

LEHIGH TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

September 22, 2026

7:00 p.m.

- I. CALL TO ORDER. The Lehigh Township Board of Supervisors held their second monthly meeting on Tuesday, September 22, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was held at the Lehigh Township Municipal Building, 1069 Municipal Road, Walnutport. Chairman Mike Jones called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance and roll call.

Present: Cindy Miller
David Hess
Janet Sheats
Jerry Pritchard
Mike Jones
Alice Rehrig
David Backenstoe

Prior to starting the meeting, the Chairman announced the Board met in executive session to conduct interviews. There was no action taken.

- II. 2027 BUDGET AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN. Alice Rehrig provided the Board with an updated budget which includes the grant receipts that are expected and the related expenses. The year to date numbers have also been updated to include September.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- A. September 8, 2026. Jerry Pritchard made a motion to approve these minutes. Cindy Miller seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE BILLS

- A. General Fund Checks 29926 to 29959. Janet Sheats made a motion to approve these bills. Cindy Miller seconded the motion. Cindy Miller questioned Check 29933 to Data Works. Alice Rehrig commented that was the final payment under a grant that was obtained two years ago to update the Police Department's records management system to be able to accommodate the State NIBRS reporting that will be in place next year. This amount will be reimbursed by PCCD. Jerry Pritchard questioned if the payments to Attorney Ettinger will bring him up to date. Alice Rehrig confirmed they would. Cindy Miller questioned what type of overage is being paid under Check 29958. Alice Rehrig commented typically we do not get charged for the dumpsters, but if they are overloaded or have excess weight, we do get an overage charge. The overage can be the result of the amount of use or people bringing their household garbage to the park. Jerry Pritchard commented he is bothered by the bills that are being charged by Attorney Ettinger. It seems like the amount of preliminary reviews

are excessive. If you look at our Board solicitors, this one seems to be the highest amount, but doesn't believe he does the most work for the Township. All voted aye. Motion carried.

- B. State Fund Checks 1662 & 1663. Janet Sheats made a motion to approve these checks. David Hess seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.

V. PLANNING RELATED ITEMS

A. Reconsideration of Extension of Time for Conditional Use Approval

1. BWC Hokendauqua Creek, LLC. Cindy Miller questioned why this was on the agenda when a vote was taken last meeting to deny the extension and they should come back under public comment for discussion. Janet Sheats commented she had contacted Attorney Backenstoe and asked if they could be placed on the agenda since the vote that was taken died because there was not a full Board. Attorney Backenstoe commented any Board member can place an item on the agenda. Cindy Miller questioned why a vote was taken at the last meeting to not place it on the agenda. Jerry Pritchard questioned why we wouldn't want to place items on the agenda. Cindy Miller commented it not a matter of not wanting things on the agenda, but at the last meeting they were denied and told to come in under public comment; that was the vote. So now, a Supervisor can call and ignore a vote that was taken and place an item on the agenda. The motion that was made at the last meeting was, Attorney Reynosa requested this be tabled until the next meeting. Jerry Pritchard made a motion to table this until the next meeting. Cindy Miller commented this project was already denied twice. How many times do we have applicants keep coming back to the Board? They could have started this over the last two years. Janet Sheats seconded the motion. Jerry Pritchard and Janet Sheats voted aye. Cindy Miller was opposed. Motion did not carry. Attorney Backenstoe commented the applicant can always reappear during public comment. Her question is, should this be on the agenda or should it be under public comment. Jerry Prithard commented what is the difference between appearing now or appearing later. Cindy Miller questioned why a vote was even taken, they could have been told come back to the next meeting. Mike Jones noted the request was not denied; the motion didn't carry. Cindy Miller commented maybe the Board needs to be more careful as to how they take votes and why they are voting on things. Why did the Board even go through the process? She wants to understand how we are moving forward. If we vote on something and it doesn't get tabled to go on the agenda, she can then call to have it placed back on the agenda. Mike Jones commented in his opinion, if something was not voted down, then yes.

Attorney Backenstoe commented in the past, any Board member has always had the right to place things on the agenda. He understands that there wasn't a full

Board of Supervisors Minutes
September 22, 2026

Board and received a call from Janet Sheats questioning if she can place this back on the agenda, and he told her he thinks she can. She could contact the Chairman to see if he had an objection and he believes Mike Jones was of the opinion that any Board member can add things to the agenda. Cindy Miller commented if there are only three members present, why have a meeting and not just move everything to the next agenda.

The Conditional Use approval for this project expires October 9, 2026. The applicant is requesting a one year extension of time. Attorney Dean Reynosa and Brian O'Neill were present to represent this project. Janet Sheats commented she believes if all of this information was provided the first time they appeared before the Board, the motion would have passed. Brian O'Neill commented this is why they regrouped and provided the outline of completing the project and would submit the land development plan by the end of the year. Cindy Miller commented they have not even submitted their land development plan.

Attorney Backenstoe commented they need to obtain their permits in order to meet the requirements of the conditional use which is why they are requesting a one year extension. They will submit their land development plan by the end of the year and it will take some time to get through the planning process and they are not able to obtain their permits until the planning process is complete. They expect it will take until next summer to get through planning and not receive their permit until fall. If they don't submit a land development plan by the end of the year, then the project is done.

Mike Jones questioned what Moore Township's position was. Brian O'Neill commented they are at the point in Moore Township where they could receive conditional approval, but they will not do that until they receive comments from Lehigh Township. Their engineer deferred the stormwater management to Lehigh Township. They figured once they submit to Lehigh Township and get a round or two of comments, he would then go back to Moore Township for the conditional approval.

Janet Sheats commented she is considering six months so that there would be better communications between the applicant and the Township. Attorney Reynosa commented it would be impossible to get the permit within six months. Janet Sheats commented she understands, but would prefer having them return in six months to see where things are with the project. Cindy Miller commented this project was approved two years ago. They should be done by now and they haven't even come to Planning yet. Attorney Backenstoe commented it would be extremely difficult to get through planning in a shorter time frame. He believes it will take them a year. The Board can say they want to see the submission by

December and come back in six months and see where they are. If they have moved forward in good faith, then the Board would understand that they in good faith would give them the additional extension of six months to get the permit. The other option would be to give them the one year extension provided they submit the land development plan by the end of the year.

Janet Sheats made a motion to grant them an extension of time until March 31, 2027, conditioned upon them submitting a land development plan by December 31, 2026. Jerry Pritchard seconded the motion. Michele Hopkins questioned if that includes the decommissioning plan they are required to submit. Attorney Backenstoe commented that is part of the conditional approval and the planning process. Jerry Pritchard, Janet Sheats, Mike Jones, and David Hess voted aye. Cindy Miller was opposed. Motion carried.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Resolution 2026-21, Establishing Procedures and Time Limits for Public Comment.

There were two resolutions that were created outlining guidelines for public comment. One version included a three minute time limit and the other just restricted the comment to one time without a time limit. Cindy Miller questioned if the rules that were attached to the agenda were what were to be followed. Alice Rehrig commented she created it based on the comments and discussions that took place at the meeting. Cindy Miller commented the last sentence under Item 2 should be eliminated. The sign in sheet should be handed to the Chairman so he knows who to call on to come up and speak.

Attorney Backenstoe commented there are two differ concepts involved with this. One concept is motions. When a motion is made, it must be seconded, then there is discussion. The Board of Supervisors discusses it first, then it is opened to the public to comment and ask questions or comment on the motion. There is not a three minute limit, but there should not be any debates amongst the public. They should be addressing the Board. When all the discussion is done, a vote is called for. The second concept is public comment which is required under the Sunshine Law. Public comment is the right for the public to comment on anything, although it should pertain to Township business, or matters and affairs that may be state or federal and pertain to the Township. The Board is discussing implementing rules, such as that you would like them to come up to the microphone, give their name and address, which is common practice. There are two proposed resolutions before the Board. One sets forth they need to be recognized by the chair, identify themselves, and conduct themselves in an orderly fashion. The other resolution contains the exact same language, except that the comments are restricted to three minutes. The Board

can either choose Option A which contains provisions on how people should conduct themselves and sets forth a three minute time limit. Option B has the same provisions as Option A, however, there is not a time limit.

Janet Sheat commented her concern is if someone doesn't sign in and decides later they want to speak. Attorney Backenstoe commented it is the Board's decision as to how they wish to handle it. The Board can go through the list, then when complete, they can ask if there is anyone additional who wants to speak, then they can come forward and add their names to the list. Jerry Pritchard commented why not have them sign in as they come forward to speak. Janet Sheats commented she would think that it would be easier to do that. Her main concern is that someone would get excluded because they didn't sign in.

Cindy Miller made a motion to adopt Resolution 2026-21A which includes a three minute per person time limit for public comment. David Hess seconded the motion. Janet Sheats commented she doesn't believe that three minutes is enough time. Jerry Pritchard commented he believes the public has the right to speak and we shouldn't limit them. He believes the Chairman can control the meeting if things get out of hand. If the time limit is removed, it is fair to both the Board and the community. Cindy Miller commented if the Board doesn't feel three minutes is enough, they can increase it to five. Without a time limit, people can keep going on and on. Janet Sheats commented she also likes #3 where people are only permitted to make one public comment. Tom Budihas commented if he signs in and likes what someone else is saying, can he relinquish his three minutes to someone else. Cindy Miller commented no, that can't be done. Mike Jones commented each person has a time limit of three minutes and then they are done. Linda Roman questioned how many times someone has to come up front to speak. Mike Jones commented during public comment, each person can speak one time. Ms. Roman questioned if she can address the Board by a letter or at another meeting. Mike Jones commented it is only for one meeting. She can always contact the Board outside of a meeting. Lisa Pignataro questioned if the Board has the right to ban comments on a specific topic. Mike Jones commented that the Board can't ban a comment during public comment. Attorney Backenstoe commented he would hope that the comments would have something to do with the Township, but the Board cannot stop a general comment such as someone not liking the condition of a certain road. Merion Miller commented he believes the answer is already in front of the Board. If someone wants to sign in before the meeting, they are more than welcome. If something comes up and someone wants to speak on it, they can sign in at that time. As far as the time limit, it could be put out at the Board's discretion as long as it is not being abused. If someone is filibustering and saying the same things over and over, the Board should be able to shut it down. Sherry Szoke commented it would be good if the Board would consider three minutes and grant someone an additional two minutes if they

were not done yet. It is hard to understand how someone could only discuss one topic per night. Mike Jones commented it is not limited to one time per night. A person gets three minutes to speak and they can include as many topics as they choose during those three minutes. Sherry Szoke commented someone may think of something additional after someone has made a comment but won't be able to speak because they used their three minutes. This is something she has a hard time with. Cindy Miller commented the public gets to make comments on each motion that is made throughout the meeting. There really shouldn't be that much left for discussion during public comment. Sherry Szoke commented if someone brings something up after she has spoken, it restricts her from being able to agree or disagree with the topic that is brought up. She thinks the Board should be able to grant someone a second time to speak. Mike Jones commented it gets to be difficult because you don't want to appear as though you are picking and choosing who gets the second opportunity to speak. Mike Hock questioned if the Township's responses to a question count towards the time limit. Mike Jones commented the Township's responses do not count towards the time limit. Jerry Pritchard commented he does not agree with the time limit. People should be given enough time to think things through. Some people can express what they want to say in two minutes, others it may take five minutes. People should feel comfortable when they are speaking and not be concerned with a time limit, but he does agree with keeping the meeting orderly and structured. Zach Szoke wanted to clarify that the three minute limit will only apply to the public comment at the end of the meeting. Mike Jones confirmed the time limit will only pertain to the end of the meeting. Zach Szoke questioned if it could be stated, here are the rules for the public to conduct themselves. At the reasonable discretion of the Chairman, an individual not adhering to the rules can be cut off from discussion. Attorney Backenstoe commented that is a way of handling things. If the Chairman determines that things are unreasonable or becoming redundant, the Chairman can tell the individual to finish their comments. Paul Nikisher commented he thinks it is important for people to state their name and not be anonymous. Is it really necessary to make people come up front? Mike Jones commented part of the reason for having people come forward is because public comment is to be addressed to the Board. There are too many times where people in the audience are going back and forth with each other. Paul Nikisher commented people bring up different subjects and others may want to comment on them. Dan Ziegenfuss commented he believes there are a lot of people with the mindset where they want to be last to hear what others have to say and things could get messy. Linda Roman questioned at what point the Chairman would become a tyrant when trying control how much time someone has to speak. Zach Szoke questioned what the purpose of the sign in was. Cindy Miller commented it helps the Board gauge how many people want to address the Board and how much time will be needed. Mike Jones commented it also helps with the minutes and identifying who is speaking. Zach Szoke commented in his opinion, it would be better for the Board to

be more diligent about people stating their name and address since people would be able to add their names to the sign in sheet at the end of the meeting anyway. Tom Szoke questioned if someone comes from another Township and signs in, are they allowed to speak. Attorney Backenstoe commented under the law, residents and taxpayers must be allowed to speak. It is at the Board's discretion as to whether or not they wish to permit someone who is not a resident or pays taxes to the Township to speak. Legally, the Board is not required to allow them. Katherine Mack commented she thinks it is important for people to state their name and where they live because not everyone will know everyone. Cindy Miller voted aye. Janet Sheats, Mike Jones, Jerry Pritchard and David Hess were opposed. Motion did not carry.

Mike Jones made a motion to adopt Resolution 2026-21B which does not have a time limit. David Hess seconded the motion. Janet Sheats questioned if Zach Szoke's comment regarding the Chairman being able to stop someone if their comments are inappropriate or redundant. Attorney Backenstoe commented it really is not necessary. He believes that it is within the Chairman's authority to politely bring someone back on topic if they are being redundant or disrespectful. The Chairman could simply state is there anything else, we need to move on. It is part of the role of being Chairman. Jerry Pritchard commented there are times where a follow up is needed. Should something be added to allow that? Not multiple times, because that does become redundant. Janet Sheats commented if the follow up is to what someone else states, you need to be able to draw the line. David Hess commented if people get to follow up on every comment that is made, nothing will change from what is taking place now. Jerry Pritchard, David Hess, Mike Jones, and Janet Sheats voted aye. Cindy Miller was opposed. Motion carried.

- B. Public Hearing and Consideration of Ordinance 2026-4, Amending Rules and Regulations of Township Parks. Cindy Miller made a motion to adopt Ordinance 2026-4. Janet Sheats seconded the motion. Jerry Pritchard questioned Section 107-5.A regarding sound amplification ceasing at 10:00 p.m. How does this impact a baseball game that may go past 10:00 p.m.? Mike Jones commented it is just the amplification of sound, such as music through a speaker that must stop, not the use of the park. Linda Roman questioned what the level of sound would be. Mike Jones commented it is the amplification of noise, not noise in general. All noise would need to stop by 11:00 p.m. Janet Sheats questioned how people will know what speeds they are going to be in compliance with Section 107-4.H. She didn't think e-bikes were going to be permitted. Mike Jones commented this would only apply to bicycles and peddle assist bikes that were designed to only go up to 20 miles per hour. All voted aye. Motion carried.

- C. Awarding of Bids for Timberline Road. Mike Muffley provided the Board with a letter dated September 22, 2026, which outlined his experiences with the company, why he recommended the type of project that was bid, and why he thinks we received the bid responses that we did. Jerry Pritchard questioned if there is still one bidder. Alice Rehrig commented it still is one bidder. In order to try to obtain more bidders, the project would need to be rebid. Cindy Miller made a motion to award the bid to Recon Construction at a price not to exceed \$1,581,028.80 with Contract #1 being completed in 2026 and Contract #2, including alternates 2-1 and 2-3 being completed in 2027. Janet Sheats seconded the motion. Jerry Pritchard commented he agrees we need to move on with the project, but we have nothing to compare it to. Paul Nikisher questioned what would happen if the project would exceed the amount. Cindy Miller commented they would need to come back to the Board for approval of a change order. All voted aye. Motion carried.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Resolution 2026-22, Authorizing Manager to submit for Monroe County LSA Grant. Janet Sheats made a motion to adopt Resolution 2026-22. David Hess seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.
- B. Resolution 2026-23, Authorizing Manager to submit for Northampton/Lehigh LSA Grant Funding. Cindy Miller made a motion to adopt Resolution 2026-23. David Hess seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.
- C. Resolution 2026-24, Authorizing Manager to submit for Statewide Gaming Grant. Cindy Miller made a motion to adopt Resolution 2026-24. David Hess seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.
- D. Manager's Report. Alice Rehrig reported she received an email from Northampton County Elections office questioning if the Township would be interested in hosting a one day Voter Services Pop-Up where residents can access many of the same services normally available by traveling to the Elections Office in Easton, including applying for a mail-in or absentee ballot, receiving and completing a ballot on demand, and securely returning a completed ballot. The Board did not agree with using the Municipal Building as a Voter Services Pop-Up because of concerns regarding the completion and validations of ballots. They felt this service should be handled in Easton with a Judge of Elections present.
1. Employee Appreciation. Janet Sheats made a motion to continue with the Employee Appreciation as we did in the past. Jerry Pritchard seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.

2. Volunteer Insurance. Alice Rehrig commented when she contacted the insurance company regarding volunteers from LTAA mowing the ballfields, they indicated that there is protection to the Township since we are being named as additional insured; however, if we are utilizing any volunteers for projects or events, it is recommended that the Township has a volunteer insurance policy. The cost of the policy is \$300 per year for up to 100 volunteers. Janet Sheats made a motion to obtain the recommended volunteer insurance. Jerry Pritchard seconded the motion. Merion Miller commented volunteer will need to be defined because everyone at LTAA is a volunteer. Mike Jones commented this policy is for individuals who volunteer outside of the organized leagues. The teams who use our fields all have insurance naming the Township as an additional insured. All voted aye. Motion carried.

E. Solicitor's Report

1. Consideration of interim change to Zoning Ordinance. Attorney Backenstoe commented the Board had received a letter from a resident, Michael Druckenmiller, inquiring about changing the zoning requirements regarding solar panels. Mr. Druckenmiller lives at 4020 Schaeffer Drive, and his neighbor installed ground mounted solar panels. Under the ordinance, there were no requirements regarding screening. This upset Mr. Druckenmiller because he can see the panels when in his back yard. There are several things that Mr. Druckenmiller wants to see done. He would like the Township to require the neighbor to plant screening and also have the Township redraft a new ordinance which would require buffering. He is also not happy with the pace in which the new ordinance is being completed. The Township's current ordinance regulates principal solar system, which is a large scale system that sells power back to the grid, and accessory solar systems which supply power to individual homes or businesses. The ordinance allows panels to be placed on the home or on the ground. The ordinance does not require screening for Accessory Solar Systems, only for Principal Solar Energy Systems. In 2022, the Township amended their ordinance and increased the allowable kilowatts to 30 kilowatts for an accessory system; however, they still did not require screening for accessory solar systems. In 2023, the Township again amended their ordinance and made Principal Solar Energy Systems a conditional use only permitted in the Industrial Zoning District. These are the ordinances in which Mr. Druckenmiller's neighbor installed their solar panels. Their accessory system was under 30 kilowatts and did not require screening. The Township is now in the process of revising their zoning ordinance which is a large undertaking. One of the aspects if this revision is to include screening for accessory solar systems. There will also be glare requirements. Once the new ordinance is adopted, the screening and anti-glare requirements will be in effect; however, it will not affect Mr. Druckenmiller. The solar panels that are of a concern to Mr. Druckenmiller will become a legal non-conformity. When

an ordinance is adopted that changes the requirements of a use, an existing use becomes a lawful non-conformity. The new requirements of the ordinance cannot be imposed upon an existing legal non-conformity. When the new ordinance is adopted, the neighbor cannot be made to comply with the new ordinance for the panels that were already installed. If he were to install additional panels, the new panels would be subject to the new ordinance. The question to the Board is whether or not they want to accelerate these requirements and do an additional ordinance prior to the completion of the new ordinance. Jerry Pritchard commented there would be a benefit to pulling it out now. It may not help Mr. Druckenmiller, but it could prevent a similar situation. David Hess commented we will be incurring additional expenses to have the engineer and attorney write a new ordinance and it will not fix the situation that is before the Board. Janet Sheats commented she doesn't agree with pulling this out of the zoning. It won't change anything for Mr. Druckenmiller and if we start pulling individual sections out of the zoning for one, we will need to do it for everyone. Cindy Miller commented the concern the Planning Commission had with screening when they developed the ordinance is that screening could cause the panels to not work properly. The Board agreed that they felt it would be best to keep moving forward with the new zoning ordinance and not want to pull this out as a separate ordinance.

Tom Szoke questioned what would happen if a neighboring property installed panels on their roof and it created a glare. Attorney Backenstoe commented the newer ordinance has provisions for the use of anti-glare materials and studies being done for the principal solar farms. Cindy Miller commented the Planners take that into consideration when a solar project comes before the Planning Commission.

Monica Brown commented if someone wanted to put in solar, they would need to apply for a permit. Attorney Backenstoe commented when a large solar project comes in, they need to go through an extensive hearing and requirements. An individual who wants to place panels on their home or in the yard would need to apply for a building permit. Right now, there is no screening required for an accessory system that an individual installs in their yard.

- VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT. Tom Budihas, Walnut Drive, commented the speeds along Walnut Drive by the ballfields are high. 45 miles per hour in the area of a park and playground seems to be high. The Police will be asked to place a speed board in the area to collect data.

Mr. Budihas also noted that there is a parking issue by the elementary school on Blue Mountain Drive. When the parents pick their children up in the afternoon, they are

parking in the lane of travel on the hill so if someone tries to go around them, they are crossing into the other lane of travel and creating a hazardous situation because it can create a head on collision. Cindy Miller commented she has a meeting with Mr. Kovalchik coming up and will bring this issue up to him.

Michele Dotta, 1187 Oak Road, wanted to address the newsletter that was distributed to the residents regarding the land preservation program. She agrees that disagreements over land preservation, taxes, and how our township should spend money is legitimate and township officials have the right to explain their position and residents have the right to agree or disagree with those positions. What she is upset about is the way in which the information was presented to the public. When information is provided to the public, the residents should expect it to be balanced, factual information, not read as an argument on one side of an argument on a controversial issue and contain language to make it an emotional impression on the issue. The information provided should be worded in a neutral manner. Official communications with the residents should be used wisely and responsibly and not trying to persuade residents on an issue. It should not include emotionally charged statements. Jerry Pritchard commented when this was discussed he stated he wanted to be exempt from the article. He doesn't agree that the Board should be picking sides. Cindy Miller commented the newsletter is not paid for by the Township; it is paid for by the sponsors.

Merion Miller, Apricot Drive, commented he has watched this unfold for the past year. The presentations that have taken place have always been one sided. All he has heard was that everyone else has opinions, only they have the truth and facts. Very few things are pointed out when it goes against local land preservation. Pennsylvania has the most preserved farmland in the nation at a cost of \$1.8 billion dollars since its inception. Northampton County farm program totally stinks. Why not take this up with the County Executive and say we the residents of Lehigh Township believe we need this program. Let a higher authority determine this. None of us are experts. It can even be taken to the State or a suit. We are told 40 percent of the land is in some type of preservation. There are many preservation options available to people who want to preserve farms and they are not being told to people. There is the Family Forest Carbon Program which helps landowners with 30 plus forested acres reach their goals by providing extra income, improving wildlife habitat, timber value and increasing carbon stored in their land. It was briefly mentioned at a presentation that the Game Commission is another source of preservation. They regularly buy and accept donations of land that adjoins existing state game lands. There are federal programs also available, the Agricultural Conservation Easement Program run by the US Department of Agriculture, the Conservation Reserve and Enhancement Program which is a federal and state partnership that runs alongside the Game Commission which pays landowners to place sensitive crop or land areas into preservation, the Land and Water Fund administered by the State to develop public parks and open space, the Forest Legacy program implemented by the US Forest Service. All

these programs are paid for by taxpayers. There is also a whole host of privately funded programs in the State of Pennsylvania which are independent non-profit land trusts which support natural environments, protect watersheds, and manage wildlife habitats. The Natural Lands Conservancy primarily operating out of eastern Pennsylvania is a mega trust managing tens of thousands of acres of natural preserve that emphasizes access to nature, trail maintenance, and regional open space. There are tons of preservation programs currently available. If we were not in such financial straits with \$9.3 million at the School Board and the fact that we are able to pave our roads, he would be much more on board with doing a land preservation program. So what if the other Townships around us have the program. That is their business. He doesn't live there and they shouldn't be telling us what to do. There is a lot of information that is not being shared with the Board. He has dissected the presentations to a T. If you want to be fair and balanced, then show it all. There is a lot more to be said on this matter.

Katherine Mack noted additional thought should be given to exonerating the individuals who have income less than \$12,000 from the Earned Income Tax. It would help the younger people and the seniors in this economy. Also with regard to the bussing issue at the Schools, the best place to address that is with the Principal at the school. There are security officers at each school and they should be directing the traffic where to go. If the problem is not addressed, then people can go to the School Board. If it still does not get addressed, then the Supervisors could contact the School Board and let them know there is a real problem at the school with safety on the roads. There will also be a big meeting in October regarding bussing in the High School Auditorium. Ms. Mack also noted that the lights on the flag at Danielsville and Delps are not on. These lights should be checked regularly.

Deirdra Kamber Todd, 5480 Sunset Drive, Schnecksville, read the minutes from August 25th and noticed an error in what she stated on Pages 8 and 9 under Public Comment. The minutes state her father was a volunteer firefighter and that is not what was stated. He is a teacher and lives in New Jersey. He has never been a firefighter and is still alive. She wanted that corrected for the record.

Paul Nikisher, 668 Long Lane Road, when there is an issue involving safety, the Police need to be informed. He believes everyone should be showing up at the School Board meeting on October 19. It does affect everyone. He would also encourage getting the sign for the Lions up at Berlinsville Park as soon as possible. The Lions contributed a nice amount of money towards the project. David Hess commented he just received the information from Preston Henry Jr. yesterday and the Recreation Board discussed it at their meeting yesterday. Mr. Nikisher also questioned how many police vehicles the Township maintains. Alice Rehrig commented it is a total of eight.

Board of Supervisors Minutes
September 22, 2026

Zachery Szoke, 4467 Timberline Road, wanted thank the Board for voting against the time limitations for public comment. He also questioned if there is an estimated completion date for the new zoning ordinance. The Board did not have an anticipated date. Mr. Szoke also questioned if a maximum capacity of the meeting room was determined. Alice Rehrig commented the number she was given was 177. Mr. Szoke commented he is confused about the direction of the Township and type of development and growth that is wanted and where will it go. If you want to build the budget, you need to know what the plan is for growth and development of the Township. Mr. Szoke questioned whose decision it was or who authorized the article to be placed in the newsletter. Mike Jones commented they can all put something in the newsletter. He would have liked to put something in the newsletter and he was shot down. At the June 24, 2025, meeting it was stated that if anyone is going to place an article in the newsletter, it would be done by the consultant. Was that the case with this article?

Lisa Pignataro, Heather Court, commented, generally speaking, anyone is welcome to attend the land preservation meetings. In addition to the two that were held at the Blue Mountain Fish and Game, there was a large one at the Fire Company and both sides were represented. Their concern is letting the people vote.

- IX. EXECUTIVE SESSION. The Board went into Executive Session to discuss personnel and collective bargaining. No action was taken.
- X. ADJOURN. David Hess made a motion to adjourn. Janet Sheats seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.