



# SKIPPACK TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

February 8, 2023 - Meeting Minutes

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

- Franco D'Angelo, Chairman
- Paul Fox, Vice Chair
- Nicholas Fountain
- Benjamin Webb
- Barbara McGinnis

## **TOWNSHIP STAFF**

- Alice Eastmure, Manager
- Barry Miller, Esq.
- Tim Woodrow, PE
- Joseph Zadlo, AICP
- Joseph Kuhls, Esq.

**NOTE** – *it was announced prior to the meeting that the Conditional Use Hearing for 1132 Bridge Rd. originally to be held on February 8 was canceled and rescheduled for March 8, 2023*

**7:30 PM** – Mr. D'Angelo called the meeting to order by asking everyone to rise and join him in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **I. ANNOUNCEMENT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Mr. D'Angelo announced that the Board held an Executive Session prior to the meeting to discuss legal and personal matters.

### **II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

A. Vincent Peszek – thanked the Board for taking the time to do the work and put in the trail to connect his development, Cassel Mill, to the trail. It has been years in the making and even though it is not finished yet, it looks really nice.

Jeanette Griffith – thanked the Board and all dog owners for all the brand-new dog waste stations. They are well appreciated.

Tanya Kateusz – two things, first one is the airport, knows that new plans have been submitted by the developer and she would assume they will be on the planning commission meeting this month. Ms. Eastmure confirmed that they were on the Planning Commission agenda for 2/21. Is this just for the plan or with DEP or PennDot or anyone else? Ms. Eastmure confirmed it was just that. The process is conditional use hearing is for the land development plans that design the site. They are under review by all those entities, Planning Commission being one that they use. Tanya asked is there nothing in yet from any of those? Mr. Woodrow confirmed that was correct.

Her second thing is the EDO, she knows it was in the Nov. 15 BOS meeting and talked about that. It was talked about that it was voted on that they were going to advertise to remove that, or possibly take the steps to remove it at the December meeting and knows it was never done, so she didn't know where that stood and now she is concerned that she saw on the December 19 that the 1132 Bridge Road

development came through and seems to be taking advantage of that so she didn't know what was going on with that. Joe Kuhls stated that the EDO is under consideration and under review and there is no expressed intent revoke it at this time. It was sent to MCPC for their comments. His recollection is that the 1132 Bridge Road application was submitted prior to there being any consideration of even reviewing the EDO. So under any circumstances, that 1132 Bridge Rd. application was going to be reviewed under the EDO because the EDO was in place at the time of its submission. Tanya thought that they would completely strike it off the books so that they could rework it. Mr. Kuhls responded that it was expressed at Nov meeting was an authorization for the staff to put into place the possibility of considering revoking the EDO. There was no expression of intent or desire from the Board to revoke the EDO. They were going to look at the EDO ordinance and the applications that were submitted since the EDO ordinance was put into place and see if it accomplished some of the goal. Staff was authorized to take the steps necessary for the Board to consider revoking the EDO. Before the Board can do anything, it has to be advertised for a hearing, has to go to the County planning commission, all that was done was commencing the process for the possibility of considering revoking the EDO. She asked if the Board has received any response from MCPC yet and both Mr. Kuhls and Mr. Woodrow stated that it was submitted, but they have not seen or received a response yet. She asked if Bridge Road then is still in effect because they submitted it for the EDO option, which will then be at the March 8 Conditional Use meeting. Mr. Kuhls clarified that the EDO or an application for land development will always be reviewed pursuant to the ordinances that are in effect at the time the application is submitted. Mr. D'Angelo added that even if it was revoked at the current meeting, if the application was submitted the month prior it would be reviewed under the EDO that is in place at the time of submission. Mr. Kuhls stated once again that an application for land development has to be reviewed pursuant to the ordinances that are in effect at the time of submission. Mr. Fox stated that it was a little confusing because this particular application was submitted prior to the November meeting. Ms. Kateusz said it was hard for them to know because they only see it on the minutes from the November meeting and do not actually know when the applications come in, so that is why she was asking the questions and looking for some clarification on the order of things and how things fell so that the public would be aware of how things were happening.

Mr. Kuhls spoke about the EDO and stated that when it was passed 3 or 4 years ago, there were certain goals for the ordinance that are stated in the legislative intent section of the ordinance. You could look up the zoning code and see what they are. He thinks this Board is taking a proactive stance in reviewing the ordinances that are in effect and saying "has this accomplished what we wanted it to accomplish? If it has, great; do we still need it? If we don't need it, maybe it gets revoked?" It doesn't necessarily mean that there is a problem with that ordinance. He stated that land use ordinances change every day. They are based on planning, but they are also based on realizing the effects of planning and watching what's happening in the community. Mr. Kuhls asked Mr. Woodrow

how many applications they have had (Mr. Woodrow confirmed it was three applications) under the EDO in various stages of completion. So it seems logical at this point in time, at the two or three year mark, to see if the ordinance is doing what they expected it to.

Ms. Kateusz stated that she was just concerned because at that meeting some of the Board members expressed that there were loopholes and that the requirements were not strict enough on it. So now that this development is coming up, and she knows that a lot of residents are not happy about five townhouses going on a less than two acre lot in a Village commercial area, so she thinks that that is where all the concern and confusion is lying in all this.

Mr. Kuhls responded that if she thinks the EDO ordinance needs to be revised, the Board and staff would certainly hear those comments during any public hearing that might occur on the possible revocation of any EDO ordinance. Ms. Kateusz said that would be great, as she has a lot of suggestions.

Justin Glennon – just comments to back off of Tanya’s, in terms of looking at the EDO and looking at where we are in terms of development in the past four to six years, he knows that one of the goals is really to, and in talking with Tim before, is to kind of figure out how we can beautify and vitalize certain areas around here and around those tracts, 113 and 73, and he has a lot of ideas about this and some other residents have a lot of ideas as well. His opinion about that is that we should be trying to attract more of a mixed-use type of Village Commercial, so that we are not trying to get caught by or revoke code or just give waivers to people. Mr. Glennon stated that we should really consider that if we are going to have “one of these things doesn’t look like the other,” type of apartment buildings next to a historic place next to a tire place, we should really start thinking about how to we attract business, which brings up your taxes. Residential building brings up your taxes because school taxes are the highest tax you pay, no matter what they say. He stated that he's just saying that we should all think together. Mr. Glennon stated that he knows this is the Board and they are their representatives, but he thinks maybe a workshop to talk about the development and how they are going to do those tracts other than Markel Main Street, is something that we could talk about because yes, there are buildings that are getting dilapidated, yes there are buildings that aren’t being made use of, but when you start putting apartments on these little tracts of land, by the usual suspects around the same places, under nebulous LLC’s out of Delaware thinking we don’t know who they are. He knows the Board will review what’s in code and what’s legal and will do the right thing, but it seems that usually, regardless of EDO, like you said, this Board can go ahead and make a decision whether or not it works within the EDO and it falls within that compliance, or, if the Board would like to have a waiver. Mr. Glennon stated that his comment basically is that you all should, and we all should as a township, think about what we want those tracts to look like. He asked do we them to look like a beautiful, nice, new complimentary place to Skippack Village? Mr. Glennon then shared that he just went to Savannah, Georgia and said if you

look at the buildings there, even the brand-new buildings show the charm and heritage of Savannah. He said that everyone here always talks about the charm and the heritage of Skippack, so throwing in five townhouses or sixteen apartments down on 73 or six townhouses down around the dogleg where the general store used to be, that is just onesie twosies before someone who paid \$350,000 for a property realizes that nobody wants to get a million dollar house off of 113 and then decides they know they are going to be able to get a waiver to come in and get five townhouses on two acres. He stated that is just a personal opinion of his, but he thinks that everyone should think about what they want Skippack to look like. Mr. Glennon asked do we want it to look nice? Do we want people to come here and have development, limited, responsible, thoughtful? Or should we have everybody that thinks they have absolute property rights to come in here and think they can just slip it in and say “yeah, go ahead and build whatever you want on your property”?

Mr. Kuhls then interjected and stated he wanted to stop Mr. Glennon because he was going a little far off-field and he wanted to be clear about the fact that this Board is not developing properties, because they are not developers. Mr. Glennon stated that he never said that and Mr. Kuhls asked that he let him finish.

Mr. Kuhls stated that the Board has the ability to zone. Mr Glennon interjected that they also overlay zone. Mr. Kuhls responded that the Board has the ability to zone geographic areas of the township. He stated that property rights are very important, and this Board cannot deny individuals their property rights. If the Board were to try to deny individuals their property rights, they could do whatever they wanted on their property and there would be no zoning that would be enforceable at all. Mr. Kuhls stated that that this is all this Board is doing. This Board is looking at geographic areas and saying that these types of things make sense here, these types of things make sense here. They do not have the ability to construct individual buildings or dictate aesthetic or anything like that and they have to honor individual property rights, as the United States Constitution guarantees that an individual cannot be deprived of their property rights without just compensation. He then offered a follow-up conversation with Mr. Glennon.

Mr. Glennon responded that Mr. Kuhls was wrong that the Board can not do that, they have to provide for every type of housing in the township, and you also have to consider whether or not in your township, that is what zoning is for. He stated that Mr. Kuhls circled around that and this Board can zone for certain types of business and housing and they can tell that individual what they can and cannot build under the code that’s been codified into law in the township and how they can do it. He said they can come to the township and ask for suggestions, waivers, concessions, etc. Mr. Kuhls responded that the Board is aware of that and Mr. Glennon replied that it was semantics and he was made to sound like he did not know what he was talking about. Mr. Kuhls suggested he wrap up because it was not fair to others who wanted to speak and Mr. Glennon responded he was.

Mary Myers, Traditions of Skippack – Ms. Myers stated that again this was just her opinion and thoughts regarding the new development. She said that obviously the ultimate recommendation to the builders will come from you. As she looks at the builder's plans, she still sees exits at Mill Road and across from Arbors. She has asked herself where these people are going and believes most of them are going to work. She still believes that Mill Rd is a mistake, even with the three way stop sign coming from the East, there is a dip before the entrance, coming out of the entrance and turning right, there is a big S-curve and she wonders where these people are supposed to try to go. The entrance and exit across from Traditions is in cement and she knows that. She stated that they are not thrilled, but the reality is that they all need to accept change. The people are either going to go right to get to Germantown Pike or left to get to Collegeville Road and go to Route 73. She doubts much traffic will cut through their community, but if they do then they do. Ms. Myers said that logically she still believes that the exit across from Landis Road makes the most sense for the majority of the new homes. People will either turn right to go to Collegeville Road down to 73 or they will turn left to go to 113. Very few will go down Mount Park (sic Airy) Road to take their kids to school and regardless of where the entrance and exit is, they are still going to go down Mount Park (Airy) to get their kids to school. She does not think there will be much traffic except to go to school IF there is an entrance at the development across from Landis Rd. She does not see it becoming a speedway because there will be a stop sign coming out of the community and once you are at the stop sign the only place to go is straight to go to the school.

Sam Engle – had a question with regards to the zoning, wanting to clarify when it is a planning development and when it is a zoning issue. He stated that the Board said they have the rules and oversees zoning ordinances and Mr. Engle was just curious when it goes to the zoning hearing board and when it comes to planning. Mr. Kuhls responded that the township drafts a zoning ordinance and they are the rules. If an individual wants to do something outside the rules, they go to the zoning hearing board, and the zoning hearing board grants them some leeway to break the rules, essentially or some of the rules set forth by the zoning ordinance. Mr. Kuhls stated that it is a very high burden that the applicant has to satisfy and they have to show that their property possesses some unique physical characteristic that was unanticipated when the zoning ordinance was drafted, and, because of that unique physical characteristic, they are unable to make reasonable use of their property without some give in the ordinance. If the ordinance essentially effects some taking of their property unless there is some leeway granted to them. He states that a perfect example would be if an individual had a half-acre lot and the ordinance said “ you can't use your property and you cannot put a single family dwelling on it unless you have three-quarters of an acre,” that person would have to go to the zoning hearing board and ask. They would have to say to the zoning hearing board and say that their lot is smaller than the others around them but they have nothing else to do with that piece of dirt and they need to have some reasonable use for it because they pay taxes on it. The zoning hearing board's job is to grant variances from the otherwise applicable

law. Mr. Engle asked if the zoning hearing board had their own attorney or if what they determine is set in stone. Mr. Kuhls responded that it is their own completely different branch of government. He said to think of it like Congress and the Supreme Court. The Board would be like Congress, they are drafting the laws, and the zoning hearing board is like the Supreme Court, which is where the laws get litigated. Mr. Kuhls stated that in fact, the law requires that the Zoning Hearing Board has its own legal counsel because it's possible that the township might appear before that Zoning Hearing Board as a party.

Debbie McCabe – wanted to back up Ms. Kateusz's comment and stated that the reason there might be some confusion is because she has the November minutes, which were approved, in front of her and they say "authorize the township staff to take the necessary appropriate actions towards rescinding." It does not say reviewing and those are two very different words as far as meaning and what you would suspect is going to happen. She stated again that it says "rescind," so if that is not what is happening then she doesn't know if something needs to be done.

Mr. D'Angelo asked if "to temporarily remove it to review it" was part of the process. Mrs. McCabe again said that it was the reason for the confusion.

Mr. Kuhls stated that the only thing that could happen is nothing or rescission. Mrs. McCabe asked to clarify if what she was understanding now was that Montgomery County was trying to reach that decision. Mr. Kuhls replied that they are not trying to reach a decision. Montgomery County Planning Commission only has an ability to make a recommendation and in order for this Board to make a decision (this Board being the only one with the authority to make a decision) they have to at least seek and receive comments from the MCPC, which is the only thing that has happened. The MCPC cannot do anything to rescind the ordinance, that can only come from this Board.

Mr. Glennon stated that he would like to know what decisions and what the plans are that the Board is trying to reach and what are they doing to get creative as Tim said before. He asked what the plan is and what they are trying to do in those corridors, because as he said, it's mixed and some of it is older.

Mrs. McCabe asked again to clarify for everyone that they asked MCPC for a recommendation to the Board to consider rescinding. Mr. Kuhls stated that they asked the MCPC to make recommendations on this Board's decision regarding the EDO ordinance. He said that this Board is going to act on the EDO ordinance at some point in time – or not. All that was done at the November meeting was an authorization to put the pieces in place for there to be an ultimate deliberation and potentially an ultimate decision by the Board. One of the legal requirements under state law, before that can happen, is that MCPC has to be given an opportunity to comment. He again stated that that is all that has been done. They have been given an opportunity to comment and say what they think about the EDO ordinance.

Person A – asked if the time that it is submitted to MCPC is when the “clock starts ticking” for when the determination has to be made for the application, or do they just rule in our favor with the benefit of the doubt. He asked if they do not give recommendation is that an automatic approval? Mr. Kuhls stated that if there is no action, then the ordinance will stay exactly as it is.

Lucas Mitsch – echoed Ms. Kateusz and Mr. Glennon’s comments, while he hasn’t done as much of the research, he appreciates their attention to detail. Mr. Mitsch had a positive comment for Mr. Woodrow, he talked to the folks doing the work at Kenney who have been out by his property and thought they were nice folks there. Mr. Mitsch also said that while he is aware the trail project makes a lot of folks happy, he would encourage the Board to be aware that such projects, especially public walkways along private property is a concern and should be avoided at all costs. He feels it is something that he would hope the folks in such a place as Cassel Mill would not have to be worried about, especially a place with sidewalks, they wouldn’t be in the same situation as having to try to stop such a project in coming out for literally years, in giving all types of reasons and examples of why that should not happen. He hopes they would not find themselves in that place, because it’s a difficult struggle especially when some Board members, not including Mr. Webb and Ms. McGinnis, remain silent for years on end and do not comment to concerns voiced by citizens. Along with that, he wanted to encourage all Board members, especially Mr. Webb and Ms. McGinnis, to please feel free to give their feedback, because they want to hear from them and know what their thoughts and concerns are. He then thanked the Board for what they do, as he knows it is not an easy job.

Mr. Peszek responded that while he is no lawyer, if he remembered correctly there was easement on the land where the township had every right to use that and it was in the deed. He felt that to state that it is private property and insinuate that the township took the property did not seem fair.

Mr. Mitsch responded that he was not contesting that and agrees with him 100 percent. Mr. Peszek responded that they really did nothing wrong, because behind his house is a retention basin and community property, which he was aware of, and if the community wanted to do something with that property, he would have to agree and he knows that. He stated that if it is in your deed you have to know that this can happen at any time. Mr. Mitsch said that it is a concern, yes, but this forum should be for folks like Mr. Peszek, should he be in that situation, to present his thoughts. Mr. Peszek said he was at many meetings where Mr. Mitsch and others spoke and presented their thoughts and the Board then made a decision. He said that while Mr. Mitsch may not like the decision, he did not feel that anything was done wrong or for nefarious reasons.

Mr. Mitsch stated that he felt that as long as the proper attention was given to this project and others in the future was his main concern going forward.

Laura Haselbarth asked if the trail was a done deal or if it was still in development. Mr. Woodrow asked her to clarify and she asked that if the trail plans were done and whether you are for or against them, are you just out of luck because it is a done deal or does it come up in stages.

Mr. Woodrow responded that the Skippack Trail system is one of the things that was identified long ago as an asset to the community and he thinks that the Board has continued to try to expand access to the trail system. He thinks that they have completed Landis Road, they have completed Mt. Airy Road a few years back and they did some work over on Kratz Road, that the current conversation is expanding 113 down to the Perkiomen Trail. He said that he didn't know that they had done any detailed evaluation yet, but it is one of the next areas, the Iron Bridge Estates subdivision between Creek Rd. and 113 that they would like to have options to the Perkiomen Trail. They have been looking at options to get those folks connected.

Mr. D'Angelo stated that to answer her question, there is a "grand plan," but it does come in stages.

Ms. Haselbarth asked if it came up for consideration, or in other words, if you did not know about any of these items initially, or if you were not interested in the trail, then you were out of luck because it was a done deal. Mr. D'Angelo said he did not know that you were out of luck, more if it affects the area you are in. She said she was just curious because she did not know why the trails had become such a big deal, but she was not around when it all started and did not know if that was the end of that. Mr. D'Angelo responded that it had actually started many administrations ago, and she said she knew that and it was before she was interested in any of this stuff and then it was already over.

Mr. Glennon asked Mr. Woodrow if he meant an extra, direct entrance to the Montgomery County part of the trail, because Skippack already does have an entrance from here all the down hill to the meadows. Mr. Woodrow stated that the Power Line Trail was part of the first big trail that they built on the PECO power lines. He said that everyone is always trying, every planning agency, the County Planning Commission, and the folks over at Lower Providence are dying to have sidewalk and trail connections and are so envious of what we have here in Skippack, and they ask him all the time how it gets done. He said it got done through a long-term effort. As you look at the community, the Iron Bridge Estates area has the least access to the trail and so it is one of the areas they would like to see connected. Mr. Glennon responded there were sidewalks there so he asked where the trail would go and if it would cut across the Gypsy Rose and go that way. Mr. Woodrow said maybe. Mr. Glennon asked if within those plans was part of a possible residential development. Mr. Woodrow responded no, they are separate and apart.



**III. APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 3, 2023 MINUTES**

Motion made by Ms. McGinnis to approve the January 3, 2023 minutes. Mr. Webb seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried.

**IV. CORRESPONDENCE**

Ms. Eastmure shared a letter from Blue Comet Motorcycle Club regarding their 2023 Event and Race Day Schedules, including trail days, a swap meet, Gold Star Mothers picnic, fireworks celebration, Blue Comet Car Show and Blue Comet Food Truck Bash. They are just acknowledging the dates as they do as part of their agreement every year.

**V. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS**

**A. Treasurer’s Report as of January 31, 2023**

Motion made by Mr. Webb to approve the treasurer’s report as of January 31, 2023. Ms. McGinnis seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried.

**B. Interim Bills Paid on January 25, 2023**

**General Fund = \$ 76,761.26**

**Sewer Fund = \$ 114,428.92**

**Open Space Fund = \$ 5,247.78**

Motion made by Mr. D’Angelo to approve the interim bills paid on January 25, 2023. Motion seconded by Ms. McGinnis. All in favor, motion carried.

**C. Bills for Payment on February 8, 2023**

**General Fund = \$ 72,543.25**

**Sewer Fund = \$ 115,075.85**

**Open Space Fund = \$ 3,712.77**

Motion made by Mr. D’Angelo to approve the interim bills paid on January 25, 2023. Motion seconded by Ms. McGinnis. All in favor, motion carried.

**VI. REPORTS**

**A. Engineer –**

- 1. Authorization to have Fred Ebert and Xylem order a new pump for the township’s Evansburg Pump station.** Mr. Woodrow said that for the last few years, normal maintenance has been performed, including replacing a couple of the pumps. There are two pumps in that station, and we have always had a spare. We have pulled out one of the pumps, replaced it and took the spare in for repairs. The cost for the repairs is \$54,000. A new pump is \$61,000 so rather than repairing and refurbishing the old pump, it would make a lot of sense to buy a new one, which comes with a warranty and guarantees. He thinks it is a line item in the budget, but he wanted to bring it to the Board’s attention for the expenditure of the replacement pump. Mr. Fox asked if it had to be bid. Mr. Woodrow responded it was a specialty product with a sole proprietor, so it does not need to be bid.

**Motion made by Mr. Webb to authorize Fred Ebert and Xylem to purchase a new pump for the Evansburg Pump Station. Motion seconded by Mr. Fountain. All in favor, motion carried.**

2. **Authorization to approve the demolition of the house located at 4182 Creek Road.** A few years back, we had discussed building a boat ramp for access to the Perkiomen Creek. They had identified the property of 4182 Creek Road to do that, but it got put on pause for a bit and progress was lost. Ms. Eastmure reminded them of the project and got it back on track.  
Person C stated that the property has a big garage and inquired if it would be kept. Mr. Woodrow responded that they were thinking they would plan to keep the garage and use it for storage, or perhaps to store kayaks and canoes. Person C said perhaps Public Works could use it as well. Mr. Woodrow said that they also planned to have a small parking lot.

**Motion made by Mr. D'Angelo to authorize the approval of the demolition of the house located at 4182 Creek Road. Motion seconded by Ms. McGinnis. All in favor, motion carried.**

3. **The Knolls at Skippack-4446 Skippack Pike escrow payment #4 for \$57,262.50.** Mark Salamone is building townhouses, he has most of the site infrastructure in and recalled the township is holding escrow. The release is pursuant to the work that is being done. Mr. D'Angelo asked if Mr. Woodrow was satisfied with the work and Mr. Woodrow replied he that he was and has been keeping an eye on how it is coming along. There was a little hiccup with water and sewer but that has been resolved.

**Motion made by Mr. Webb to release escrow payment of \$57,262.50 for the Knolls at Skippack-4446 Skippack Pike. Motion seconded by Ms. McGinnis. All in favor, motion carried.**

4. **Resolution 2023-18 authorizing the submission of a grant application for the 2023 round of the Montco 2040 Implementation Grant Program.** The Montco 2040 Grant is useful and has been used for sidewalks, trail projects etc. in the county. Mr. Woodrow is looking at the crossing at Cross Road at Meadow Glen, as linking Meadow Glen Phase One and Meadow Glen Phase Two has always been a goal. The Board had authorized their traffic consultants to talk to PennDOT to come up with some alternatives and TPE has done that. Mr. Woodrow has talked to John Mayer, from the association at Meadow Glen and just got his information today. He is hoping the Board will authorize the resolution for the grant.

Person D asked if Toll Brothers was responsible for any of that. Mr. Woodrow responded that the plan did not obligate Toll to make a crossing at Cross Road, but it is certainly something that is part of their trail plan. They would like to get folks in Phase One and Three across to the trail and linking them would be a great thing to do, and to bring the community

together to the clubhouse. PennDOT thinks there are a couple viable options for the township to pursue.

**Motion made by Mr. Webb to approve Resolution 2023-18 authorizing the submission of a grant application for the 2023 Montco 2040 Implementation Grant program. Motion seconded by Ms. McGinnis. All in favor, motion carried.**

**B. Solicitor**

**C. Planner**

**D. Manager**

1. Certification of the qualifying volunteers of the Skippack Fire Company Earned Income Tax Credit 2022. Firefighter who qualified are Ray Bracken, Roberta Bracken, Keith Grierson, Jade Hale, John Kelly, Leigh Kelly, Ray Lavenburg, Kyle Merkel, Jim Neusch, Michaleen Pacholski, Matt Risell, Mike Risell, Matt Rotenbury, Josh Taylor, Dale Tyczka and Ron Wilkie. Ms. Eastmure thanked them all for their service.  
**Motion made by Mr. Fountain for the certification of the qualifying Skippack Fire Company volunteers. Motion seconded by Ms. McGinnis. All in favor, motion carried.**
2. Seeking approval of the Special Event Permit for the ‘Run Baby Run’ race event on August 13, 2023 at Palmer Park.  
**Motion made by Ms. McGinnis to approve the special event permit for ‘Run Baby Run’. Motion seconded by Mr. Webb. All in favor, motion carried.**
3. Amend Resolution 2023-14 Fee Schedule. De minimis charge of \$75.00 to Section 1-B will be added back into the fee schedule.  
**Motion made by Mr. D’Angelo to amend Resolution 2023-14 adding the de minimis charge back into the fee schedule. Mr. Fountain seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried.**
4. Amend Resolution 2023-12 regarding the 2023 Board of Supervisors Schedule. Due to a conflict in the Flag Day holiday date, the meeting date of June 14 will be moved to June 13 (Tuesday) and the updated schedule will be re-advertised with the new date in the newspaper.  
**Motion made by Ms. McGinnis to amend Resolution 2023-12 moving the June meeting date to June 13. Motion seconded by Mr. Fountain. All in favor, motion carried.**
5. Resolution 2023-16 declaring intent to follow the schedules and procedures for disposition of records set forth in the Municipal Records Manual, approved December 16, 2008. Ms. Eastmure said that they only need to be kept for seven years, similar to your tax documents at home.

Ms. Kateusz asked about the disposition of records and how long they needed to be kept. Ms. Eastmure responded that there is a book with a guide and there is no one set time. For example, financial records have

certain years set, such as seven years. Park Applications have a different time period (one year), Right to Knows have two years. Anything done at the township is all broken down in the guide.

Mr. Glennon asked if someone could actually request RTK's from a certain time period back to when Ms. Eastmure has said that they do not need to be kept any longer. Ms. Eastmure stated that once they are past the two-year period would not be kept. Mr. D'Angelo said they would need to be requested before the records are dissolved. Mr. Glennon asked when that was due to be done and Ms. Eastmure said it was now. Mr. D'Angelo clarified that the vote was to follow the manual. Mr. Glennon asked if the records were digitized, and Ms. Eastmure said they were not digitized. Mr. D'Angelo said they were gone after dissolution was complete.

**Motion made by Ms. McGinnis to approve Resolution 2023-16 to follow the procedures set for disposition of records. Motion seconded by Mr. Webb. All in favor, motion carried.**

6. Resolution 2023-17 LPVRSAs acknowledging the LPVRSAs has implemented an \$8.00 yearly increase. This will amount to an additional \$2.00 charge per quarter on sewer accounts. **Motion made by Ms. McGinnis for Resolution 2023-17 LPVRSAs \$8.00 yearly increase. Motion seconded by Mr. Webb. All in favor, motion carried.**

## **VII. OLD BUSINESS**

## **VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

## **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:19PM.