure at 208 East Fourth Street.

J. *Certificate of Appropriateness – 1 East Fourth Street*

Mr. Stellato and Mr. Recchiuti sponsored Resolution 2015-57 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install signs at 1 East Fourth Street.

Voting AYE on Resolutions 9 F through 9 J: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The Resolutions passed.

K. *Approve Grant Application – DCNR Community Conservation Partnerships Program Grant Application*

Mr. Recchiuti and Mr. Stellato sponsored Resolution No. 2015-58 that approved the Grant Application for the DCNR Community Conservation Partnerships Program.

Mr. Evans mentioned the next three Resolutions, 9K, 9L and 9M, are somewhat tied together and related to the Monocacy Creek Bridge. He asked Ralph Carp, Director of Parks and Public Property, for a brief explanation of this project and associated potential grants.

Mr. Carp informed the bridge that is the subject matter of these Resolutions, is the bridge that is almost directly beneath the Main Street off ramp, where it would connect the parking lot under the Main Street Bridge to Historic Bethlehem, near the Waterworks building. Mr. Carp

informed the current footbridge is in the last stages of its life. We have a rather unique project repurposing an historic bridge structure that was actually manufactured in 1881 and is being readapted to use in this area. Mr. Carp noted they are looking for some grant money to replace the present foot bridge.

Mr. Evans asked the timeframe for this project and if it will be installed this summer.

Mr. Carp stated this grant will not be awarded until later this year so most likely construction will be in 2016.

Mr. Recchiuti noted Mr. Carp mentioned the current bridge is in its last stages of life and queried if will it survive Musikfest.

Mr. Carp stated he does believe it will.

Mr. Recchiuti queried to confirm that they will be repurposing an existing bridge.

Mr. Carp replied yes, we are able to salvage a bridge that was in storage in the D & L yard at Hugh Moore Park. It was in storage there for about 25 years, and was going to be scrapped. We identified this bridge structure; did some research, and found it was actually an historical bridge to the region. He stated it is only one of two known existing Bow String Truss style bridges left, and it was manufactured in 1881 in Philadelphia. Mr. Carp added they would like to repurpose this bridge and replace the bridge that is there with an historical steel bridge. Mr. Carp sees this as a unique project and would be a great compliment to Historic Bethlehem.

Mr. Evans remarked this is asking the DCNR for a grant, and then the matching dollars would come from the Northampton County Open Space Initiative fund. Mr. Evans inquired whether there is there is anything coming from the NUCI or the Bonds.

Mr. Carp stated not at this time. We are expecting to put together some community partners that would potentially include Arts Quest, Historic Bethlehem Partnership, the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor with some initial feasibility and design work, the DCNR in Northampton County and Lehigh County because the bridge sits at the County borders, and other interested parties.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The Resolution passed.

L. Approve Grant Application – Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor Grant Application

Mr. Recchiuti and Mr. Stellato sponsored Resolution No. 2015-59 that approved the D & L mini grant for funds to be appropriated for feasibility studies.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The Resolution passed.

M. Approve Grant Application – Northampton County Open Space Initiative Grant Application

Mr. Recchiuti and Mr. Stellato sponsored Resolution No. 2015-60 that approved the Northampton County Open Space Initiative Grant Application.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The Resolution passed.

N. Authorize Use Permit Agreement – Work to Live d/b/a Run Lehigh Valley – Brew to Brew Run Event

Mr. Recchiuti and Mr. Stellato sponsored Resolution No. 2015-61 that authorized a Use Permit Agreement for public property with Work to Live, LLC d/b/a Run Lehigh Valley for Nevin Place for the Brew to Brew Run Event April 18, 2015.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The Resolution passed.

O. *Authorize Contract – Motorola Solutions – 911 Trunking Radio System Software Upgrade*

Mr. Stellato and Ms. Reuscher sponsored Resolution No. 2015-62 that authorized the execution of a contract with Motorola Solutions Inc for the Radio System Software Upgrade 7.7 to 7.14.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The Resolution passed.

P. *Resolution Opposing the PennEast Pipeline Project as Currently Proposed*

President Reynolds mentioned he will now accept a motion to add to the Agenda a Resolution opposing the PennEast Pipeline project as currently proposed.

Ms. Reuscher made the motion and Mr. Callahan seconded the motion.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The motion passed.

Ms. Reuscher knows many in this room are familiar with the PennEast Pipeline project, which is being proposed to cross just south of the reservoir where the City of Bethlehem gets our water. The City of Bethlehem has already submitted comments to the Federal Energy Regulation Commission (FERC). Ms. Reuscher pointed out this Resolution is to oppose the current route of the pipeline as we feel this puts the City water supply in danger.

Ms. Reuscher and Mr. Recchiuti sponsored Resolution 2015-63 opposing the PennEast Pipeline Project as currently proposed.

Mr. Recchiuti knows this was brought up earlier. The Bethlehem Authority did authorize their Solicitor to enter his appearance with FERC, and is monitoring the situation. They also hired a consulting engineer to review and advise the plan. Mr. Recchiuti supports this Resolution and agrees with the Mayor's letter. He noted he believes this is a good letter, and he is happy to support this Resolution. Mr. Recchiuti inquired how big our transmission line is. His concern is about a 36 inch pipeline going over our line.

Mr. Boscola noted we have dual transmission mains. He thinks in the area where PennEast is talking about crossing over, our mains are about 30 inches in diameter. Mr. Boscola reported the gas pipeline is one-36 inch pipe.

Mr. Recchiuti asked how deep our pipes are and if the gas pipeline would go over or under ours.

Mr. Boscola informed they have had some initial discussions with PennEast on this matter. As currently proposed, the one possible crossover location is in the area of Route 209, in Carbon County. He noted, our pipeline is actually a tunnel which goes through that hill. In that area our pipe is actually very deep.

Mr. Boscola remarked our line goes through two tunnels: one is at Blue Mountain and travels under the ski resort; the other is further north in the area of Route 209 where we go through a tunnel. In that location, our lines are actually very deep. Mr. Boscola is not certain of the actual elevation, but he would say our transmission lines are dozens of feet below surface. This is one area that could be one potential crossover point where the gas line would actually be much closer to the surface. The PennEast line may only be four to six or eight feet deep, but would be much farther above our transmission main.

Mr. Recchiuti continued and mentioned the right-of-way they will need and asked how wide are they proposing for the right-of-way.

Mr. Boscola stated the construction easement they need to install the line might be on the order of 70 feet or 100 feet.

Ms. Reuscher mentioned it is 100 feet.

Mr. Boscola continued to say this would be to build it and install it because they need a wide enough space to dig the hole and get the equipment through there. Once they are done the final permanent easement he believes is only 50 feet.

Mr. Recchiuti mentioned this area would have to clear of trees and everything. Mr. Boscola replied yes, there are requirements.

Mr. Recchiuti asked if we have any other pipelines going across our line right now. Mr. Boscola stated yes.

Mr. Recchiuti remembers something going in a few years ago that was maybe the Monroe County Authority.

Mr. Boscola reported there is an existing gas transmission main in much the same location in the watershed where PennEast wants to run their gas mains.

Mr. Recchiuti asked how big that is. Mr. Boscola explained that he does not know and added this has probably been there for decades.

Mr. Recchiuti wondered if it was there before our water source.

Mr. Boscola could not say and noted we have had the watershed for 75 years but he does not know the age of the existing gas main.

Mr. Recchiuti asked if that is the only one we have currently and Mr. Boscola stated it is the only one he knows about, of any size.

President Reynolds added this Resolution is the first step in what could potentially be a stronger involvement, not just by City Council but by the Administration and the City as a whole. He believes this is not just about the pipeline, it is about the City of Bethlehem and one of our most prized possessions is our drinking water, which is valued by our residents. President Reynolds thinks it is ridiculous that this pipeline could go through the center of our land. This land is probably not just our most valuable land financially, but also our most valuable land environmentally and has provided high quality water for Bethlehem through the years and will continue to do so into the future. President Reynolds informed many people who are familiar with this process understand the uphill battle it is challenging the FERC. He knows the Bethlehem Authority has been on top of this issue. City Council is willing to join the Administration and the Authority in whatever is the best option to try to find a way to move the pipeline, at the very least, to much less environmentally sensitive land, if not stop it all together.

Mr. Callahan asked if we sold some of this property for carbon credits.

Mr. Brong replied no. He there is an environmental easement that was an agreement, which was entered into in order to participate in The Nature Conservancy's Working Woodlands Program. We did not sell any land for that purpose.

Mr. Callahan recalled Disney or another Florida entity that entered an agreement to purchase carbon credits in lieu of us not ever developing this land or do any type of building.

Mr. Brong informed that is the environmental easement.

Mr. Callahan asked if that is part of that area the pipeline is going through and Mr. Brong stated yes.

Mr. Callahan asked how they can legally do this.

Mr. Brong informed he is unaware of the specific path of the pipeline at this point, so he cannot comment on that.

Mr. Recchiuti asked Mayor Donchez if he instructed City Solicitor Leeson to enter his appearance with FERC or is he planning to do this in the future.

Mayor Donchez remarked that he does share the concern Council has, and his memorandum dated February 25, 2015 outlines 10 or 12 recommendations and concerns. Mayor Donchez added, he

is waiting for the recommendation from the Bethlehem Water Authority. He added he has his personal opinion but he is waiting for that recommendation. Mayor Donchez reported that they will be meeting with Mr. Boscola and our Legal Bureau to determine our next point of action.

Mr. Recchiuti asked Mayor Donchez to keep Council advised of this and Mayor Donchez replied that he would keep City Council informed.

Mr. Callahan asked if we can have our Legal Bureau look at the area that was purchased for the carbon credits to see if the pipeline is going in that area. Those carbon credits are also part of a Federal program.

Mr. Brong stated that is true and he is sure that the legal counsel for the Bethlehem Authority either has done that already or is in the process of doing that. Mr. Brong mentioned that question should be answered but he cannot answer it at this time.

Voting AYE: Mr. Waldron, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Evans, Mr. Recchiuti, Ms. Reuscher, Mr. Stellato, and Mr. Reynolds, 7. The Resolution passed.

10. NEW BUSINESS.

Committee Meeting Announcements

Chairman Recchiuti announced a Finance Committee Meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 31, 2015 at 7 p.m. in the Mayor's Conference Room and the subject will be Transfer of Funds and Budget Adjustments.

Steve Schmitt

Ms. Reuscher mentioned she wanted to take a moment to recognize Steve Schmitt, a great man who passed away this weekend. Mr. Schmitt was the Director of the Coalition for Appropriate Transportation (CAT) for over 20 years. He had a lot of passion about the issues of climate change and air pollution. Ms. Reuscher noted he had a strategy of localizing it and making it something that you and I could do something about. He was such a caring person and in her opinion he was a genius. Mr. Schmitt was recognized by the DEP for his work on air quality. Ms. Reuscher pointed out he was also incredibly humble. Ms. Reuscher continued, when the LANTA station on Guetter Street was full of trash, Mr. Schmitt personally went out there and cleaned up the area. She added that when people were nervous to ride their bicycles in traffic, including herself, he rode right behind her. He was a great man and a friend. Ms. Reuscher stated she personally will miss him. Ms. Reuscher suggests that everyone honor this man by taking their bicycle to work one day this week.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT.

Art Project

Elaine Chen, a Graduate Student at Lehigh University mentioned that she wanted to ask everyone at this meeting what they want to do before they die. As Ms. Reuscher mentioned before, people pass suddenly. She would like to introduce a project called: Before I Die, I want to..... This is a public art project started by a designer named Candy Chang. Ms. Chen handed out an informational paper to Council regarding the project. This is actually a wall entitled: Before I Die, I want to... and leaving blanks for people to write their thoughts. This project has been in 70 countries, over 500 walls globally, and today she wanted to announce this project to City Council to see if we can make this happen in Bethlehem. Ms. Chen believes this is a very good way to reflect on our lives and a good place to share our personal aspirations, and also to make peoples voices heard. She has been living in Bethlehem for almost three years and she loves this City. She added, this is the most important motivation that pushes her to bring the project to the City's attention. Ms. Chen has contacted Candy Chang's team to get permission from them to introduce this wall to the City of Bethlehem. She would like to get permission to use City property or any public area where there is heavy foot traffic for people to stand and write on the walls. Depending on public space availability she would move forward and see if she can obtain financial support from the City to make this happen.

President Reynolds suggested she speak to Mr. Carp, Director of Parks and Public Property, and set up a meeting with him to know what public land would be most available for this type of project.

Rail Authority

Kirk Raup, 818 West Union Boulevard, mentioned he would like to speak about the Rail project he has spoken about at past meetings. Mr. Raup noted after the last Council Meeting the Mayor was kind enough to call him the next day to let him know that he and the Mayors of Allentown and Easton have discussed this during their monthly breakfast meetings. He is very pleased to know that they are talking about this but just wants to see what direction they are going in with this subject.

Mr. Raup wanted to ask President Reynolds if he is willing to put the Rail issue on the Agenda before Council again so that he can see what he is or is not looking for in this matter. Mr. Raup stated he is especially interested considering the position that Senator Lisa Boscola has taken to seek funding for this measure if we decide to move forward. Mr. Raup mentioned this is something we can and should do together along with Allentown and Easton. This issue itself, he believes, is important enough to Bethlehem and the rest of the Lehigh Valley to be discussed in an open and public way and work out some things, including any misunderstandings. Mr. Raup noted for example, the memo that he asked the Mayor to retract from last May contains many things that are not factual; the Mayor was just mistaken. Mr. Raup would like the chance to show exactly what is wrong with the Mayor's position on the matter. He wants to address this directly and finally get through this impasse we've had for the past year. Mr. Raup informed this has gone nowhere since last May and he would like to ask that this go before Council as was the intention last May and again in August when he met with Mr. Callahan's Committee. Mr. Raup added there is money in Harrisburg, which is what Senator Boscola has committed to pursue for this project. He noted, since it is flexible funding many other people apply for these funds as well. Mr. Raup reiterated he is asking President Reynolds if he is willing to put this on the agenda for discussion.

President Reynolds reported he will turn to the Administration for an update of the conversations with the City of Easton and the City of Allentown as to where this potential Rail Authority is with the other cities.

Mayor Donchez stated the Mayors of Allentown and Easton and a few from our and their Administrations have had two meetings on this issue. They have another meeting planned next month and talks are progressing with the issue that Mr. Raup referenced this evening. Mayor Donchez informed that is all he will say at this time.

Mr. Raup asked President Reynolds if he could add this to the Council agenda so this may be discussed. It is frustrating that he has just five minutes each time he comes to a Council Meeting to bring this up and not have a discussion with Council, regardless of what the Mayor decides to do or not do. Mr. Raup noted this is the process that is supposed to take place.

President Reynolds mentioned generally the Courtesy of the Floor is not an opportunity to go back and forth regarding an issue. However, he will say that Council is going to wait until Allentown, Bethlehem and Easton and the larger group comes up with a plan as far as what to do here. This is not something that Council will be taking on until the Administration of Allentown, Easton and Bethlehem comes together with a plan.

Mr. Raup mentioned that is one of the misconceptions that he is trying to correct. He stated he is not asking Bethlehem to take on this project. This would be a completely separate entity, separate from any of the cities, with no financial or legal liability. Mr. Raup noted the problem is he cannot do this on his own. He continued he does have a plan but he just cannot form this organization on his own.

Art Project; Greenway; Billboard; Boards and Commissions Meeting Minutes

Stephen Antalics, 737 Ridge Street, noted we are very fortunate that people like Ms. Chen come into our City for an education, fall in love with the City, and come up with very innovative ideas. Mr. Antalics believes the City should really support what she has to say this evening. He envisioned people in nursing homes going to that wall and believes it would energize them to have their views made public on a permanent basis. He stated this project is a great idea.

Mr. Antalics queried if there is any Ordinance or rule preventing advertising of the Greenway. He mentioned when he drives south over the Minsi Trail Bridge to Daly Avenue there is a massive sign facing the bridge advertising another casino. Mr. Antalics sees this as a blur to the City. He does not see the Greenway used as an advertising agency for commercial enterprises. He wonders if Council is aware there is that sign and thinks it should be taken down. Mr. Antalics added, if it is there because it gives money to the City he thinks that is hurting the Greenway and its purpose, because the sign is not attractive to the Greenway. Mr. Antalics asked if signage or advertisements are allowed on the Greenway. He received a phone call from someone asking if he would look into the matter, which was brought before the South Bethlehem Historic Commission. He tried to look into it but cannot because he is not being told there are minutes taken at these meetings. Mr. Antalics has checked with City Hall and he has not received an answer. In addition, he has checked with the Chair of the Commission and has not received an answer either. He queried if Commissions and Boards are required to take minutes at their meetings. Mr. Antalics noted there could be a legal issue. He noted, if there are no minutes then it becomes word of mouth. He wondered if the Commissions and Boards who are not taking minutes should be required to do so for the public interest, so people, like himself, can do research. Mr. Antalics suggests the Administration or City Council look into the commercialization of the Greenway and also whether Boards and Commissions are required to keep minutes so that the public is free to review them if there is an issue. Mr. Antalics thinks this will come up at a later time once he gets more information on this matter. He would appreciate answers to his two questions.

Impervious Coverage

Tim Rippert, 1039 Decatur Street, stated he wanted to commend the person in the second row for bringing attention to Bill No. 17 regarding the proposed Ordinance that relates to Maximum Impervious Coverage. Mr. Rippert believes nothing would have been done and it would have been passed if this man had not stressed his views to Council. Mr. Rippert commended President Reynolds, Councilman Recchiuti and Councilman Evans for putting one foot forward before the other Council Members to reduce the impervious coverage. Mr. Rippert thinks that Council should listen to more research. He believes that the Planning Commission should research this so Council can have more information in front of them to make a better decision. Mr. Rippert then mentioned the water runoff and wondered where it would go. Mr. Rippert noted, this needs to be studied further before something is put forward because he does see water coming down the street and coming up out of the man hole covers due of the amount of water flow during a rain event.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

ATTEST: