

LEHIGH TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

July 28, 2026

- I. CALL TO ORDER. The Lehigh Township Board of Supervisors held their regular monthly meeting on Tuesday, July 28, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was held at the Lehigh Township Municipal Building, 1069 Municipal Road, Walnutport. Chairman Mike Jones called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance and roll call.

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

II. POLICE DEPARTMENT

- A. Swearing in of Patrol Officer. Magistrate Robert Hawke was present to administer the Oath of Office to the newest member of the Police Department, Brett Bindics. Officer Bindics started going through the hiring process in January and was given a conditional offer of employment in June. He is a veteran of the United States Air Force and a retired officer from the City of Easton.
- B. Promotion of Sergeant. Chief Henry announced the promotion of Officer Craig Ball to the position of Sergeant. Sergeant Ball successfully completed the promotional process which started in January which included studying for a written test and completing two interviews. He is a graduate of East Stroudsburg University and the Allentown Police Academy. He has been with the Department since June 22, 2015. During his time with the Department, he has been in a leadership role by being a field training officer, firearms instructor, in charge of the property room and assisted or been lead investigator in many criminal investigations.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- A. July 14, 2026. Janet Sheats made a motion to approve these minutes. David Hess seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE BILLS

- A. General Fund Checks 29791 to 29827. Janet Sheats made a motion to approve these checks. David Hess seconded the motion. Katherine Mack questioned Check 29811 to Neil Ettinger. This is only a portion of the amount that he is owed. Mike Jones commented there are questions regarding the bill and a letter will be sent requesting clarification of the amounts. Katherine Mack commented she does not think it is right for him to not be paid for the services he performed. All voted aye. Motion carried.

- B. State Fund Checks 1655 to 1657. David Hess made a motion to approve these checks. Janet Sheats seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.

V. OLD BUSINESS. There was no old business.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Ordinance 2026-4, Parks and Recreation. Alice Rehrig prepared a draft of an ordinance which would address the proposed changes to Chapter 107, Parks and Recreation. The Police Department and Attorney Backenstoe also need to complete a review of this ordinance.

Mike Jones commented Item G is referring to unlicensed vehicles not being permitted; however, you are able to license ATVs and Snowmobiles. Attorney Backenstoe commented the language could be changed to specifically prohibit them from the parks. The sentence would be changed to: Operating an unlicensed motorized vehicle; operating electric bicycles, scooters, dirt bikes, snowmobiles, and ATVs within a recreation area.

Janet Sheats made a motion to table the ordinance pending review by Attorney Backenstoe and the Police Department. David Hess seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.

- B. Manager's Report. Alice Rehrig noted that the Northampton County Emergency Services grant program is open through August 28th. This is a 2 to 1 match up to \$20,000. She was suggesting that an application be submitted for the replacement of a police vehicle. There was no objection to this.
- C. Solicitor's Report. Attorney Backenstoe did not have anything specific to report. He continues to work with the Zoning Officer on a number of zoning issues and concerns and also preparing developer agreements as needed and recommended by the Township Engineer.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT. Paul Nikisher commented he saw the lettering on the fence in Berlinsville and it looks good and has been completed before National Night Out.

Donald Wehr, 1011 Plum Drive, in Danielsville raised concerns regarding the 2027 Budget and the hiring of two new police officers. The Police Department is 45 percent of the budget and questioned if this will be sustainable. Mike Jones commented it was for 2026. The hiring of the officers is replacing officers, not additional officers. Mr. Wehr also raised concerns regarding the condition of Plum Drive. There are numerous potholes that need to be repaired. There are other roads that are also in poor shape. Mike Jones

commented every year, the Public Works Director evaluates the roads and determines which roads will take priority for the year. Mr. Wehr commented he thinks twelve police officers is overkill. We do not have rampant crime. Other communities around us have State Police. Mike Jones commented the State Police will only respond to serious incidents. Janet Sheats commented our Police respond to medical emergencies to start treatment prior to the ambulance arriving. The ambulance can take up to 15 or 20 minutes to respond. Mr. Wehr commented we have an excellent rating for the least violent crime. Mr. Wehr noted the Township has been at 10,000 for years. He really doesn't see the need for 12 officers. Mike Jones commented recent studies have indicated that the department should be 14 to 16 officers in size. Jerry Pritchard commented there were issues with his mother and the police responded and he was very thankful they came as quickly as they did. He understands the financial concern because if the expenses continue to rise, but the revenues do not, how do you pay for the future? Jamie Andrews commented he likes having our own police force; we need to keep the force. He likes that there is low crime. When his mom had a heart attack, the police were there. We need to keep our department and fund it better. Lisa Pignataro commented one of the reasons we have low crime may be because we have our own Police Department.

Katherine Mack commented last year all our lawyers were under budget, except for the labor related lawyers. There was \$85,000 spent which was way over budget. Who is watching this and why is only zoning a concern? The overtime for the police department was \$142,000 and that didn't include holiday overtime. That would give you your other officer. When people are in on overtime, they are not as sharp, they are tired, strained, and you will not get the quality work from them. This is also the first time that the Township included the residents tax money for roads. In the past it was just the State money that went towards roads. Roads are expensive to repair, and they need to be funded. Not raising taxes for so many years and not putting that money into the roads is why the roads are not in good condition. She also believes the microphones should be used. People cannot hear what is going on. There should also be money included for the sign out front. Katherine Mack commented the Township gets Recreation Fees from all the developments that go into the Township to either buy parks or build parks. That money must be kept in a separate dedicated account. She doesn't see that transparency in the budget. Alice Rehrig commented there is a specific line item for Rec Fees paid, the expenses paid from the account, and a separate line item that shows the money being transferred from the Rec Fund to the General Fund when the bills are paid.

Donald Wehr questioned what assessment is used for the taxes. Mike Jones commented the County is the one who sets the assessed values for the Township. Mr. Wehr commented he would be curious what Woodstone's assessment is because after that was built, the Township should be flushed with money. Cindy Miller commented the County

Board of Supervisors Minutes
July 28, 2026

is also discussing doing a reassessment. Mr. Wehr questioned if Woodstone received any type of tax break when they built their facility. Cindy Miller commented she is not aware that they received any type of tax break.

Zach Szoke commented they held the land preservation meeting at Blue Mountain Fish and Game on Monday and are planning on holding another one on August 17, 2026. There are a lot of people in support of land preservation and being given the opportunity to at least vote on land preservation. When will the Board of Supervisors move forward with voting to adopt the ordinance to place this on the ballot. Mike Jones commented there is not a specific time set. Zach Szoke commented it has been a year and a half and moving goal posts. Zach Szoke asked Attorney Backenstoe to verify where this is stuck in the process. Attorney Backenstoe commented the Board needs to vote to move this to the referendum and start the process two months in advance of the deadline to submit to the election office which is 13 Tuesdays prior to the election day. Zach Szoke questioned if there are other votes that the Board must take to move this to the ballot. Attorney Backenstoe commented the Board needs to authorize the advertisement of the ordinance and then they need to vote to adopt the ordinance. Zach Szoke questioned if there are historic zoning maps available. Alice Rehrig commented there are only two zoning maps which were complete rezoning of the Township. There were two or three amendments made to the map.

Lisa Pignataro commented she believes that most people will not have the acreage to be a part of the preservation program, but it is more about the democratic process and giving people the opportunity to vote on it. How much advertising and how many meetings will it take for the Board to be satisfied that the public has been adequately educated on this?

Linda Roman questioned how many flyers went out. She received one, but many of her neighbors did not get it. She has a lot of questions pertaining to that flyer. Mike Jones commented the Township did not send out the flyer. If there is a question regarding the flyer, it would need to be addressed by Zach Szoke and Mike Hock who he believes are the individuals who sent out the flyer. She does not want to pay a tax for land preservation on someone else's land. If someone wants to preserve their land, they can put it in a trust. Zach Szoke commented they used the same mailing list for their flyers as the Township does for their newsletter.

Mike Hock questioned why the Board wouldn't want to give the citizens the opportunity to vote on this? Mike Jones commented they have equally heard from people who want it on the ballot and who don't want it on the ballot. The reason they wanted the information put out there was that people do not understand how this process works. People thought the letter came from the Township. They even showed up at the Rec Board. Mike Hock commented he understands that the Board may not want to take a position, but why

Board of Supervisors Minutes
July 28, 2026

wouldn't they want to give them the opportunity to vote on this. Mike Jones commented the Board has been hearing that people who can't vote on it, will have to pay for it and people who won't have to pay for it can vote on it. It's unfair to the people who are left out. Mike Hock questioned why start to move the process forward in 2025 and then stop and pull it back. Janet Sheats commented she has learned a lot about this since that time. Mike Hock questioned what they could do to move this forward or at what point will this move forward or are they just wasting their time?

Karen Reis, Cherryville Road, commented regarding the concern about people who don't own land and having to pay for the taxes. People who don't have children in school, pay the school taxes. Jerry Pritchard commented the school tax is not giving money to private citizens.

Merion Miller commented we do not have a democracy. We live in a representative republic. We do not vote on a Congressional Bill. We vote for our Senators and our Congressmen, our elected officials, are the ones who vote on the bills. The Supervisors are our elected officials. Only through elected officials can policy and legislation be passed. This is what was chosen by our society.

John Knoblach commented it is true that people without kids in school pay school taxes, but they are also able to access the facilities. If someone puts their land into preservation, he doesn't have the right to go to their property and walk on it or use their swimming pool. There is a big difference.

Sherri Szoke commented the Board did vote in July for this to go to referendum, so now all of a sudden, the Board doesn't want this to go to a vote. It is not fair that the Board voted for this to go to referendum and now the Board is changing their mind. Mike Jones commented the Board voted to have the documents prepared. The vote to advertise the ordinance died.

Donald Wehr commented is misleading to say we have a republic and our representatives vote for us. Over the years, he has voted on many referendums. Who will decide when the voters have been educated enough to vote on this? That is subjective.

A resident questioned why we have the ability for a referendum? Attorney Backenstoe commented Pennsylvania is a representative form of government, and it is very limited as to when you can have a referendum vote and it must be set forth by State Statute. It is illegal to do a non-binding referendum. When the statute allows a referendum, the Board must vote to move it forward.

Cindy Miller commented the Pennsylvania law states that a local government unit, excluding counties and county authorities, *may*, by ordinance, impose in addition to their statutory rate limits on real estate taxes set forth in the municipal code set forth by that local government unit, an open state tax on real property not exceeding the millage authorized by the referendum under Section A3. It also states a local government unit, excluding counties and county authorities, *may* by ordinance, impose in addition to the earned income tax rate limit set forth in the Act of December 31, 1965, known as the Local Tax Enabling Act, an open space tax on the earned income of the residents of that local government unit, not exceeding a rate authorized by referendum under subsection A.3. Revenue from the levy may only be used for the following...and it continues. The key word is “may”. The elected officials determine if they feel this is something or an issue that they want to adopt in the Township. That is the first step. Should the Board decide that they want to move it forward, it has to go on referendum vote to the voters to set the millage rate, which at this point it was suggested to be .25 percent. That is what the law states. The elected officials need to determine if this is something that they want to consider for the community. Where this failed is that the majority of the Board did not vote to advertise the ordinance. If the Board decides that they want to tax the community for land preservation, they would at that point open it up for referendum to the community.

Tom Szoke commented regardless of the number of people who attend the meetings, the Supervisors need to get together and give Zach Szoke and Mike Hock an answer. They have been coming to this meeting for a year and a half and the answer they get is we don't know. That is not fair to anyone in the Township.

Mike Lakentosh, Coatbridge Lane, commented it is his understanding that only three of the five Board members were present for the vote to move it forward. Is the Board allowed to vote with only three members present? Attorney Backenstoe commented there must be a majority of the Board of Supervisors on a vote to carry the motion regardless of how many members are present. Three members would constitute a quorum, and then you would need all three to be in favor because you need three positive votes.

Bob Hock, North Cypress, why have the vote to draft the paperwork, but then change your mind and not move it forward, and then not revisit the subject. David Hess commented when the vote was taken in December, the individuals who were at the meeting did not change their minds. Cindy Miller commented she hasn't changed her mind. Bob Hock commented he was here at the July meeting when the initial vote was taken. He recalls Janet Sheats saying personally she was not for the preservation, but she voted to have the referendum paperwork drawn up. Why waste taxpayers money? This is one of the cases where the citizens can have a say in what they would like to see for the Township.

Dan Ziegenfuss, 4116 Wood Drive, commented he was at the meeting at the Blue Mountain Fish and Game. There were 37 to 40 people there. He believes there was a smaller number of people who were opposed to this than were for it. He appreciates that Board not wanting to push this through. He believes that the Board has learned some things over the course of the weeks. There was still plenty of misinformation being brought out at the meeting last Monday. He believes there is a small number looking to push this through, half of which are retired and probably wouldn't have to pay for this. There is misinformation using scare tactics, showing a stream and Route 22, which would you like? You can't put a road in the middle of a creek; you would need a bridge. The government did this to the boomer generation and indoctrinated this generation with vaccines, equality, and racial issues. They are showing pictures that are playing with our emotions. The information is not fully true, a picture of Lower Macungie Township is being shown. This township cannot and will not ever look like Lower Macungie Township. It's being pushed which would you rather see, Lower Macungie or Lehigh Township. Lehigh Township grew 200 people in the last 6 years, and he thinks we grew 1200 people in the last twenty years. It is not like we are bursting at the seams. His fear is that this goes to a vote and it will be mishandled by the voters. A question was asked why all the farmers are telling them not to vote for it. The farmers do not want the government to control their land and have others pay in so that people can get a little bit of money to keep their land out of development. It was brought up that there are 301 parcels that are over 10 acres. Jaindl owns a lot of property; they own a lot of property; he knows a lot of other people who own property who wouldn't go through with this. He feels like it would be a poor decision on the Township's part to impose a tax like this. He doesn't feel like it would be used appropriately in that it would be used to preserve wetlands and floodplains which cannot be developed. Overall he does not think this would be a good idea and appreciates the fact that the Board has been learning about this.

Lynn Tamarro commented this is everyone's community and he feels that the Board is doing everyone a disservice by not allowing them to vote on land preservation.

Jamie Andrews commented he has lived here all his life. The Board is doing a great job. Everyone on the Board has been elected by the residents. If someone doesn't like what they are doing, they can run for office. The people who are elected to office are there because the residents want them to make the decisions for them. The Constitution and the Declaration of Independence laid the foundation of how the government works. They gave people the right to vote people in and out of office. People need to learn how the government works.

Mike Hock questioned what objective criteria the Board is using to determine if this should move this forward; not an opinion or individual feelings. Cindy Miller commented that after she conducted her due diligence and drawing upon her experience

serving on the Board, attending PSATS conferences, speaking with informed consultants, speaking with other local government officials, serving on the Planning Commission, listening to residents, she concluded that it is not in the best interest of Lehigh Township to develop a land preservation program. This is where she is coming from and has consistently taken this position.

Bob Hock commented he agrees the Board does a lot for the Township, is pleased to live in the Township, and has lived here all his life. He also remembers when there was a push by a previous Board to run water and sewer throughout the Township and believed they could turn us into Whitehall Township. This Board will not always be here. Other Supervisors may come along and have another idea as to what they want the Township to look like. With that thought in mind, the people who are for this are looking to protect the parcels which can be protected. As Board's switch, things can change and be pushed rapidly so whatever buffers can be put in place for the benefit of the Township, he feels is a good thing.

Mike Hock questioned why Cindy Miller chose seven years when she proposed the resolution to not discuss the land preservation. Cindy Miller commented probably to prove a point; she actually thought about bringing it up and just saying two years to make it more realistic and get more input from the Board. Mike Hock questioned why the Board of Supervisors signed off on the Comprehensive Plan which includes sections which specifically addresses land preservation and the preservation of natural resources. There are bullet items that indicate keeping a rural community, but nothing is being done to advance it in that direction and wanting to stop conversation about it. Why agree to have it in the Comprehensive Plan and not want to follow it? Cindy Miller commented the plan is being followed through zoning. Mike Jones commented the plan does not require the Board to adopt an additional tax. The County is constantly adding property into the preservation program.

Linda Roman commented she doesn't want to pay a tax to preserve someone else's land. You want people to vote for someone that they will not have any use of. Let individuals go through the County and State programs. Why should people of this Township pay taxes to preserve someone else's land? Linda Roman questioned how many people in the Township actually want to preserve their land. There should be an actual number. The Township shouldn't be in the business of land preservation. That should be done by the County and State.

John Knoblach questioned if the program went forward and people's land was preserved, would that also reduce their tax burden. Attorney Backenstoe commented he believes there is a reduction similar to the other programs in place. John Knoblach noted that the

more tax breaks that are given, the more the other people will have to pay. Cindy Miller commented it would also impact the school and county taxes. The loss in revenue will need to be made up and the only place to make it up is through the remaining taxpayers.

Jamie Andrews commented it's not that people are against keeping open land, but it should be done through tougher zoning. If someone wants their property preserved, they can go through the County and State or put it in a trust. People shouldn't have to pay for other people's property just so they can get money.

Zach Szoke commented he attended a Planning Commission workshop last year and proposed limiting the number of lots that can be subdivided from a tract of land and he was disrespected by the Planning Commission and told it couldn't be done. This is something done by Heidelberg Township and Mr. Jaindl sued the Township and the Township won. It is something that can be done through zoning. It is not preservation, but it disallows over development of the Township. They tried to change the zoning, but the people in power did not want to hear about it.

Jerry Pritchard commented he remembers a farm was proposed to be sold to Chesapeake Homes for development and now that same farm today is being preserved. Why? It's the money. If the money is taken out of this, do you still feel the same way? Why didn't Chesapeake Homes go through with the development; they didn't want to run all the water and sewer. A developer ran from us because they don't want to run water and sewer. It is not real to think that a developer is going to run water and sewer. It's not going to happen. If you take the money out of it, see what you stand for. Why should someone pay you for what you stand for?

Lou Heller commented as you add more and more cars with developments, it will create more issues with the roads. He doesn't like seeing the Township getting built up. He is against any development here in the Township. He has 15 acres which he planted with trees and would want to preserve his property, but does qualify for preservation with the County. If there was a local program, he would qualify. They claim there will be an additional 150,000 people in the Lehigh Valley by 2050, and they are all coming north. The less people that come in, it stays clean and green.

Sherry Szoke commented it was stated that the preservation was about money. She wants to make is clear that she and Tom will not benefit from this program. The 35 acres that they own is already preserved. There is no monetary gain for Mike Hock and Zach Szoke or any of their families in trying to get this program started.

Lisa Pignataro commented she is trying to be objective about this, but questioned how someone can dispute that development will impact the Township between new roads,

schools, and services. It has to cost more in the long run. She is looking to see what impact the Jaendl project will have on the roads around it. We need our farms and have a responsibility to preserve them.

Lynn Tammero commented you need to look at the studies objectively. Anyone can take statistics and make a case they want by picking out the things they want.

Mike Jones commented he agrees that statistics can be made to work the best for the situation at hand. He's not saying that they are right or wrong, that is just how statistics work.

Linda Roman questioned if someone sells their development rights and can they get them back down the road if they are dissatisfied with it. Mike Jones commented they cannot get them back after they were sold. Linda Roman commented people need to understand that; once it's gone, they don't get it back and they can't do anything with their property.

Michelle Dotta commented her concern is her daughter and the next generation after her. She wants to preserve Lehigh Township as Lehigh Township has been. That is the goal; the plan. Whether it is done through EIT or another method, we need to figure out how to preserve the lifestyle of Lehigh Township. When the development goes in, the ground water and the wildlife around it are affected. Wetlands are not supposed to be disturbed, but she sees her neighbor going through his. Ultimately, we need to protect Lehigh Township and our way of life and would like the Board to figure out how to do that so 30 homes cannot be placed on 50 acres.

Donald Wehr commented everyone assumes the wetlands and streams will be protected, but look at Woodstone, they filled in wetlands, he was fined, and nothing happened. He was still able to develop along the creek.

Dan Ziegenfuss commented they work hard and have spent a lot of money on land in Lehigh Township. If you want something preserved, go buy it. Take it in your own hands. You own the land and should be able to do what you want with it. He hopes the zoning would never go to what Heidelberg Township did, because as someone who is self-employed and doesn't have health insurance, he would want the ability to sell some land if he ever had a medical catastrophe.

A resident commented if the program passes, people are not required to participate in it. Mike Jones and Cindy Miller commented the program is voluntary, but everyone is required to pay for the program. Mike Jones commented after five years, the Township could have almost \$5 million in an account and people are not required to do preservation and the money will just sit there.

Board of Supervisors Minutes
July 28, 2026

Monica Brown commented unless everyone with larger tracts of land participates, it won't really make a difference because the developers will just go down the street to the land that is not preserved. You can't stop the development.

Lori Hock commented it is her understanding that there are Townships all around us who already have this program in place. What made their supervisors and communities different than ours that this can't be put to a vote. Mike Hock commented Moore, East Allen, 83 percent of Carbon County and North Whitehall Township. Washington Township and Allen Township do not. The amount of municipalities adopting a local program grows every year.

Susan Seltzer, Mountain View Drive, questioned if all the unknowns is a strategy to delay the program because of the time limits. Mike Jones commented the time for November has past; the earliest this could go to a referendum is spring 2027. Susan Seltzer commented she has been active in the community and has roots in the community and would want to see the Township remain as it is and the beauty be maintained. She would like to see this go forward to referendum to keep things the way they are for future generations.

Bob Hock commented Mike Hock and Zach Szoke have been asking questions and getting limited answer, but he is concerned that they are being strung along and wasting their time after all the countless hours they have put into this. Will they ever have the opportunity for this to be moved forward to a referendum? Janet Sheats commented she put it on the agenda once and it was voted down. David Hess commented a Board member needs to place it on the agenda.

Paul Nikisher commented is almost seems like in the interest of fairness, it should be on the ballot. He's not sure if it will ever stop and this will keep on being volleyed back and forth. There are people who can't handle the taxes now and if they get more they will really be struggling. He also agrees with Katherine Mack that the sign out front needs to be updated.

Mary Trexler commented the Board previously voted to not put this on the referendum and we are already past the time limit to put it on the November ballot, it would seem like it would be a moot issue since it can't go on the ballot.

John Knoblach questioned if a private company could donate an electronic sign to the Township. Attorney Backenstoe commented anyone is permitted to donate to the Township.

Sherry Szoke commented that even though the approval to move this to the ballot was not approved for the election this fall, there is the spring of 2027, and if not, the fall of 2027. There is always an upcoming election that people can be given the opportunity to vote on it.

Zach Szoke commented the Board can vote to place this item on the agenda at anytime if they choose. He also believes that the elected officials should be basing their decisions on facts, not opinions. There are studies available that show the benefits of open space. He is wondering where the studies are that show open space costs money. Every study shows that residential properties cost taxpayers more money than open space properties. If they are incorrect in what is being said, show them the studies. The Board has a duty to operate on facts, not on opinions.

Mike Jones commented if the Board completely stops development in the Township right now, how can you say taxes will never go up when you have to pay for everything you currently have. Zach Szoke commented taxes will go up because of the economy and inflation. The taxes will go up at a steady rate when there is open space. Without open space, there is a sharper increase in the tax rate. Taxes will be lower in the future with open space preservation then they will without. David Hess commented this will be a tax on Township residents and he has not voted for a tax increase since he is on the Board.

Katherine Mack commented it is unrealistic to expect that taxes will not increase. How will we ever pay for our roads if there is never a tax increase. Utility bills go up and the cost of materials and maintenance of the vehicles that need to be maintained. You will need to increase taxes if the Township is going to move forward.

Zach Szoke commented he and Mike Hock have been coming to meetings about open space since January of 2025. In the year and a half that this has been discussed, there are four supervisors who have not answered as to why they do not was this to go for a vote. Cindy Miller is the only person who offered her personal opinion. Zach Szoke commented zero input from the leaders of the Township in a year and a half is disappointing. Cindy Miller disagreed; it is not her personal opinion, but a lot of research that she has done. Janet Sheats commented she has stated why she did didn't want this to go forward at previous meetings.

- VIII. 2027 BUDGET AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS. Alice Rehrig provided details pertaining to a five year budget and the capital improvements plan. She asked the Board to specifically look at the 2028 and 2029 capital items to determine which items should be submitted in the LSA grant funds which are open through September 30th. She also

Board of Supervisors Minutes
July 28, 2026

suggested the Board meet with the police department so they can get an understanding of changes that have occurred within the equipment they use and how it can impact the capital plan and budget.

Janet Sheats made a motion to table this discussion. David Hess seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.

- IX. ADJOURN. Janet Sheats made a motion to adjourn. David Hess seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.