

BETHLEHEM CITY COUNCIL MEETING
10 East Church Street - Town Hall
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
Tuesday, May 4, 2021 - 7:00 PM

INVOCATION

PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

1. ROLL CALL

President Waldron called the meeting to order. Present were Bryan G. Callahan, Michael G. Colón, Grace Crampsie Smith, Olga Negrón, J. William Reynolds, Paige Van Wirt, and Adam R. Waldron, 7.

Communication 6B – added to agenda

President Waldron announced that a Communication will be added to our agenda tonight and it is an additional comment letter from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission on the privately proposed zoning text amendment for the Martin Tower site for First Reading on tonight's agenda item 9B. This letter contains some new comments in addition to the commissions previous comments that were read at the April 20, 2021 Council Meeting.

Communication 6 B

The Clerk read a comment letter from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission dated April 23, 2021 concerning the review of the privately proposed zoning text amendment that would affect the Office Mixed Use District at the former Martin Tower site at 1170 8th Avenue. The commission stated that the proposal is generally inconsistent with the Regional Plan because the presented amendments would result in suburban-scale development patterns that are not consistent with the character of the city or conducive to multimodal accessibility. Additionally they state that because the proposed amendment if adopted would affect more than one property. They suggest that the developer approach the Zoning Hearing Board.

President Waldron noted that communication has been added to our agenda. The reason for that is this letter came after our agenda was set last week and contains additional comments from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 6, 2021

3. PUBLIC COMMENT (on any subject not being voted on this evening – 5 Minute Time Limit)

Article 717-Noise Ordinance

Artie Curatola, 813 Laufer Street, mentioned he had a few questions in relation to Article 717.01 (b) and that the exemptions are political rallies within the city limits for any person running for the upcoming election. It says that it is exempt from noise and that you cannot complain about it but he believes there should be a time limit on it. He wondered if there has been anything added to this Article.

President Waldron noted he does not have that information.

Mr. Curatola asked if someone is running for a political office can they have some bands perform outside for a little bit of time without people complaining providing this is normal music. If it is decent music is this acceptable? This Article says it is and that they are exempt but it does not state any particulars. He wonders if people would need a permit for something like that.

President Waldron imagines any use of public property would require a permit.

Mr. Curatola remarked if he gets an okay from Yosko Park or from different places, he wondered if a permit is still needed from the city.

President Waldron stated the city would issue a permit for public property.

Mr. Curatola asked if this could be for any type of political rally where someone is running for an office. He asked who to contact, what department.

President Waldron informed that would be the law bureau.

Mr. Curatola reiterated that Article 717, the noise ordinance where it states the provisions of 717.01 shall not apply to political and Labor Rallies, Athletic Events. The use of devices such as public address systems, amplifying systems, bull horns, musical instruments, tape messages or similar devices which are used at political or labor rallies, or athletic events or other City of Bethlehem licensed, permitted or authorized events to the extent already protected by law. The other thing is that number 7 of the provisions has to do with the entertainment and says Facilities that offer entertainment between the hours of 12:00 p.m. and 12:00 a.m. in outdoor venues located in an Industrial Redevelopment District and an Industrial Redevelopment – Residential District. So that means they can have entertainment without having to worry about how loud it is according to how this reads. Mr. Curatola believes this Article needs to be amended because they can have music going as long as they want and as loud as they want.

Affordable Housing/South Side Development

Anna Smith, 531 Ridge Street, informed tonight a diverse group of south side residents has gathered virtually to engage our community in thinking about responsible development and the affordable housing challenges that our neighborhood currently faces. This topic has emerged as a primary area for concern among residents that were surveyed recently by Community Action in the development of a new neighborhood plan for the south side and it is a familiar topic around our dining room tables, in text message conversations, and backyard chats with neighbors. Ms. Smith continued to say that neighborhoods always change but the rate of change on the south side seems to have sped up recently with over 550 new almost exclusively luxury

apartments at some stage between planning and occupation right now. Neighbors across our community have share with us the feeling that they have no power to influence the process let alone acknowledge that the changes are coming. Projects like the proposed 104 foot building for South New Street that was unanimously denied by the Historic Conservation Commission becomes lightning rods that threaten our community with false choices that are designed to split us apart, to create a zero sum game where we must choose which component of our community to save and which to sacrifice. We are here tonight because we reject the notion that we must pit economic development against preservation, affordable housing against neighborhood character. We reject the way forward for our community that is determined by folks who do not live in our neighborhoods perpetuating cycles of marginalization of the voices of individuals who have long been excluded from our city's decision making process. We see an opportunity to create a new generation of south side leaders by empowering the residents of our neighborhood to participate in envisioning a way forward that identifies and builds on what has made our community the place where anyone can gain a foothold, a community where affordable housing is our hallmark, whether a 100 year old row home, multi-family buildings on our street corners or garages converted into an apartment or two in our backyards. Our affordable homes include new subsidized construction like the Hayes Street Lofts, a dozen rehabbed homes sold through the Lehigh Community Land Trust, a few developments built into the hillside, a row of habitat homes along the mountain side, group homes that have existed for decades to serve adults in recovery and rooming houses here and there throughout our neighborhoods. Ms. Smith stated we get affordable housing in our community because we have been the most affordable place for folks to build their lives and grow their families since Bethlehem was founded. We know that affordable housing is complex and it is not a building you can point to, it is integrated to the very fabric of a community. We believe that folks could learn from the density of our south side residential neighborhoods and commercial corridors which if they were a stand-alone city would be the 52nd most densely populated city in the United States, immediately after Boston. We believe our neighborhoods mixed income and mixed ethnic and racial character could be a model for other communities that have tended to segregate by income, race, or ethnicity. We believe that the diversity of housing options in our neighborhoods is one of our greatest strengths and that the character of our community is protecting and preserving because it shows a path forward that builds on history and reinforces our community's identity as a place where all are welcome. Ms. Smith asked what about new development, do we not always ask for more affordable housing on the south side? She loves data and numbers so yes we have an affordability issue in our community but like all these topics the data on affordability looks different for the City of Bethlehem than other communities. According to census data housing affordability in our community is primarily an issue among renters and on the south side where 72% of residents rent their homes this is certainly a major cause for concern. So who are the folks struggling to pay their rent and utilities every month? According to census data of all the cost burdened renters in Bethlehem, the households that do not have affordable housing, 74% of these households, an overwhelming majority make less than \$35,000 a year. These are the folks that need affordable housing in our community. According to HUD these are folks that for the households with the highest income of \$35,000 a year can afford to pay a maximum of \$875 dollars a month in rent and utilities combined. These are families stretched to the limit paying rent that averages \$1,000 a month or more. These families need a solution that meets their needs in our community. There is no question about it that solution will only come from subsidies and really creative thinking. Ms. Smith added it will not come from market rate development with 10% affordable units in a market rate building because a standard of affordability that these units meet is already higher than what these families can afford to pay. The New Street Tower for example may be an

affordable housing solution for folks moving here from New York or New Jersey but it is not a solution for our neighborhood. Ms. Smith is here today because she has been talking with south side residents for a few months now about their hopes and fears for our community in community meetings in response to the Ahart's closure. We are thrilled with the news today about the new grocery store. Concern about new development that places a burden on the south side community while not addressing the needs of residents and small businesses is the most prevalent thing that comes up in discussion and while her friends and neighbors might not have the data she presented she is hearing they feel the pressure of new development and feel powerless about having a say in the process. You may not live or work on the south side or even set foot in our neighborhoods very often but your choices moving forward will define who gets to live here and what their quality of life will be like. Please use your powers to lift up the voices of your south side neighbors who do not have any representation on Council. We will be inviting you to join us to hear from south side residents about our data and vision for responsible south side development and strategies to promote affordable housing after the Primary Election. We are ready to do the hard work to find solutions that are more complex but can have a lasting positive impact on our neighborhood. We look forward to sharing our stories and ideas and hope you will commit to working side by side with us to create a more equitable community that lives up to the south sides reputation as a place where all are welcome.

Sustainable Development/Martin Tower Site

Greg Zahm, 224 E. Macada Road, informed regarding the current and evolving Martin Tower property development plan he has a question focused on sustainable development. As we try to develop the necessary self-control regarding greenhouse gas emissions and the threat of climate change to our way of life he and seen and heard about sustainable development from Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Waldron, Mr. Slingerland, and Mr. Crownfield regarding the concern for green areas, growing local trails, the Monocacy, impervious surfaces and net-zero development. He thanks the Bethlehem Gadfly for curating the resources developed around this important topic. This past year a number of Bethlehem residents and organizations with Council leadership set out to help develop Bethlehem's Climate Action Plan (CAP) for reducing our carbon emissions. Higher density housing in the plan for the development does align with more sustainable development goals otherwise how does the development plan align with our CAP to reduce carbon emissions by incorporating existing technologies for sustainable buildings such as integrated sight design, as well as solar power generation. Impervious materials such as asphalt and concrete which are already in use and water reclamation, has this been addressed by the development commissions, city leadership, and the developer Mr. Ronca. Mr. Zahm noted that Mr. Slingerland had focused on the important idea of making cities walkable and bikable and accessible by mass transit rather than only carbon emitting motor vehicles. The Martin Tower property development is an opportunity to truly improve the site and its use such as reducing that paved cover and re-greening as much as possible. Because it was previously covered by so much impervious material does not mean it must remain that way. The developer said he has worked on this plan for 15 years and invested tens of millions of dollars, but that is the nature of the beast and especially an area of this size. Mr. Zahm is sure there is a considerable profit to be made but the city and our current and future families will endure any negative impact of a plan not thoroughly considering the above needs and technologies and for how long would we endure that? He just wants to know that proactively these ideas have been addressed.

Affordable Housing

Delia Marrero, 607 William Street, mentioned she would like to discuss the need for affordable stable housing in south side Bethlehem. She purchased her first home in south Bethlehem in 2019. When she thinks about her families long history many of them started their homeownership in south Bethlehem. Most recently she has noticed proposals for new luxury apartments and the development of luxury housing units and she wondered where the housing options are for low income households and affordable housing. According to the MIT living wage calculator a single adult with 2 children in our area must earn \$34.42 an hour to support their households and families and that is way above the average of what our residents in south Bethlehem are earning. Ms. Marrero explained before she purchased her home she tried looking for an apartment and discovered quickly that she was not able to rent at an average of \$1,200 to \$1,400 dollars a month. She was fortunate enough to purchase a home in south Bethlehem that accommodated herself and her two children comfortably. But she knows that is not the case for everyone. As someone who is literally one unexpected expense away from financial hardship she has the security of knowing she has an affordable mortgage payment. Ms. Marrero explained when she looks at the south side she sees the potential of having real mixed income neighborhoods with safeguards for vulnerable populations by working towards development that focuses on preserving culture and history of the south side. The New Street building would only add about 10% which was around 6 to 7 units of affordable units. That simply just is not enough for our community. Are we trying to run our low income black and brown residents out of the south side? We risk losing what makes our community such a special place where folks of all income levels can live side by side. Ms. Marrero encourages Members of City Council to visit our community and reach out if you are interested in learning more about the realities of our community and some of the challenges we face living on the south side.

Responsible Development

Anne Evans, 464 Montclair Avenue, explained she would like to speak about responsible development. It is really important to her that the diverse neighborhoods of our south side are developed with the interests of the residents who live in them being listened to, that has not always been the case. In recent months the Community Action Development Corporation has had some public Zoom meetings to discuss what are the interests of the people who live on the south side and what do they think we need. Ms. Evans remarked in past studies those have been very divergent from what the city thought we needed. There are big developers coming in to develop things that are too tall for the landscape of the south side and then throwing in the carrot of saying there is some affordable housing. She noted that 10% of a building is not throwing in a lot of affordable housing which is a serious need for us on the south side. We would like to work cooperatively with the city in an active manner in a proactive way. Every time one of these projects come up we as residents are always on the defensive, reacting as opposed to being able proactively discuss this with the city and with the developers before we get to the stage where they are asking for all kinds of changes and permits. Ms. Evans urges Council to listen to the voices of the HCC in voting down these large buildings and sitting down with us to talk about what affordable housing really could mean here on the south side. The south side has always been where people started out and were able to buy or rent in an affordable way when they came to our city. That should still be and can still be a focus of what the city is doing now.

Resolutions on Gun Control-Police Reform/Police Hiring

Ed Gallagher, 49 W. Greenwich Street, informed he wanted to make two suggestions about possible resolutions that Council could make. We often make resolutions to higher legislative bodies to indicate our support. He wonders if we could think about resolutions for commonsense gun control and what we might call commonsense police reform. These are two kinds of things that higher levels seem to be getting some traction. He wonders if Council would put their rhetorical weight behind those kinds of things. Mr. Gallagher suggests marking the important anniversary of the murder of George Floyd on May 25th with a Public Safety Meeting here or a Committee of the Whole Meeting or whatever kind of committee would be appropriate. A time that we could look back on a year which has challenged us to think as a city of being especially anti-racist and to thinking about a new way or different ways to do public safety. Mr. Gallagher related he has been reading back through the Gadfly archives and this was a very busy and interesting year. It would be important to take stock and see where we have come from and where we are going. For instance, we could hear about the Community Advisory Board of the NAACP which the city participates in. That would be an operation now about 11 months and he has not heard anything about it except one or two very fleeting references. Maybe the NAACP could be invited to such a meeting marking the anniversary of George Floyd to report on what has gone on in that Community Advisory Board. We could hear about the exciting idea of the Community Engagement Initiative. Mr. Gallagher remembers talk of two different types of meetings, that the city would have or meetings that outside organizations would have. He remembers talk of City Council Members referring to the City Clerk notices of these meetings that would be published on the website so citizens would know and be able to attend. He not heard anything about those kinds of things, so please bring us up to date on the Community Engagement Initiative. In that resolution from July of last year it was added at the last moment by amendment an element of dealing with Professor Ochs at Lehigh University and that police research group. We have not heard any more about that and he wonders if we are still doing that. Also about the police department itself, Mr. Gallagher is not a big social media person although he does run a blog but he cannot help but notice a lot of community outreach by the police on social media. Just by chance he happened to hear an interview with Chief Michelle Kott on a radio station about two weeks ago pitching the event at Touchstone Theater. She mentioned at that time a thing called the Neighborhood Outreach Initiative. We also need to hear more about the nuts and bolts of police activities. We seem to be hiring now so what kind of person are we looking for and how are we pitching the kind of department we are and do we give tests to recruits. Once we hire people what kind of training are we doing? He noted that training has been mentioned several times at our meetings but it never gets beyond generality. We have 154 officers and do they get trained every year in 3 or 4 different kinds of things or is there some phased operation that goes on. He read in the newspaper that we are joining with a training initiative at Northampton County and is that a compliment to what we do or different than what we do. Also internal affairs, how do we make sure that the bad apples are weeded out. A meeting like that on May 25th would be a good time to refresh us on how the pilot with the Health Bureau is going on. So this is an important anniversary and there are a lot of things we could be caught up to date on and we could set some goals for the future.

Affordable Housing

Kimberly Carrell-Smith, 833 Carlton Avenue, remarked she is speaking as part of the tag team about affordable housing. We appreciate the city work that went into the exploration of how to increase affordable housing in cooperation with local developers but evidence suggests that private developers are constrained by the markets since they are accustomed to building

within a particular cost structure and find it challenging to combine that with affordable housing for the most vulnerable people. Those are people with incomes at \$35,000 a year or less in Bethlehem. We need to be more creative to explore local data and the needs of each neighborhood in our city. Although affordable housing is a national regional and valley wide concern it is important to consider policy creation based on our city neighborhood assets. That would be what supports our people, what supports stable communities to make our city strong and what is working and how do we preserve what is affordable and how can we identify assets to guide us to successfully develop Bethlehem's affordable housing vision and plan. Ms. Carrell-Smith explained our plan should be based on local data, who needs what and how much can they pay and who is being left out. Our plan should have what it would take to convince local non-profits to do housing development work and to come together to explore and develop new models particularly in rental housing, not just home ownership models, in order to enhance Bethlehem's existing housing stock. Just one example a coalition could consider things like apprenticeship programs that could enhance employment, help residents develop skills in housing rehab and bring more small investors into affordable housing. Jumpstart Germantown which some of you know about already as well as other preservation related housing rehab programs provide us possibilities for this kind of work and would provide a model. They have been shown to work for communities that need affordable housing and the value and protection of historic building stock in historic districts, which is the case for our city. Big developers do things on a far larger scale, so why not see what we can do for affordable housing by working on a smaller scale but with more redevelopers. Multiple studies show this kind of work is both effective and transformative. She is happy to provide those resources. We proposed not simply hold forums where residents share information that gets dumped in the laps of consultants or city officials, instead how can we truly engage the expertise of those who know our city on the ground, the residents and others and have the strongest understanding of affordable housing. The Student Housing Overlay ordinance is a great example of how stakeholders came together to work with the consultant and crafted a plan that was community engaged. Developing affordable housing in Bethlehem will be a larger undertaking the community engaged example our city undertook with the overlay ordinance provides a roadmap for successful planning. Residents and professionals worked together and interacted with the city's paid consultant. City Council Members sat down with stakeholders to identify key issues and became informed early on. By the time the overlay ordinance reached Council it had community and Council support with listening and engagement. Ms. Carrell-Smith pointed out we can work as a community and work together to investigate established models and find new ways to approach affordable housing and preserve our community assets throughout Bethlehem.

Rachel Leon, 946 East 5th Street, remarked there has been a lot of talk tonight about affordable housing but she wanted to talk about her concern for the environmental impact that shipping traffic is having. In south Bethlehem we bear the brunt of shipping traffic and our air quality is diminishing. If we keep building these buildings higher and higher we will create what is called an environmentally unfavorable zone. That air will be trapped and will be very stagnant. She just wanted to make sure as we are considering these things that we are considering the environmental impact. These issues are extremely complex and as a city we need development but she hopes we can find a way to balance that against the well-being of the residents that we have especially in south Bethlehem.

Seth Moglen, 726 Hillside Avenue, noted he is calling in as part of the group that is talking about affordable housing and responsible development. He wanted to call Council's attention to

a few of the major points that have been raised so far. We are in an extraordinary moment in the city. For the first time in the almost 25 years he has lived here we have many Members of City Council talking about the importance of affordable housing. Mr. Moglen stressed that everyone who has called in, the network of residents and people active in the non-profit sector and business owners, he believes that all of us share the basic development priorities that have been expressed by all of you on City Council. Everyone on City Council like everyone who has called in knows we deeply need more affordable housing and that means genuinely affordable housing for working people. We know that we need residents in the urban core who can support local business and we all know that we need to strengthen our tax base. One of the things you are hearing tonight is that there is a lot of concern on the part of those of us who live on the south side about the recent proposals for out of scale building and development projects inside the Historical Conservation District. Mr. Moglen remarked that Bethlehem was way ahead in creating historical conservation districts and they have served our city very well. Council is aware that 10 and 12 story projects, 90 foot projects are in excess of what the Historic Conservation District permits. We have a path forward on affordable housing and we represent a larger network of people who are eager to collaborate with Council to create authentic affordable housing proposals and development projects. A 10 or 12 story luxury apartment building with a handful of rental units that exceeds the needs of ordinary south side residents and that is not an affordable housing initiative. We will be reaching out to you to set up a time when you can sit down as you did with the Student Overlay Rental process, sit down with stakeholders in the community and talk about what those affordable housing initiatives look like to support the benefits we gain from the Historic Conservation District. He thanks Council Members that have expressed their commitment now to the project of affordable housing that is important for our community.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT (on ordinances and resolutions to be voted on by Council this evening – 5 Minute Time Limit)

Martin Tower Project/Public Safety

James McNally, 1128 Eaton Avenue, informed as a resident of Bethlehem all his life he is concerned with the speeding and noise from loud mufflers on Eaton Avenue and also on 8th Avenue. We in the area have been faced with the building, the Eaton Avenue apartments, a new bank, 5 buildings, St. Luke's Hospital and Lowe's which has brought more traffic to the neighborhood. Now with the development of the 53 acres of the Martin Tower site he is very concerned about what type of speed control will be installed, if any. Right now there seems to be very little. Every day there is speeding and loud mufflers plus pollution. People need to slow down. Mr. McNally remarked that motorcycles have mufflers that are cut out and of course that is not permitted. He wondered if the Bethlehem Police test for muffler noise. We have always had loud cars, he understands that but it seems like it is everywhere with these loud mufflers. We have a lot of modified exhaust systems. Mr. McNally is concerned about what will happen when they put in that 53 acres down the street with what they are going to put in what type of traffic control there will be and if there is plan for that. He wrote to the Mayor but he did not get back to him but a Police Lieutenant did get back to him and he agreed this is a problem with speeding and loud mufflers. This will only get worse when the 53 acres gets built.

President Waldron thanked Mr. McNally for his comments and noted that our Chief of Police is with us on this meeting and she has heard your comments so he would relay those to her and to follow up with him.

Mr. McNally was thinking for example of they had these road bumps put in. He knows there are some on Main Street Extension and he does not know why because they do not have the traffic that Eaton Avenue has. He just wanted know if they are going to put anything in for speeding.

President Waldron understands his concerns and frustration and he will relay these comments to Police Chief Michelle Kott and hopefully that will start a dialogue and give him a bit of a solution.

Jane Cook, 208 W. Langhorne Avenue, stated she would like to read a letter she sent last week to Council, the Planning Department, and the Mayor's Office.

The Board of the Monocacy Creek Watershed Association is impressed with the care City Council took at the April 20 meeting to consider the redevelopment of the Martin Tower site as it affects our city as a whole, including the precious resource that we too often take for granted – the Monocacy Creek. From a historical perspective, we know the creek was the heart of the Moravian settlement. The Monocacy has not always received the appreciation it should.

As one of our Board members, Jose de Jesus, said in a video released nationally last month by The Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, "For the past 15 years, there's been an enormous amount of development north of here. The creek cannot handle the quick runoff. It gets wider, warmer and becomes barren of trout, barren of life. Without funding to help this stream out, it's going to continue to deteriorate. We can't let this happen, it is such a precious resource for people to enjoy." <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CBC8z9fTwHI>.

Our main area of concern is for the integrity and protection of the Monocacy Creek, with its environmentally sensitive tributaries, floodplains and wetlands, plus its varied wildlife habitats. The increased development upstream of Bethlehem is already putting a strain on this unique watershed, and we must make every possible effort to protect it when we can.

Our specific concerns about the current Martin Tower redevelopment proposal are:

- the large amount of parking and paved areas – ~30 acres is 58% of the total site
- the limited amount of green space and buffer area – ~13 acres is 25% of the total site
- and, probably most importantly, the stormwater management protocols.

We ask you to enact policies that protect and preserve this jewel of a waterway as you make decisions about how to best develop this prime land, all of which is uphill of our precious Monocacy Creek. We urge you to consider how each part of the plan will affect the creek's environmental integrity. Please begin by demanding the highest design and land-use standards be applied to the entire 53-acre site. Thank you for your consideration of these concerns.

Sebastian Zawierucha, 341 Spring Street, remarked he has heard many other residents of Bethlehem voicing their concerns about zoning with the new wave of construction that will have a drastic impact on our community. He wanted to talk about the Martin Tower project that is being proposed and some of the zoning ordinances, specifically to a letter that was submitted by

Scott Slingerland, the Executive Director of the Coalition for Appropriate Transportation (CAT). This letter was submitted to members of the Planning Commission on April 14, 2021 and City Council and other leaders in the City of Bethlehem. Personally he recently sold his car to pursue a life of only living by bicycle. He looks forward to some of the changes that were being discussed about future trails and accessibility. When he uses 8th Avenue and Schoenersville Road and many other streets in Bethlehem it is taxing to use those roads on a bicycle because the traffic is intense and there are not many bike lanes for consideration for bicyclists as well as pedestrians. Mr. Zawierucha has the advantage to be able to choose a life where he does not need a car but many other people rely on public transportation to get around. He would like for continued respect and pressure on developers to work with what we as a community need which is better access for those who cannot afford to buy into a car. Someone was asking about traffic flow and he remarked that on Schoenersville Road this is item 5 on that letter and that any of the traffic proposals that were being referenced by the developer were 20 years old for when Martin Tower was under use by PPL but times change and traffic has changed. The 53 acre development will have a significant impact on traffic in that area for pedestrians, noise, and pollution. Two weeks ago at a Council Meeting many Members of Council had expressed that they are intent on protecting people's access to the area. He appreciates the thought but please keep pressure on these developers and not let them wiggle through with promises of economic development. Being aware of some of the events with regard to Covid relief funding and the City of Bethlehem receiving \$33 million dollars there are a number of other communities who are also receiving this funding. It is his understanding there is a deadline to state what those funds are to be allocated to with restrictions. He does not see that this will be discussed tonight but with there being a need he hopes this can be discussed at a future meeting with the public, even if it is virtually.

Lynn Rothman, 870 Wafford Lane, noted she is speaking tonight on behalf of the Environmental Advisory Council (EAC). The EAC is an officially created arm of the Pennsylvania Municipal Government, a non-political body in an advisory capacity for the governing boards that appoint them. The EAC makes policy proposals, researches issues, and makes recommendations regarding land use, sustainability, and other issues. The EAC also serves an educational role for the city and the public. The Bethlehem EAC was established in 2007 under Article 146 and some of the powers stated in that Article include:

- Make recommendations as to the possible use of open land areas and/or environmentally sensitive lands within the City of Bethlehem and its surrounding areas.
- Advise Bethlehem City Council, City of Bethlehem Departments and the Administration upon issues of energy conservation.
- Review subdivision and land development plans as appropriate.

When keeping with this charge the EAC made recommendations regarding the Martin Tower site in 2019 and supported the recommendations made by Scott Slingerland, Executive Director of CAT-Coalition for Appropriate Transportation in his letter of April, 2021. Ms. Rothman added that the Martin Tower property is an opportunity for sustainable development in keeping with the newly created Climate Action Plan (CAP). The spur trail connector referenced in Mr. Slingerland's letter is in keeping with the transportation, walkability and green space strategies in the CAP. Goals and the accompanying strategies in the CAP also encompass stormwater management which is especially crucial as precipitation increases, the greening of Bethlehem City, and the incorporation of energy efficient design and renewable energy. The

Martin Tower development has the potential to further the goals outlined in the plan. In 2019 we offered recommendations in the following subject areas for the proposed development:

Density

Consolidate uses and cluster commercial buildings

Parking

- There is no apparent reason to exceed the amount of parking spots required by the City.
- Use shared parking to maximize the use of each parking space.
- Angled parking spaces would allow narrowing of access roadways.
- Utilize permeable pavement.
- Parking garages in lieu of surface parking would reduce stormwater runoff and mitigate the heat island effect.
- Consider parking underneath apartment buildings

Trees

Note that existing trees have a higher carbon sequestration capacity than new plantings.

- Every effort should be made to preserve and retain existing trees. Compensate for felling of mature trees. Recommend replacement on a 2 to 1 basis.

Green space:

- Green spaces slow and filter stormwater runoff, mitigate the heat island effect and provide habitat for the wildlife that currently inhabit the property. Furthermore, green space as part of a development creates the opportunity to improve quality of life. Natural light and connection to the environment has been proven to add to productivity and relieves stress.
- Recommend larger areas of green space interspersed between all buildings.

Buffer area:

- Natural corridors surrounding the property support and maintain existing wildlife and absorb storm water runoff.
- The minimum buffer adjacent to wooded areas and slopes should be increased to 200 feet.
- Light from buildings and parking lots should be directed inward so that it does not encroach upon open space, disrupting native species.

Stormwater management

- Traditional methods of stormwater management don't account for recent increases in the severity of rainfall events, necessitating the use of innovative methods of storm water control. The City is also going to have to comply with permitting requirements for Municipal Separate Stormwater Sewer Systems (MS4).
- Stormwater management onsite should be integrated and include the removal of contaminants as opposed to only channeling it offsite.
- Pollutants from the gas station and contaminants from automobiles and salt are of particular concern. Permeable pavement would allow for greater infiltration. Natural swales and wetlands would absorb and filter storm water and provide wildlife habitat.

Energy

- Complete a solar assessment for solar panels on buildings and in parking lots or on top of garages.
- Install solar panels where feasible.
- Install electric vehicle charging stations in both residential and commercial sections of the development.

Ms. Rothman stated we urge the city and the developer to work together to fulfill the commitments in the Climate Action Plan which was funded by the city to create a partnership with residents, institutions, businesses and organizations.

5. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Members of Council
- B. Tabled Items
- C. Unfinished Business

6. COMMUNICATIONS

- A. *Director of Public Works – Recommendation of Award – Celebration Fireworks – July 4th Fireworks*

The Clerk read a memorandum dated April 15, 2021 from Michael Alkhal, Director of Public Works recommending a contract with Celebration Fireworks, Inc. for the Celebration July 4th Fireworks. The term of the contract is July 4, 2021 with a rain date of July 5, 2021. The fee for the contract is \$34,000 dollars with no renewals.

President Waldron stated Resolution 10 B is on the agenda.

- B. *Lehigh Valley Planning Commission Memorandum-Proposed Zoning Text Amendment – OMU – Martin Tower Site – 1170 8th Avenue*

The Clerk read a comment letter from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission dated April 23, 2021 concerning the review of the privately proposed zoning text amendment that would affect the Office Mixed Use District at the former Martin Tower site at 1170 8th Avenue. The commission stated that the proposal is generally inconsistent with the Regional Plan because the presented amendments would result in suburban-scale development patterns that are not consistent with the character of the city or conducive to multimodal accessibility. Additionally they state that because the proposed amendment if adopted would affect more than one property. The zoning amendment proposal is directly related to the development proposed for a specific site. The LVPC recommends that the developer seek a variance from the Bethlehem Zoning Hearing Board.

- B. President Waldron stated the zoning text bill is on the agenda for First Reading as Item 9

7. REPORTS

- A. *President of Council*
- B. *Mayor*

Covid Update/Ideal Food Basket/American Rescue Act

Mayor Donchez noted he has a few reports and then a condensed version of his State of the City speech requested by Council. The full speech is on the City of Bethlehem website along with the video. Mayor Donchez then gave an update from our Health Department as of yesterday. A total of 31,312 people have been vaccinated by the Bethlehem Health Bureau and they plan on winding down their mass vaccination clinic at Wind Creek by the end of May. Smaller clinics will be held in Town Hall as well as some targeted clinics in the community. The Health Bureau is holding a vaccination clinic at Freedom High School and Liberty High School on May 10, 2021 and these clinics are being held for students 16 years of age and older as well as their parents. We are coordinating that with the principals and Dr. Roy. We had a very good announcement today pertaining to the closing of Ahart's. He noted that Ahart's will be remodeled and redeveloped into a full service grocery store to be named the Ideal Food Basket. The owner of C-Town is the new owner of the future Ideal Food Basket. The goal is to renovate the facility and to try to have an opening by November or December. Mayor Donchez reported this is great news for the City of Bethlehem and for the south side. He thanks them for their investment in South Bethlehem. As for the American Rescue Act, we expect the guidelines and regulations from the Treasury Department next week and that will give us more clarity as to what the money can be spent for. We have a general idea but we are waiting for the guidelines as the other cities are from the Treasury Department. That will be made public and it will come before City Council for approval.

State of the City Speech

State of the City Address

Let me begin by thanking my department heads and City Council for allowing me to address you this evening.

It's been said, "Nothing accelerates innovation like a crisis." As we know, innovation has always been part of the Bethlehem story. There's no better example than our past with Bethlehem Steel. Perhaps now, more than ever before, we see our story transcend - with innovation and a renewed entrepreneurial spirit, happening all around us, as a result of the pandemic. The decisions we made this past year, and the ones we will make tomorrow, will determine the future of our city for generations to come. My administration has risen to the challenge, and will continue to do so. Adversity often creates opportunity. We responded to the challenges of the past year. We were creative. We moved forward. And we planned for our future.

While my administration continues to manage the responsibilities of the city, many of the things we've come to appreciate and enjoy about Bethlehem, are done in partnerships, with the tireless efforts of community organizations, health networks and educational institutions.

Dr. Roy continues to offer progressive leadership and innovative education to our children and facing the pandemic the district quickly stepped into action and worked tirelessly with community partners, to find a way to provide online access, and learning to all of its students.

The school district's support for the Northside 2027 Neighborhood Plan, and partnerships with our health bureau and police department, has been a much appreciated collaborative effort, which will result in revitalized neighborhoods.

The City's health care facilities are second to none, with both St. Luke's University Health Network and Lehigh Valley Health Network ranked in the top ten hospitals in Pennsylvania. They are both important strategic partners, and continue to support our city and community in many different capacities. Over the years, LVHN has sponsored free parking in our business districts around the holidays. St. Luke's signed a five year \$120,000 sponsorship of the Bethlehem Golf Club. In addition, St. Luke's support and partnership with the Hispanic Center has been a valuable asset to the Hispanic Community in our City and to South Bethlehem. But this year, it is the commitment of both hospitals, along with our own health bureau, in getting our community vaccinated that is most appreciated. We are very fortunate to have these two highly esteemed health networks in our City. And I want to thank President and CEO, Rick Anderson and President and CEO, Dr. Brian Nester for their Partnerships during my tenure in office.

Our economic partners, BEDCO, LVEDC, and the Chamber, ensure that the City is seen as the vibrant City it is, with many possibilities for business growth. Throughout my two terms as Mayor, their collaboration with the City and our businesses, has resulted in long term economic growth, resilience of businesses and improved quality of life here in Bethlehem. Our partnerships are the foundation needed to sustain and advance our city's growth, while continuing to attract new companies, jobs and talent. I would like to thank them for their tremendous support of our businesses during the pandemic.

In addition, I would like to acknowledge the support and partnership of Wind Creek Hospitality. Their willingness to provide us with sanitizers and PPE and to allow the City to use the Event Center to vaccinate the public is greatly appreciated. In addition, many thanks to their employees, who have volunteered countless hours assisting our Health Bureau at every clinic.

During my tenure as Mayor, the City has made great progress in achieving the goals that were outlined in my first State of the City Speech in 2014. At the center of these goals, was one that would ensure the sustainability of our City - making Bethlehem financially sound. I am pleased to announce that the state of the City is strong. When I took office in 2014, the City had a five year, 40 million dollar projected deficit and a BBB- bond rating. In 2020, Standard and Poor's conducted a credit review. They analyzed our financial status, and I am proud to say that their report re-affirmed our A+ credit rating, with a stable outlook. Our strong financial report was built by developing and implementing strong financial strategies, through consultation with my Financial Advisory Committee, and working with City Council and the City Controller. Changes were made to make Bethlehem leaner, stronger and more strategically prepared, to tackle and meet the challenges of the future.

Improvements like consolidating departments, embracing new technologies, streamlining purchasing, and refinancing debt, made us more efficient. In addition, we leveraged our purchasing power to achieve better deals for energy, banking and healthcare saving the taxpayers money.

We are currently in the process of replacing the 1950s outdated huts at Rodgers Street. Our Public Works department is overseeing the transformation of the former Water Control Room in the City Hall Garage, into a holding facility for housing stray dogs. Since 2014 we have milled and paved over 40 lane miles utilizing over 40,000 tons of blacktop. This past year alone we paved 13.14 lane miles. We also completed the upgrade of 5500 cobra head street lights to LED and our

city website, along with the new My Bethlehem PA APP, have been revamped so that residents and visitors can get information more quickly.

During my time in office, Bethlehem experienced two historic snow storms in 2016 and 2021. Several years ago, we upgraded our salt storage facility, and fitted our trucks with new plows in order to be better equipped to handle such snowfalls. Furthermore, we utilized new technology to improve monitoring, optimizing plow routes and road treatment, conduct operations and evaluate results. We can now track services in real time, not only for snow, but for leaf collection and street sweeping operations as well. This tracking system ultimately reduced overtime costs while improving service.

Bethlehem's new Climate Action Plan will aim to reduce community-wide greenhouse gas emissions 33% by 2025, 60% by 2030 and reach net-zero emissions by 2040. Bethlehem will lead by example by purchasing 100% renewable electricity for municipal operations and continuing to invest in cost-saving energy reduction initiatives, which have already reduced municipal emissions 38% relative to 2005. We are committed to safe drinking water. This past year, our water filtration plant received its twelfth consecutive Area-Wide Optimization Program Award.

As our world evolves from the pandemic, and with more people increasingly spending time outdoors, the presence and upkeep of our streetscapes, paths, parks and recreational facilities will become even more important. Our work on improving streetscapes has made areas safer and more welcoming to residents and visitors alike. Improvements including sidewalks and trees were made along 4th Street, and we anticipate the improvements to South New Street from Third up to Farrington Square to begin shortly. We are about to begin Phase 5 of the Greenway which will ultimately connect to Saucon Park. Additionally, numerous improvements are being made at the Rose Garden, including a walking path.

Memorial Pool, which opened in 1957, has undergone a 5 million dollar renovation with an expected opening in June, and our Golf Course underwent 1.75 million dollars in renovations. The course has posted successful seasons and set records for play in each year since these upgrades.

Public safety is very personal to me. My administration has spent more on public safety than in any other area. From 2003-2009, the City did not replace any fire trucks, and as a result we had an aging fleet. In order to bring our fleet back into line with national standards, we purchased eight new advanced life support EMS vehicles, and five new engines for the fire department, serving all sections of the city, and an all-terrain vehicle for off-road EMS calls and rescues that was used during Musikfest. Lucas Devices, automatic chest compressors, were acquired and placed on all EMS vehicles. We consolidated our 9-1-1 Center with Northampton County, a complex transfer with critical implications. We completed the consolidation, and continue working to make sure that Bethlehem citizens receive the highest level of service.

In September of 2020, I announced a new police chief to serve the citizens of Bethlehem and lead us progressively into the future. Chief Michelle Kott has already brought a new energy and perspective to the Department. She is a strong advocate of Community Policing, Community Partnerships, and additional training, especially in the areas of mental health, cultural awareness, de-escalation tactics, implicit bias, and crisis intervention. We have seen great success with the

Naloxone program and the Police Department and Health Bureau initiated a drug recovery program entitled BPAIR (Bethlehem Police Assisting in Recovery).

Chief Kott has reorganized police personnel to better serve the community. This is the first such restructuring in over 20 years. Units have been realigned under a more efficient command structure, and categorized in to three primary groups: Patrol, Support Services, and Administration. Most importantly, the new realignment will support criminal deterrence and detection, as well as create opportunities for meaningful interaction between our officers and our community. He and the Chief will have more to say about this in the next few weeks.

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the tireless, unwavering work of our Health Bureau - especially our director, Kristen Wenrich and Bob Novatnack, our Director of Emergency Management. Through Kristen's leadership, our city was prepared, and has served as a model for the rest of the state. Our health staff spent the past year addressing COVID-19 through investigations, surveillance, community awareness, education, mitigation and recovery efforts. Our Police, Fire, EMS, Emergency Management, and other City staff - should be commended for their assistance to the Health Bureau at their COVID Vaccination clinics.

When I came into office in 2014, the Lehigh Valley economy was growing faster than other regions of Pennsylvania and the Northeast. I made the decision it was time to focus a significant amount of our energies on our neighborhoods, something that previous administrations did not have the luxury of doing.

Initiatives have been developed like the Bethlehem Blight Betterment Initiative, Northside 2027, Northside and Southside Districts Retail Analysis, a new Northside LERTA, a renewed Southside LERTA, a new rental housing plan, a student zoning ordinance and the list goes on. My goal was to make sure we focused as much on community development, making Bethlehem a better place to live, learn and play, as we had on economic development during the decline and eventual closure of Bethlehem Steel. Out of this came a revamped eminent domain program, where we employ a transparent process to identify private sector partners to tackle our most blighted properties.

Through Northside 2027, the City, Community Action Development Corporation, the BASD, and Moravian College, have partnered with residents to identify neighborhood issues like improving public space, fostering economic vitality, and supporting the neighborhoods through services, outreach and community development. Investment through a federal designation - Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area - will see millions in federal investment over the next few years. This neighborhood now will be anchored by the new Food Coop grocery store, a great addition to the city and has benefited from over two million dollars in public infrastructure spending, including a \$100,000 dollar upgrade to Friendship Park.

To support our neighborhoods, we knew we needed to change our rental housing inspection process to a data driven, inspection-based process recommended in the City's Blight Analysis. Moving forward, we will license units annually, and inspect all residential rental units for the first time throughout the city on a three year rotation. With your support we enacted a provision that will beneficially impact the quality of housing provided in the city's 14,000 residential rental units.

New employment opportunities continue to be added to the area through the further development, of the former Bethlehem Steel site. Companies like Walmart, Zulily, QVC, REEB Millwork, Curtis-Wright, Crayola, Continental Cup, Alpha, Trammel Crow, EcoTech Marine, Ecopax, and most recently the news broke that NIKE will be locating here. These businesses are providing thousands of jobs. Bowery Farming is an indoor vertical farming company who will be opening their largest and most advanced facility yet in Bethlehem. A vertical farm on a former Bethlehem Steel brownfield: Wow, we've come a long way. Since the closing of Bethlehem Steel in 1995, to date we have seen an investment of 1.6 billion dollars and approximately 8,000 jobs - on a reformed 1800 acre steel site. In addition, Wind Creek Hospitality is in the process of constructing a \$120 million dollar, 270 room hotel. We look forward to working with them as they continue to develop their property into a destination.

Our recent efforts have been focused on helping our current businesses, especially those in our downtowns. Through our efforts we have directed over \$2 million dollars with Councils approval of investment into our downtown businesses and have helped to facilitate much more through County, Federal, and other private programs. This includes purchasing of outdoor dining equipment, Parklets, PPE, direct grants to companies, and funding for the Southside Ambassador program that work to maintain a clean and inviting atmosphere.

We will continue to support our businesses through these challenging times and hope that they will adapt and emerge stronger as a result.

Bethlehem is undergoing transitions all over the City. Whether it is facilities, equipment, technology, or programming, we are planning, adapting, and investing to meet the needs of our growing and diverse population. Bethlehem has been called "a uniquely vibrant historic city". We are proud of our history, and have a strong commitment to honor our heritage. Historic Moravian Bethlehem, currently a National Historic Landmark District, is on the verge of hopefully being named a World Heritage Designation, one of only 24 sites in the United States.

During the course of the last seven and a half years as Mayor, I have taken pride in honoring the history of our City and the spirit of those workers that came before us, as we worked together to shape the future of this great City. "One thing is certain - our future is very bright and Bethlehem will continue to be the jewel of the Lehigh Valley."

8. ORDINANCES FOR FINAL PASSAGE

- A. *Bill No. 14-2021 - Zoning Text Amendment - Multifamily dwellings in CB and CL Districts*

The Clerk read Bill No. 14-2021 - Zoning Text Amendment - Multifamily dwellings in CB and CL sponsored by Ms. Crampsie Smith and Mr. Waldron and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM, COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, AMENDING ZONING ORDINANCE SECTION 1322.03 (II) TO AMEND PROVISIONS FOR MULTI-FAMILY DWELLINGS IN THE CB AND CL ZONING DISTRICTS

Voting AYE: Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. Bill No. 14-2021 now known as Ordinance No. 2021-13 was passed on Final Reading.

9. NEW ORDINANCES

- A. *Bill No. 15-2021 – Zoning Map amendment proposal submitted by the property owner at 1852 West Market/1843 West Broad Street from CL (Limited Commercial) to LI (Light Industrial)*

The Clerk read Bill No. 15-2021 – Zoning Map amendment proposal submitted by the property owner at 1852 West Market/1843 West Broad Street from CL (Limited Commercial) to LI (Light Industrial) sponsored by Ms. Negrón and Mr. Waldron and titled:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING PART 13 OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM, PENNSYLVANIA, AS AMENDED, KNOWN AS THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM, PENNSYLVANIA, BY AMENDING THE CITY ZONING MAP

Voting AYE: Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. Bill No. 15-2021 was passed on First Reading.

- B. *Bill No. 16-2021 – Zoning Text Amendment request by the property owner related to the OMU (Office Mixed Use) zoning district at the Martin Tower site at 1170 8th Avenue*

The Clerk read Bill No. 16-2021 – Zoning Map request by the property owner related to the OMU (Office Mixed Use) zoning district at the Martin Tower site at 1170 8th Avenue sponsored by Mr. Callahan and Mr. Waldron and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM, COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, AMENDING PART 13 OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES RELATING TO ZONING WITH RESPECT TO PROPERTIES IN THE OMU DISTRICT BY AMENDING SECTION 1311(a)-(b) PERTAINING TO THE CONFIGURATION OF OFF-STREET PARKING AND DRIVEWAY ACCESS ONTO ARTERIAL STREETS AND SECTION 1314.02(b)(5) TO LESSEN THE MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK.

President Waldron then mentioned the timeline with this before we dive into this. The text amendment that has been proposed by the developer is something that has gone through the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission, the Bethlehem City Planning Commission as well as the public hearing we had two weeks ago when we first heard what was being proposed and started to weigh in on that conversation. This is our First Reading of that ordinance and any ordinance, this included, will require two readings and two votes with a majority vote to pass. If Council decides to make any amendments to the zoning text amendment that is in front of us this would retrigger the entire process of the planning commissions having to review any changes that Council makes. So we will be starting that process over again. President Waldron stated just to

give a background on how that process works to go through the two planning commissions and then coming to Council for two readings. This is something we have talked about dating back 6 years when there was a much different Council than we have this evening. Some of the conversations that we had then and some of the needs have changed quite a bit in that time. President Waldron thinks it is important to weigh into this. There was a lot of conversation two weeks ago about some of the issues and priorities that Members of Council had and were advocating for. We did get a letter in response to some of those conversations that is dated April 28, 2021 and Council has that in front of them. Some of those items in there were the general genesis for the project for the changes that were being asked of Council. These include trees and planting, shared parking, green space, impervious coverage, stormwater, traffic, walkability and trails, Burnside, CRIZ, affordable housing, and tax revenue. There are quite a few items put into that and President Waldron thanks the developer for coming forward and presenting their perspective in trying to mute some of those questions head on. Anytime we have a development project that is as large as this there will be a lot of questions and feedback. This is the beginning of that conversation that we are having this evening. He will turn to any other Members of Council with questions or comments. We are joined this evening by Mr. Ronca and Mr. Wagner and they are available to make comments or answer questions that Council may have this evening. So now is the time to ask questions of the developer or we could also have an internal conversation as well. President Waldron did ask two weeks potentially for the Administration and representatives from the developer to get together and talk about some of those issues. He is not sure if that has happened as far as prioritizing some of those items but this is a good starting point to that conversation, this packet that was given to us dated April 28, 2021. President Waldron does thank Mr. Ronca for answering some of those questions head on. President Waldron asked if Mr. Callahan had any questions.

Mr. Callahan said he will defer to Dr. Van Wirt.

Dr. Van Wirt stated her questions are for Michael Alkhal, Director of Public Works. If you drew a perimeter line around the Martin Tower site, in order for this development to go from where it is right this minute until the finished product will the city be committing any resources in terms of building out infrastructure including sewers, street lights, anything at all within that perimeter.

Mr. Alkhal does not believe the city would have to provide any additional infrastructure beyond the footprint of the development itself. All of the improvements as would be required based on the review of the then developed lands for the most part would be on site. There may be some traffic issues that have to be addressed off site but beyond that in terms of sanitary stormwater or water service those infrastructures are in place to support the development.

Dr. Van Wirt asked if there are new sewers that need to line the roads; those are not being done by the city.

Mr. Alkhal stated that is correct.

Dr. Van Wirt anticipated this letter with a lot of interest and she was hoping the city would hear the urgency in our town last meeting about sitting down with the developer and hammering out something solid that we could react to. Unfortunately that did not occur. She read this letter from the Martin Tower developer, dated April 28, 2021 extremely carefully and

she read it in conjunction with the comments from the EAC, the CAT, the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission and she has a few comments. In terms of the feeling about the text amendments and the request for the increased parking between 8th Avenue which our own City Planning Department did not support and it is clear how the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission feels. She has to say she finds it incredulous to believe that a medical user of these buildings is insisting on a one entrance only security standpoint for these buildings as justifying why this parking has to be engineered in front of the building. This pandemic is new to us but it certainly is not permanent. She noted the idea that we would build a building right now at the tail end of a pandemic that is permanent and stuck in a one entrance standpoint just to her pushes the edges of her own credibility. Dr. Van Wirt also wanted to talk about the impervious coverage. The EAC wrote their 2019 letter as referenced by Ms. Rothman two years ago and the developer has had two years to understand that this is a serious document. The EAC is a city entity and these are serious recommendations. The idea explained under the impervious section coverage on page 3 that it is not adding more because there already was concrete there from Martin Tower to her also strains her credibility. We are not looking at what was there, we are looking at needs to be built and how do we protect our environment, how do we make the best decisions going forward. To offer the fact that there was already a whole lot of concrete on the space as a justification for continuing the same amount of concrete to her pushes her credibility. As for the stormwater she would really like to see a professional environmental engineer assess these plans and say are these plan adequate for stormwater runoff. One of the reasons we lost all the trees is because the site had to be regraded. Whatever was happening on the Martin Tower site prior to demolition of the tower is no longer valid. We have new grading of this land and we do not know what the stormwater runoff situation will be and if that retention pond is adequate to protect the Monocacy Creek. We just have the developer's word and she would like something more firm in terms of data. Dr. Van Wirt added with affordable housing the idea that continuing discussions is what the last sentence says in this letter. It says noted by Mr. Wagner during the public hearing, the current intent is market rate housing however we will continue to sessions with the Administration and exhaust all available options. Continuing discussions to her sounds like the phrase, "Thoughts and Prayers", it is meaningless. She is looking for something of substance in this letter. Dr. Van Wirt would say her overall impression from this letter was really seriously disappointed. She is hoping that the Administration will take whatever opportunity is in front of us right now to sit down with the developer and take the points that were put out by all of these different entities about how we fix this and make it better and not just justify that what was there was already the way was and we should be happy having that same amount of infrastructure, concrete, and impervious surfaces.

Mr. Callahan hopes that we should at least try to take some of these things off of the table one by one so we could just narrow down what our real focus is here. He is going off the letter that Mr. Ronca had sent to all of us in answer to concerns that were brought up at our last meeting. As far as he is concerned and he would think everyone should agree, as far as the trees and plantings, the developer has already agreed to (inaudible) on the site. He had a conversation with him after the meeting and asked about the trees and from what he was told was with the regrading of the property a lot of the trees would be damaged because the soil had changed. The developer assured all of us in this letter that all of the trees plus some will be replanted on the site. He hopes that we could all agree with that promise we could take the trees and plantings off of the concerns. The second thing he looked at was with the stormwater retention. The existing site that has been there all these years, he asked if they had a retention pond or any type of stormwater runoff.

Ms. Heller is sure they had stormwater runoff; there is no retention pond that she knows of on the site right now. She is sure that the stormwater requirements are different than they were when the building was first built.

Mr. Callahan noted the site that has been there for all these years, all the water ran into the Monocacy eventually, is that correct?

Ms. Heller added she does not know, it could have gone into the stormwater infrastructure that goes out into 8th Avenue or elsewhere.

Mr. Callahan remarked there is no retention pond.

Ms. Heller does not believe there was a retention pond on the site that is correct.

Mr. Callahan noted from the drawings that were offered to us, there is now a substantial stormwater runoff area there where a majority of the site water will be running into. He is asking because he does not know all the details. It says in its current state there are no detention basins or other features to provide rate control or water quality enhancements prior to the stormwater runoff reaching the Monocacy Creek. As part of the redevelopment, rate control and water quality enhancements will be provided by way of a new stormwater detention basin that will reduce the current flow rate to the Monocacy and allow suspended solids to settle in the basin before stormwater is discharged into the Monocacy Creek. He would assume that a majority of that water from the property site right now is running into the retention pond and then it is being distributed according to the laws and environmental guidelines of today. He asked if that is correct.

Ms. Heller pointed out there is a detention pond proposed. There has not been any analysis of that stormwater plan yet, that would still be part of the plan approval.

Mr. Callahan asked what the item he was referring to as far as a spray irrigation system that will recharge a portion of the basin stormwater through on-site irrigation.

Ms. Heller stated you would have to ask him that.

Mr. Ronca informed the spray irrigation system would effectively provide recharge of the two year storm onto the existing surfaces like in the wooded areas. So rather than allowing stormwater to go directly from the pond to the stream, it will instead come out of the pond and sprayed, some will be sprayed around the apartment areas and the green areas, etc. It allows the water to evaporate. It is a water quality measure.

Mr. Callahan thinks it is safe to say that prior to this he would assume when we had massive storms the water and all the debris that got caught up in the rainwater or the discharging of the water from that site, that all ran into the Monocacy Creek.

Mr. Ronca noted that is correct.

Mr. Callahan asked what corner the retention pond is in.

Mr. Ronca stated it is basically on the center south.

Mr. Callahan remarked the site is graded in the middle and has always been that way because of the hills.

Mr. Ronca noted that is correct.

Mr. Callahan related that a substantial amount of this runoff is now going to a retention pond. He asked what the purpose of a retention pond is although he would assume that is where the excess water flows and then the water than can be controlled as far as the amount of flow into any waterways.

Mr. Ronca stated the detention basin is basically a big bladder so the water will flow into the pond and be discharged at a smaller orifice at the discharge point before it goes to the pond. So if there is a storm that went for two hours and filled the pond the water may take 10 hours to leave rather than it all going directly to the stream in the same two hour period. It is rate control; it is slowing the flow to the Monocacy Creek. The other thing it does is allowing settling time for any suspended solids in the water to settle out and collect in the basin.

Mr. Callahan pointed out he wanted to clear up the issue of the walkability and the rails to trails. In the letter from Mr. Ronca he states to promote and enhance walkability we are proposing a new sidewalk connection from Eaton Avenue/Schoenersville intersection and that is where the entrance is to the mulch area is. You are going to run a sidewalk connection all the way down to the Burnside Plantation driveway.

Mr. Ronca pointed out that is correct.

Mr. Callahan added there will be a sidewalk connection to the Burnside Plantation.

Mr. Ronca remarked that is correct and stated there is an existing connection point there now with a set of steps and we will tie our sidewalks into that connecting point.

Mr. Callahan continued to say that it states there will be a perimeter walking trail starting at 8th Avenue and traveling along the south and east development limits and he asked where that is.

Mr. Ronca explained it would be at the southeast corner of the site where the C-Store gas station is, actually south of that, between that and the actual rail tracks traveling east and then north all along the perimeter of the property, not outside the wooded area but the perimeter of the development area. Then it will reconnect out to that first location where the sidewalk will be going down to the Burnside driveway.

Mr. Callahan noted he forgot who wrote the letter for the trails and the biking path but he thinks that gentleman was incorrect and he asked if Mr. Ronca owned that extension rail system that runs past the old Durkee site where the Lowe's is.

Mr. Ronca noted that is correct. He was correct in his statement that our earlier plan showed a connection at that point. Back when that plan was generated the city was hoping to

acquire that portion of the rail lines from Norfolk Southern. Because that has not happened yet and we are prepared to move forward he cannot show that connection on our plan or even promote walking to lands that the city does not own and we do not own.

Mr. Callahan asked Ms. Karner about acquiring that area of the rail for the city and noted that it was a few years ago that we talked about it. At the time someone had stated that the discussions did not go anywhere and that the city does not own that property either.

Ms. Karner stated that section of rail is something that Ms. Heller may be better poised to speak about. We have not had any conversations with Norfolk Southern for that section under this Administration. Mr. Callahan may be confusing the section that connects the Hellertown lower Saucon Rail Trail which we have had conversations on since she has been with the city.

Ms. Heller remarked she can only recall conversations with Norfolk Southern about this western stretch of rail line with the end of the prior Administration. We had conversations with Norfolk Southern in a very comprehensive way to look at two different sites in the city. They were not interested at that point in time in transferring this section of line but that does go back at least 10 or maybe 12 years. So things can change, but at that time there was no interest.

Mr. Callahan remarked the city does not own it and Mr. Ronca does not own it.

Ms. Heller stated that is correct.

Mr. Callahan remarked it is fair to say right now that topic we hope will be resolved, the city does not own it and Mr. Ronca does not own it. He added that Mr. Ronca already said he is willing to enhance the walkability of the trail from his perimeter of the property line that borders the Monocacy Creek. He does not have to do that, Mr. Callahan thinks this is a generous offer and he appreciates it. He hopes we could take the walkability and rails to trails off of our list of things to talk about. He is not talking about the walkability as far as the 8th Avenue area that has to be discussed. On the Burnside Plantation Mr. Ronca had submitted to us last week a 45 degree angle visual from the Burnside area. He asked what direction that is looking in.

Mr. Ronca remarked if you were standing on the Burnside property between the existing barn and the existing two story building and you would be looking up, it is about a 45 foot elevation difference with Burnside being lower. So you are not only looking up hill but you are looking up hill and at trees that are at the top of the hill that are much higher beyond that.

Mr. Callahan asked if Ms. Karner is aware that Mr. Ronca has agreed to decertify the 3.5 acres for CRIZ.

Ms. Karner noted that was included in the letter.

Mr. Callahan remembered two weeks ago Ms. Karner had said she had discussions with him but Mr. Callahan did not know what the acreage amount was.

Ms. Karner stated two weeks ago she was reiterating what the Mayor's comments were which was the ongoing conversations with date back to probably 2015 about CRIZ decertification.

Ms. Karner informed that Mr. Ronca has maintained the same approach which is something to have a conversation about.

Mr. Callahan remarked he may be wrong but he does not think there was ever a determined amount of acres that he is going to give back to the city.

Ms. Karner asked Mr. Ronca to comment.

Mr. Ronca related this conversation has happened he does not know how many times with our monthly discussions with the Administration. The decertifying the CRIZ happens on a parcel by parcel basis. He also has to deal with the CRIZ component with each of the users on the site. As the subdivision occurs the immediate ground would obviously be the area under the roads that can be decertified because those clearly will not be CRIZ. As the other transactions are solidified and we know what those tenants are demanding, those conversations can continue from there. He added that there is also a process through the state to decertify. He is not sure it is quite that simple to try and decertify 10 acres, 20 acres, or 30 acres at one per shot.

Mr. Callahan explained he has a driving school and he is in that area all the time. He uses that area to work on his turns for his students so he is in that area constantly. He also grew up in the Kaywin Avenue area and we walked to Nitschmann Middle School and anyone that grew up in that area that has walked there, it is not Main Street and not Broad Street. Because of route 378 this area is very separated from the rest of the community other than the Kaywin Avenue area. When we were walking to Nitschmann, if you drive by there it is not really for pedestrians. You are lucky if you find one or two people even walking around there any time of the day, it is not an area where a lot of people walk to, because it is a remote area. All the buildings around this area already have the same exact setback that the end user is not requesting from the developer. Mr. Callahan is not sure not giving this a look to allow the setback where all the other buildings are, the St. Luke's building across the street, that new building has the setback that is being requested. He is not sure not allowing the setback will make it any more walkable. There was a pedestrian bridge that went over the entrances and ramps to Route 378 and not one kid from Nitschmann ever used it because you had to walk 100 yards up, 100 yards across and 100 yards down versus walking 10 feet across the 378 entrance on 8th Avenue. None of us ever walked on that side and when they were redoing it they knocked it down, it does not exist anymore. That tells us the amount of walkability in that area. Mr. Callahan is wondering what this discussion is really about, it is really about two rows of parking that all these neighbors already have. He is not asking for it, the end user is. The end user wants it for branding purposes, they want frontage in the front. All of the businesses in that area have only one entrance, all the St. Luke's buildings have one entrance, and they do not have multiple entrances. All the buildings to the right of that heading north have one entrance. The CVS has one entrance facing 8th Avenue. Even the setback St. Luke's building that is behind the CVS has it facing 8th Avenue and they only have one entrance. The argument can be made that the end user (Lehigh Valley Health Network) is requesting something that everybody else has and their thought is if they are paying rent on 8th Avenue they do not want the back of their building up against 8th Avenue and that they are paying 8th Avenue leasing space and want the front and brand and signage facing 8th Avenue. If they turn the building around to face 8th Avenue now we will have the dumpsters facing 8th Avenue. This whole thing comes down to \$2.7 million dollars of additional taxes coming into the city versus 2 rows of parking at the request of the end user from the back to the front so that their patients, primarily elderly people can park there. We had talked about the tree canopy, the

stormwater runoff, the walkability and the trails in the back that Mr. Ronca said he will lengthen the sidewalk areas down to Burnside at his cost. We have to narrow this down to the fact that we have \$700,000 in new city taxes, \$1.2 to \$1.3 million dollars in school district taxes and an additional \$600,000 in county taxes. So we are looking at \$2.2 million dollars in taxes. We raised taxes last year, he did not but Council did, he voted against it, and a 5% increase brought in \$1.5 million dollars that is all. We are looking at \$2.2 million dollars in additional revenue over basically moving two rows of parking from the back to the front, no more additional parking only moving it because the end user is requiring it and the end user has in their lease contract that they can walk if they do not get it. Mr. Callahan hopes that we all put on our City Council hats because we have many obligations and things to think about. One of the most important things is when we raise taxes on our taxpayers that we all understand. (inaudible) If these end users walk he does not know how long it would be before another end user shows up and then they have to go through a lot of legal rambling before it is presented back to Council. He would assume that a new end user would probably ask for the same thing, the frontage facing 8th Avenue. He would like to narrow this down to what we are really talking about and let's get all the other things off the table that have already been addressed.

President Waldron related one sticking point that keeps coming up is parking because that is specifically what is being asked of us. We have brought up some other concerns and other priorities that we would like to see included in the development. We cannot force the developer to do that, that is not our role unless we are willing to change what the zoning looks like on this site. One thing that did come up is the setback and he just wanted to clarify with Ms. Heller what is being asked of us. It is pretty simple the understanding of the push back of the parking but he does not believe that the text amendment specifies those numbers specifically to say we are moving it back two rows specifically, no more no less. He queried if that is correct.

Ms. Heller stated that is correct. Right now the way the wording is (in the current zoning ordinance) that it allows one row of parking and one driving aisle in front of the building and the proposed amendment just removes that provision.

President Waldron remarked that the verbiage may include and this is something we would want to get correct, is to allow specifically what is being asked of us on that site map that was proposed with that change of having more rows of parking. Someone did float the idea two weeks ago, and if he remembers it was Mr. Callahan of bringing up the proposal of amending what is in front of us. That way we have that specific verbiage and he thinks that is a good idea that Mr. Callahan had that we would make that amendment so that way we are specifically giving what is being asked of us and that is what is being asked of the developer by the end user, the anchor tenant that is demanding this change. If we are to proceed with this that is at least a minimum change he would like to see and he would be willing to support his getting that verbiage correct so that way we are not giving carte blanche to allow for as much space from the curb to the building. He does understand if we do make that amendment it is considered a substantial amendment and take everything back to both planning commissions, but that is a consideration we should take on this evening.

Mr. Callahan appreciates President Waldron's comments about the parking. In Mr. Ronca's letter he mentioned impervious coverage versus what the lot was and he had stated that if it was his preference he would want less parking and more buildings, because the buildings are bringing in rent revenue or lease revenue. He would prefer to not have as much parking. The

parking is what going to be ultimately be required by the end users. As you are going up 8th Avenue and you pass Eaton Avenue and are heading towards Schoenersville Road the first left hand turn after St. Luke's Medical Building and that is on the left and on the right hand side are residents. He can remember long ago that a lot of those residents for a number of City Council Meetings came and complained that the patients that were going into that site were parking on the street and taking up street parking. He is not sure what the street name is.

Mr. Alkhal believes that is Richards Street.

Mr. Callahan does not know if Mr. Waldron or Mayor Donchez remembers that the end user at that site did not have enough parking and the over flow was going out into the street and they could not find off-street parking. He remarked that parking is a difficult issue. If it was up to Mr. Ronca he would prefer to have less parking and more buildings to generate revenue. The parking is either being required by the city or the end user and in this case the end user because it is going to be a medical building and there will be patients coming in every day. There is not enough parking in the front for them and that is why the request has been made for two rows of parking in the front. Mr. Callahan wants to narrow the argument down to what we are looking at versus the extra \$2.2 or \$2.4 million dollars of taxes. That is not the end all of every development issue but it is a significant amount of money for the city taxpayers. He is not sure the end user would even want to turn the building around and have the frontage facing the back and if they did we now have the garbage dumpsters facing 8th Avenue. He does not see the walkability increasing or decreasing because of the extra setback of two rows of parking. He would ask everyone to respectfully consider that as we think about the amount of tax revenue being generated.

President Waldron pointed out that the idea of impervious coverage is equal whether it is a parking spot or the roof of a building. So the question obviously is impervious coverage and we are not trying to replace a parking spot with more building we are trying to replace that impervious coverage with more green space.

Dr. Van Wirt thinks it is really important that we are precise here in what we are speaking about. When we break down the post development projected assessment and tax services the amount the city will receive if this project is fully built out is per annum is \$577,000 dollars a year, it is not \$2.7 million, the other remainder goes to the county and the final remainder goes to the school system to offset the increase cost of having school children there. Dr. Van Wirt remarked when we had the Parking Authority contributing \$500,000 a year to the General Fund and suddenly they decided to stop doing it nobody said boo about it. But now we have a development that has a projected annual addition to our General Fund of \$577,000 a year and it is like the second coming of God. She just wants to be very clear about the numbers we are talking about in terms of our General Fund and where the rest of it is going.

Mr. Colón thanked President Waldron about his point before about the line where it talks about limiting one row of parking spaces and driving aisles. In terms of what is in front of us to vote on adding the four way up there by CVS, he is comfortable with that as it reads with the reducing the rear yard setback from 30 feet to 20 feet, he is also comfortable with that. His question at the last meeting touched on what President Waldron talked about. What we are talking about what is proposed for the site but what we are voting on to Mr. Callahan's point of holding things up for an additional driving aisle row of parking, but that is not what the

amendment reads. This is not proposed for this specific project, but it would be for that zoning district. He is not comfortable with the idea of deleting the entire line prescribing the need for one driving aisle and one row of parking to leave it up to the fact that it could potentially be anything, although not specific to this plan, but that is how the zoning would be changed to read. Mr. Colón asked if Council were to make an amendment tonight or at a future meeting to what is in front of us with these text amendments, Mr. Waldron said that would go back to both planning commissions, the City Planning Commission and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission, he wondered if that is correct.

Ms. Heller stated that is correct.

Mr. Colón asked what we are looking at until we are back again with this ordinance.

Ms. Heller informed the Planning Commission and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission each meet monthly so that is at least 30 days or maybe 45 days depending on the calendar. Actually the City Clerk could answer more on this but before another public hearing could be held there would have to be an advertisement and there is a time period for that. He would add another 30 days for that. To get back to another public hearing it is probably 60 or 70 days.

Mr. Vidoni stated that is a realistic timeline.

Mr. Colón informed he appreciates the letter from Mr. Ronca and the development of the site. But as we go through this process a little bit he knows the user who he is in negotiations with in leasing these buildings is saying that the one lane of parking and one traffic aisle will not work for them. He wondered if they are asking for specifically for two rows and if that would work for them and has that been discussed.

Mr. Ronca stated we need to remember that these lots are only so large and that the building can only move so far. If you look at the plan and at the corner lot the most that building could move would probably be to take the rear row of parking and move that to the front of the building. You would not do that because that is where the drop off aisle is. We need to realize we have an entrance on Eaton Avenue, in and out, we have an entrance at the main driveway, the new driveway and there are also two entrances on Tower Drive. So now we will take traffic at each of these buildings for that matter because they want their buildings facing 8th Avenue. We will take traffic from all these directions and follow them to a single drive aisle up along the street, people being dropped off with no circulation around there and no way to take a second aisle like when you go to your typical department store. You are now stuck. If you move over to the right side of the page at the corner building you will see there is a single row along the street, a double row and then you have the very large drop-off canopy area. Mr. Ronca explained because of the size of the lot and the depth of the lot as he indicated in his letter the internal road structure is affectively fixed at this point. The most that building could move back, you could not even move a double row because you cannot do odd rows. The most that could happen there is that the building could be moved back another 18 feet with parking in front of it but that would create a parking deficiency so we would not be doing that. On the smaller building that could probably move back an extra double row and have that double row out front that is the extent of movement on these lots. If you pushed them all the way back for that matter and had a drive

aisle, you are literally talking about moving them back somewhere between 60 and 80 feet at that point.

Mr. Colón remarked in the request for the text amendment what was the genesis for just deleting the language that relates to limiting one driving aisle, one row of parking as opposed to just asking for two driving aisles and two rows of parking.

Mr. Ronca stated if you go to the ordinance and that section in the ordinance on parking you will find multiple areas in there where the item does not apply to the OMU, there are at least 5 or 6 of them there, he cannot say off the top of his head what they are but they are requirements in other zones that from day one did not apply to the OMU zone. So the simplest change was that it does not apply in the OMU zone for this item. If we look at the driveway it is understood that the purpose of the requirement in 1108 (b) that says no new driveways unless you can prove to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or whoever that rear alleys and other access points cannot be accomplished is a safety issue. You do not want multiple driveways coming out on arterial streets like five houses coming out on an arterial street because it could create a dangerous situation. The signalized intersection is the safest location you can create to exit and enter a piece of property. His point is that the ordinance is not perfect that he should not have to be asking and in fact he does not even know if they had to ask for it across the street when they put it in. The ordinance is not perfect and that item should not even have to be asked for because that is not the condition that the provision of the ordinance is meant to protect against. Mr. Ronca remarked there are many other guidelines or whatever we want to call them, sections in the parking regulations that do not apply in the OMU zone. The buildings can only move so far so we did not see it as any reason with two drive aisles and two parking lanes or whatever, did not need to apply. To the point of walkability we have two medical buildings here and there are 8 other medical buildings around this area, we have a grocery store here and we have a grocery store across the street. Ours are going to be no less walkable than every other building here, in fact probably more walkable.

Mr. Colón stated he appreciates the feedback. Relating to the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission memo that we received and the City Clerk read into the record at the beginning of the meeting, can you speak to what the planning commission made mention of with going to the Zoning Hearing Board rather than text amendments. What is the process behind this course of action as opposed to going before the Zoning Hearing Board?

Mr. Ronca informed as we sit here today his grocer user is not signed. He believes he will have them and he has two others that are interested in the site. Each of these operators has their own specific prototypical buildings, prototypical parking requirements, etc. If he gets a variance for this and this does not get inked and he has to bring another user here he will have to go back for another variance. If the hospital between now and the time we build decide they will reconfigure that building, it would be a similar situation. So he will go and get a variance for a specific plan and then that will no longer comply because the plan would change. That is ludicrous and is an undue burden and we will be caught in a loop here. This is not an easy project, we have 50 acres here with 40 developable and items here will be interchangeable. He will never have 10 uses solidified at the same time. Mr. Ronca reiterated that the buildings can only move so far on the lots.

Mr. Colón pointed out in the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission's memo they make reference to the fact that the amendments would result in suburban scale development patterns. He knows that 4 of us were not on Council at the time and he wanted to make mention that a previous Council Member during the previous public hearings and when this zoning amendment had passed, around December of 2015 said exactly that. The zoning ordinance as it was being voted on; their concern was that it was creating more urban sprawl in a suburban situation, what would be more typical of a suburban development situation. Here we are all these years later and it is ironic how a few years can change things. Those are his comments and he thanked Mr. Ronca for his feedback.

Ms. Crampsie Smith remarked that it seems that the one bone of contention amongst others is the parking amendment. It seems like the other two amendments the City Planning Commission and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission are recommending those but they both do not recommend the parking amendment. She needs some clarification. Her understanding is that you are asking for those amendments because it was an agreement between the proposed tenants of the buildings, that they want the front of the building to face 8th Avenue, she is assuming for address purposes as well as have their logo and parking in the front. But she is confused because she goes to the doctor across the street who is on the corner of Eaton Avenue and Schoenersville Road. Their address is Eaton Avenue even though the front of the building, the entrance to the building is in the back of Eaton Avenue. She went to another doctor last week who is a part of Lehigh Valley Health Network and they are on the corner of Tilghman and Hausman but they are far in on a little road that is off of Luther Crest that should be called a court but the address is Hausman Road and again the entrance does not face Hausman or Tilghman Street and the main entrance is not on either of those main thoroughfares but their address is Hausman Road. She is confused as to why there is an issue that the tenant must have the building in the front of it facing 8th Avenue and have an address of 8th Avenue when several other medical buildings do not face the main street and have that address.

Mr. Ronca stated he cannot answer your question; he is not in their office. If it were to him, it does not necessarily matter. If they were okay with the buildings in compliance with the ordinance we would not be having this conversation. It does nothing for him, this is their requirement. His lease document literally has a termination provision that if they are not able to site the buildings in accordance with the plan they can terminate and they likely will terminate. Anyone on this call is more than welcome to speak with them and ask that question directly. Mr. Ronca pointed out he is not here telling a story, he has no reason to want it one way or the other, this is their requirement not his. As to Dr. Van Wirt's comment it is not that the building will have only one entrance, it will have a main entrance and will obviously have many exits to comply with safety. Mr. Ronca pointed out it will have a single entrance, he cannot think of a medical building that does not have one unless you are going to a hospital that is a sprawling complex. Any medical building he has gone to there is a main entrance you go into, you see the reception area, it is controlled, after you get through the reception area they take you in the back for whatever is going to happen.

Ms. Crampsie Smith is thinking that you have that in your agreement that it is a condition for termination of their agreement with you if they cannot have the entrance in the front facing 8th Avenue. She wonders why you would even do that knowing that you need a variance and the variance is not definite.

Mr. Ronca stressed that frankly he cannot believe this has turned into the issue that it has. We have buildings up and down this corridor that are all set back. This provision in his opinion is somewhat of a hangover requirement when we had the third downtown concept that nobody wanted. He added that unfortunately when the ordinance was changed to get rid of that, to keep the entire downtown community happy this item still hung around. Again, he cannot believe this is as much of an issue. He does not know why every other building on this corridor can be set back and his three, although it is only two because the only thing this change does for the grocery store is literally provide him the six handicapped parking spaces adjacent to the building. Again, this is a prototype building designed and provided by the user. But that is all that does for the grocery and he hopes that is as de minimis as anything you could possibly talk about. We are literally talking about two buildings here; he cannot for the life of him believe that we are having the magnitude of conversation on this item. He would never have believed this would be this much of an issue.

Ms. Crampsie Smith hears what he is saying but the bottom line is right now the way the zoning is written you need a variance to get this parking to change, to meet the requirements for the desire of the tenant. What she is saying is instead of coming after us why are you not realizing that you need a variance and why did you even go into this type of agreement until you got the variance and knew it would happen, that is her train of thought here. That is enough about that issue because that is certainly an issue that is a bone of contention. The other thing she has questions about is the storm water runoff. She remarked that we have the Climate Action Plan where we are looking to make sure that any future development is going to be as green as possible. We also imposed a storm water fee which she was involved with and was not too happy we had to do this during the pandemic but we had to because of state and federal requirements. Ms. Crampsie Smith is wondering how can we get some kind of a more guarantee that the retention pond is going to be enough to prevent storm water runoff into the Monocacy. Is there a way we can get that guarantee and can we have as Dr. Van Wirt said maybe an environmental engineer come in and do some kind of evaluation so they could tell us what it will look like with the retention pond.

Mr. Ronca stated the short answer is no, simply because the detention pond will not preclude storm water from going to the Monocacy Creek. The pond will slow down the rate of flow to the Monocacy Creek but it never could alleviate 100% of the flow to the Monocacy Creek if that is the question.

Ms. Crampsie Smith stated that is her question so is that the answer that it will not eliminate 100% of the runoff.

Mr. Ronca stressed there is nothing he can do that would accomplish that goal.

Ms. Crampsie Smith understands that the only thing we have to vote on is the three amendments. The first two she is fine with but the parking she has some issues with. She asked why Mr. Ronca would not consider doing some level of affordable housing for middle incomes knowing that it is the buzz word in our city, our state, and our country right now. It is something that can help to eliminate the crisis somewhat.

Mr. Ronca stated while he appreciates the initiative, he thinks that everyone needs to realize that we have literally the most expensive ground anywhere in the Lehigh Valley probably

times 10 between our acquisition, remediation, demolition, site clean-up, etc. He thinks that Ms. Karner can tell you we had the conversation, she has met with Mr. Wagner or at least got on the phone with Mr. Wagner several times to discuss what options are there. She assumes they are still in the middle of those conversations. Mr. Ronca cannot sit here today and tell you that he can afford to do affordable housing here. Our pro-rata land costs on the residential component is twice what it could be sold for on the market. He would not know how to further burden that component, financially burden it.

Ms. Crampsie Smith asked if he is saying it would be a financial burden to do affordable at this point.

Mr. Ronca stated that is correct. He is not saying we are not willing to entertain it; they are having discussions about other incentives or whatever else is going on in other parts of the city. This is a very expensive piece of ground.

Ms. Crampsie Smith remarked as Mr. Ronca said in his letter, this is a very complicated project with a laundry list of concerns. It does require, as he said in his letter and she appreciates this, cooperation and compromise by all concerned parties. She does not think she is convinced that enough of that cooperation compromise has happened and that this can be the development that we would all like it to be. There are several unresolved issues that have been highlighted by the numerous letters we received to Council and the Administration as well as the numerous phone calls that we received tonight from the concerned citizens which she appreciates. Plus the agenda was just updated this afternoon with to include the letter from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission with their comments on the Martin Tower plan. That indicates given all these factors she will make a motion that we delay the vote on this until our next Council Meeting so it will give us and the Administration and Mr. Ronca time so we can look into more of these unresolved issues and truly try to do the cooperation compromise that is necessary. Ms. Crampsie Smith made the motion that we delay the vote until the next Council Meeting on the amendments.

Mr. Callahan asked if we can finish comments with everybody before we do that.

Solicitor Spirk stated we need a second to the motion before anything else. There is a motion on the floor, you need a second.

Mr. Callahan asked if that shuts down comments.

Ms. Negrón seconded the motion.

Solicitor Spirk advised because it is a motion to postpone and not a motion to table, a motion to postpone to a future date is debatable, so there now has been a motion and a second.

President Waldron asked if Mr. Callahan has a comment on the proposal to postpone two weeks.

Mr. Callahan stated he wanted to make a few additional comments.

President Waldron asked Mr. Callahan if he has a comment specifically on that motion to postpone.

Mr. Callahan has a point of reference to Solicitor Spirk. He asked if we pass this to postpone, which he would be in favor of, does that stop us from having other discussions on this topic tonight.

Solicitor Spirk stated you always have New Business but you would not be discussing it right at this point of the meeting. That would have to wait for New Business. Once the motion would pass, if it passes you would not be able to discuss it more now you would have to reserve that to New Business, if the motion passes.

Mr. Callahan can wait until New Business or we can do that now, whatever the preference of Ms. Crampsie Smith is.

Ms. Crampsie Smith defers to President Waldron.

President Waldron remarked it seems like there might still be some conversation we would like to have on this topic. Not every Member of Council has had an opportunity to speak yet as well. He does have the idea of a potential amendment and he does not know how long that would take to get that in writing and whether two weeks is enough time to do that or not. The consideration would be to push that even longer. He does not want to rush the process and that we come back in two weeks again and say here we go do we have everything in order. It is important that we get this right and do it the first time as cleanly as possible. That way we do not feel like we are on an artificial timeline to get this done as soon as possible as if there is a year-end goal we need to meet. With the potential of an amendment it would trigger the whole process over again regardless. President Waldron asked Ms. Crampsie Smith if she is willing to pull her motion, he would support that motion this evening but he thinks it might make sense to conclude our conversation and everyone have a chance to weigh in and then at the end of that dialogue re-propose that amendment, whether it is two weeks or four weeks out and then take a vote on that and then continue with our agenda this evening. He asked if Ms. Crampsie Smith is willing to withdraw that motion.

Ms. Crampsie Smith stated yes, absolutely, she will withdraw her motion.

President Waldron stated he will give her the opportunity to make that motion again after we conclude our dialogue on this.

Ms. Negrón stated she wanted to speak before but also wanted to say she is okay in just passing the motion and her comments could be at the end of the meeting during New Business.

President Waldron believes it makes sense to focus on this topic at hand. We do not have much to do after this but it does make sense to stay with what we are discussing.

Ms. Negrón appreciates the feedback from the other Council Members. She still thinks about affordable housing and in order for individuals to pay for market rate housing they have to be making \$34 dollars an hour. In the letter Mr. Ronca closed by saying that this construction will create hundreds of construction and permanent jobs. That is great but are they going to be

paying \$34 dollars an hour because those will be the only ones that will be able to live in that market rate place. There are hundreds of jobs with the hospitals and move of them except the doctors get maybe \$20 dollars an hour and under \$20 dollars an hour cannot afford market place rent. That is what affordable housing is for; it is for the working people. We have thousands of working people in the Lehigh Valley that have no place to live because with market rate rental you have to be making \$34 dollars an hour. If you are going to have jobs in there that will pay \$34 dollars an hour, let me know because I will quit my job and work there. She does not make \$34 dollars an hour. She was looking to sell her house and rent an apartment on the south side and she could not afford it. Ms. Negrón stated she is talking about these people who will be in those hundreds of jobs, where are they going to live? She noted that we have thousands of people working in these warehouses and she deals with them every day and they make \$17 dollars an hour. None of them have a place to live that is a decent place because everything is market rate.

Mr. Callahan related as far as the taxes are concerned, this is a huge issue to him. The city taxes as Dr. Van Wirt had said, she is correct. (inaudible) When this is complete it is \$577,000 dollars and that is an increase of \$567,000 dollars to the city coffers. Council just raised taxes, although he did not vote yes on that, for 5% which brought in \$1.5 million. So a \$567,000 dollar increase in tax revenue to the city equals 1.8% tax increase. So this money being generated by the development of this property is equal to a 1.8 % tax increase if his calculations are correct. That is an enormous amount of money to the city taxpayers. Mr. Callahan remarked that Dr. Van Wirt could afford those tax increases but as Ms. Negrón said there are people that cannot afford it. Every time we raise taxes that increase makes Bethlehem less affordable. The affordable housing crisis is real. Mr. Callahan proposed a few meetings ago to take \$5 million dollars of the federal stimulus money out of the \$33 million that we will get and put it towards affordable housing and he got no response from anybody on Council. We will never have this windfall of money ever again from the federal government. This is because of the crisis with the pandemic. Mr. Callahan is proposing again \$5 million dollars of that federal stimulus money, the \$33 million to go to affordable housing and on top of that we have a big vote coming up on a topic that someone called in about tonight. The developer on the south side proposed 10% of affordable housing and that got shot down 5-0 by the historical board. That is something that we will have to address as Council Members. That vote is going to be very important and will put a lot of us in a position where we put our money where our mouths are. He is willing to put \$5 million dollars of that federal stimulus money towards affordable housing and we also have to vote on the south side developer. You cannot have affordable housing without density and without height. We have a developer over on the south side who has already proposed putting in 10% affordable housing and that got shot down. Mr. Callahan does not know where the expectation is for these developers. The bar seems to keep moving. That \$567,000 dollars is city money and the 1.8% tax increase and that is not including the \$1.7 million dollars to the school district which is primarily all city taxpayers. He understands if you do not want to count the County money because Bethlehem is a small part of the County but the Bethlehem Area School District is getting \$1.7 million dollars in additional tax revenue. That site is paying right now \$32,964 dollars a year in taxes but when it is done they will be paying \$1.748 million a year in taxes that is just the school district. He added that on top of that the city gets \$567,000 dollars and that is over \$2 million dollars. This talk is only over two lanes of parking and he thinks that is what this basically comes down to. As far as the impervious coverage he had talked to a good friend of his who owns a paving business and he asked if they make pervious blacktop and he said yes they do but they do not use it much around here because previous blacktop is not used that often around there

because this area is known for sinkholes and when you have pervious coverage in the blacktop the water drains through the ground and then you get sinkholes, that is why they do not use it here. Mr. Callahan noted that Mr. Alkhal can address that better than he can about the sinkholes. Maybe a few years ago on New Street we had a huge sinkhole problem and there were 2 or 3 houses that were demolished because of it. So this is an issue that has to be addressed.

Ms. Crampsie Smith clarified about Councilman Callahan's comments and stated that nobody wants to ever raise taxes especially during a pandemic. She grew up as a free reduced lunch student and she has been on her own for the past few years supporting her 3 kids and she knows what it is like to struggle financially. That is why she is such an advocate for those that are oppressed and need affordable housing. It does not matter where any of us are at as far as our income goes, what we are looking at here is that we need to look at development to increase our tax base. But the way she sees it here is that we will not approve a development project just because it will bring taxes in. We have a proposal here where we have to vote on amending the law and that is what the bottom line is. We have to vote our conscience as Council representing the citizens of this city. We heard many of them call in tonight not in favor of us changing the law. The bottom line is that we are here to vote on changing the law, not to vote on changing the law just because we want to increase our tax base in the city.

Mr. Callahan added that we are not making this decision in a vacuum; there are real consequences if the end user leaves which is a possibility. If we vote against this and it does not go through and the end user walks away maybe the taxpayers will say you know what we would rather have our taxes raised over that two extra rows of parking. The taxpayers of the City of Bethlehem, if they drive by this and see where the existing buildings already are would think that we are a little off in our judgment by not allowing this and taking the chance of the end user walking away, which he hopes does not happen. It is a lot of money. Is the whole thing about tax dollars? No, it is not but when you look the small ask on the end user and what their requirement is, not the developer, the chance of them walking away from this is substantial. All of us will have to answer where this is the right decision or not. Mr. Callahan is all for affordable housing and he hopes all on Council will support him when we do have the discussion of moving the \$5 million dollars to the affordable housing problem in our city. It will be upon us when the vote comes for the new building on New Street where the developer did propose to put 10% of affordable housing in there. They are trying to help the city out and the ask of the end user on this site is not that great of an ask. (inaudible) It is fair to say it is actually something we should have addressed when we rezoned the property many years ago, but we did not so it is now on us to fix. He does appreciate everyone's comments.

Mr. Colón stated he appreciates Mr. Ronca being frank about what the request is of those that he is in negotiation with for these two buildings. He asked Mr. Ronca if he is working on any kind of timeline.

Mr. Ronca stated of course we are and added that at least three of our users have questions what is happening and why and is this project going to move forward. These people work on multiple deals at a time. If there is something that looks like it will not happen they will move on. This has been a long road. He appreciates the question. One of the things that was going through is head is does everyone realize that the people we are dealing with all have time frames and there is programming they need to accomplish. They are all spending time and money and are just wondering what is happening.

Ms. Crampsie Smith stated she is willing to reintroduce her motion but did President Waldron want to speak about more parameters to the amendment.

President Waldron pointed out if they are making a motion to postpone for two weeks, what is the purpose of that.

Ms. Crampsie Smith remarked there are a lot of unresolved issues and this is a complicated matter and she hopes that Mr. Ronca and the city can have more dialogue and try to come up with some resolution. For example just for the variance for parking it is unlimited. We have the Parking Authority and the Planning Commission that both do not recommend it. One of the issues is that it is unlimited as far as the number of parking lanes and driving aisles. Perhaps that is something that can be looked at. The storm water issue that is another thing that is not resolved. Ms. Crampsie Smith believes there are more questions than answers in her mind and she would like to take more time to have these issues resolved.

Mr. Ronca stated not to take this the wrong way but the storm water is a planning issue, a DEP issue, etc. He tried to respond to a whole bunch of questions or comments that frankly he does not believe have any bearing whatsoever on the requested amendment. Of course he wanted to provide the responses he could. But he does not know how the storm water issue would be something for Council to be addressing. We are not asking for a variance, we are asking to modify the provisions of the zone so we have flexibility simply on the parking and it only concerns those frontage lots. We are talking about the two medical buildings and the grocery store at this point that is all this affects. It does not affect the internal lots, it only has to do with the arterial street and those lots are only so big, those buildings can only move so far.

Ms. Crampsie Smith explained she is aware of that and she is also aware that our only control is to vote on the three amendments that are in front of us. As everyone heard tonight there are a lot of concerns from our citizens regarding environmental issue especially the storm water that is why she brought that up. She thought that was perhaps something that could be looked into further to appease the concerns of all the citizens that called in tonight and all the citizens that have emailed us the past few weeks.

Mr. Ronca is trying to say that he would not know how to begin to appease anybody. The site has to be designed in total. The storm water system has to be designed in total. What would you ask him to do to appease them?

Ms. Crampsie Smith remarked we listened to the people who called in and when we referenced our Climate Action Plan we want to do everything we can to avoid any runoff into our watershed and the Monocacy Creek.

Mr. Ronca does not think that anyone expected there would be no runoff to the Monocacy Creek. They asked what controls will be in place. He does not believe anybody in any of these letters has suggested that there should not be a drop of water coming off our site and reaching the Monocacy Creek. They are just asking to ensure that there will be controls for that. He has already represented that there will be controls for that. We showed that on the plan.

Ms. Crampsie Smith noted that is a dead issue with the storm water runoff but we still have the issue with the parking. She will make the motion because we have many unresolved

issues and especially since our agenda was just revised this afternoon to include more information regarding this development, she made the motion that we delay this vote.

Ms. Negrón seconded the motion.

President Waldron explained for a motion to postpone we need to pick a specific date. So if we are looking at the calendar we are usually the first and third Tuesday but because of the Primary Election that gets pushed to the Wednesday, May 19, 2021. The question is do you intend to push to that Wednesday or the first meeting in June.

Ms. Crampsie Smith believes the first meeting in June is June 1, 2021. She made the motion to postpone this until June 1, 2021.

Ms. Negrón seconded the motion.

Mr. Callahan is in favor of this. It will also give us more time to look at the issues that are still on the table. It will also give us an opportunity to reach out to taxpayers. We had several representatives speak about the environment and storm water runoff. The extra time until the final vote that will give us time to get feedback from regular taxpayers and people in the surrounding neighborhood and also from the school district. This vote will have an impact on a lot of different entities other than some of the ones that called tonight. We are looking at a substantial amount of taxpayer money and tax increases if this does not go through. It is fair to say what Mr. Evans said of Mr. Waldron's question a few months ago that the city needs to bring in an extra \$2 million dollars a year to balance our budget. There is no question that this is one the largest development project in the City of Bethlehem; next to the Sands it is probably number two. Mr. Callahan related this is important to the people who really believe in affordable housing to look at this, (inaudible) we have an affordable housing crisis throughout the United States. A lot of construction stopped during the pandemic and because of that there is a huge shortage right now. The only way you bring down prices is you increase the amount of housing stock. Mr. Callahan agrees with this and will support it.

Mr. Colón noted earlier he asked Ms. Heller and Mr. Vidoni about the process of the timeline if this is amended. June 1, 2021 is our first reading if we have amendments on June 1, 2021 and we vote to amend it we are still looking at a second reading. His question is if we amend it and vote on it once, it still has to be voted on a second time before it gets kicked back to the City Planning Commission and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. Is that correct, passing it through once, would that trigger that?

President Waldron thinks so; he does not believe it will take two readings to do that.

Mr. Colón stated so amending it and passing the amendment one time would then take it out of Council and kick it back to planning.

President Waldron explained we would be passing an amendment, not actually passing the ordinance.

Mr. Ronca asked if there is amendment how much further beyond that then.

President Waldron noted if there was to be an amendment or if there was for the text ordinance to pass, the timeline is up in the air because we do not know what the next step will be.

Voting AYE on the motion to postpone until June 1, 2021: Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. Bill No. 15-2021 is postponed until the June 1, 2021 Council Meeting.

10. RESOLUTIONS

A. *Approve Records Destruction – Police Department*

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Waldron sponsored Resolution No. 2010-085 that authorized the disposition of Police Department public records, as stated in Exhibit A.

Voting AYE: Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. The Resolution passed.

B. *Approve Contract – Celebration Fireworks, Inc. – July 4th Fireworks*

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Waldron sponsored Resolution No. 2021-086 that that authorized to execute an agreement with Celebration Fire Works, Inc. for the Celebration July 4th Fireworks.

Voting AYE: Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. The Resolution passed.

Motion – Considering Resolutions 10 C through 10 E as a group – Certificates of Appropriateness

Mr. Callahan and Ms. Negrón moved to consider Resolutions 10 C through 10 E as a group.

Voting AYE: Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. The Motion passed.

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

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Waldron sponsored Resolution No. 2021-087 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a sign at 220 East Third Street.

D. *Certificate of Appropriateness – 412 East Fourth Street*

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Waldron sponsored Resolution No. 2021-088 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a new hanging sign at 412 East Fourth Street.

E. *Certificate of Appropriateness – 215-217 Broadway*

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Waldron sponsored Resolution No. 2021-089 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new 25-foot x 107-foot addition. A partial addition structure will be demolished including the foundation at 215-217 Broadway.

Voting AYE on Resolutions 10 C through 10 E: Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. The Resolutions passed.

11. NEW BUSINESS

Community Development Committee Meeting

Chairman Van Wirt announced there will be a Community Development Committee Meeting on Tuesday, May 11, 2021 at 6:00 pm in Town Hall. There are two agenda items. The first item is the discussion of an Administration-proposed bill to expand the eligibility requirements for Board Members on the Historical & Architectural Review Board. The second is review of the Administration South Side Planning Study.

Supermarket on the south side/ Touchstone Theater

Ms. Negrón thanked Mayor Donchez for securing the food supermarket, the idea of the Food Basket on the south side. Also to have in the meantime the foundation doing the fresh food. She saw it last Saturday and the people on the south side were excited about it. She also wanted to thank the Mayor, Administration, and the Chief of Police for taking the time for the Touchstone Theater, it was a great event. It was great having the police there made a big difference to the neighbors and members there. They had coloring books and the kids were coloring with the books that the police department gave them. These are little things that make a difference. Many members of the community said they wanted to meet Police Chief Kott and just like that she was there to say hello. Also there were other members of the police department there. She is thankful.

Affordable Housing/Development

Mr. Callahan stated he wanted to finish up his comments on affordable housing and his point of view on it. (inaudible) The more supply we have the less the demand and the lower the price will be. The only way we are going to come out of this housing crisis is if we throw an extra thousand units of residential housing in the City of Bethlehem the supply will lower and bring down the cost of housing. Right now the costs are high because there is not a lot of housing available and we have a lot of people who want to move into the city. If we increase the supply and we are more receptive to developers that will make a difference. He and the Mayor and Mr. Reynolds and Ms. Karner received an email from a developer, not Mr. Ronca, we only have a few developers in the area but we, saying that Bethlehem is not very receptive to development right now. We have been making it harder and harder for people to develop in the city. Mr. Callahan noted that the City of Easton, who we are in competition with, Mayor Panto has his arms wide open and there are two Bethlehem developers that are there right now. The best way for us to get out of this housing crisis in the City of Bethlehem is to produce more units. There are people that are in existing moderate level housing that would like to move up to a higher level and that frees up the affordable housing. The south side of Bethlehem if you go onto Zillow, he is not talking about rents, but that is probably the best area of the city for affordable housing and if you look at homes there you can buy a 3 bedroom home over there for \$175,000 dollars. We have a developer already, he does not know him but he is proposing 10% of affordable housing in a building and that vote will come to us so let us see how serious we are about affordable housing. The only

thing that will get us out of this is a greater supply. Mr. Callahan stated us being negative and pushing back on development in the city is causing the crisis and many others.

Tax Rates

Mr. Colón informed just for reference as we are talking about tax rates and the City of Easton came up, our City of Bethlehem municipal millage rate is 19.14 and the City of Easton's millage rate is 24.95. As we talk about tax increase and other things, this is just for reference our city taxes are about 23% lower than those of our neighbor to the east, just for comparison.

Mr. Callahan stated that is not true, that is millage rate, that is correct but our average housing stock and property values are much higher. It is the assessment of the property times the millage rate. He asked if Mr. Colón is aware of that.

Mr. Colón stated yes.

Affordable Housing Task Force

Ms. Crampsie Smith thanked all of the south side folks who called in about affordable housing. She hears them and our task force is still working on developing a tool box we can use. It is a matter of getting incentives and sitting down with developers and getting them to be willing to listen. We are going to continue with the Affordable Housing Task Force and look for new members and new entities to join on. She looks forward to working with the folks on the south side and everyone throughout the city so we can meet our goal of having Bethlehem be truly inclusive in housing.

Mr. Callahan would ask all Council Members to support his ask of the Administration for \$5 million dollars. There will be many departments asking for money and if we really thing affordable housing is a priority we need to put our money where our mouths are. He hopes he will have the support of everybody on Council to take at least \$5 million of the \$33 million dollars and put that towards the affordable housing crisis. He has been impassioned by the work of Councilwoman Grace Crampsie Smith and it is in her name that he makes this ask.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 pm.

ATTEST:

Robert G. Vidoni, Esq.
City Clerk