

I. **OPENING**

CALL TO ORDER: The Environmental Advisory Council meeting of Lower Saucon Township was called to order on Tuesday, February 14, 2012 at 7:01 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Sandra Yerger, Chairman, presiding.

ROLL CALL: Members: Chair, Sandra Yerger; Vice Chair, Tom Maxfield; Ted Beardsley, Allan Johnson. Laura Ray arrived at 7:09 pm. Absent – Colin Guerra & Tom McCormick **Associate Members:** Dru Germanoski; Absent – Glenn Kaye **Planner:** Karen Mallo – Absent **Solicitor:** Terry Clemons **Hellertown Liaison:** Terry Boos – Absent **Jr. Council Member:** Vacant

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. **OPEN SPACE SUB-COMMITTEE**

A. **PROPERTY UPDATES**

Preservation of the Marson, Carber and Smith-Buroff Properties:

Mrs. Yerger said Mr. Clemons met with Council last week about the Marson and Martin properties and he's here to talk about the evaluation and anything else he feels needs to come from the directive of Council.

Mr. Clemons said regarding the Marson, Smith-Buroff and Carber properties, which were considered as a group, one of the things you were asked to do was to reevaluate these three properties based upon having a little more knowledge. When these properties were ranked, Marson and Carber each ranked 4 on development potential and Smith-Buroff ranked 5. There were some questions as with so little frontage, was that a proper ranking. We don't know that you even knew what frontage there was at the time you went through the evaluation. We have a plan that shows that there is a 100 foot access. He showed the plan and explained where the properties were located. The three properties are tied together by a driveway that gives access and goes back to where they want to build a house. He has an aerial of the properties. You have the access on Wassergass Road, the driveway which cuts off into Carber and there's a home being built. They had requested two building envelopes; one where they could put their home and one where they could put a large barn and agricultural improvements. Carber would only have that existing residence. They were looking at the evaluation and wondering if some of these rankings would be changed given there's a 100 foot access. He's not sure how that relates to the appraisal as we got the appraisal done and the appraisal assumptions that were provided by the Zoning Officer in terms of its develop ability. In the Marson appraisal, they have what we call an extraordinary assumption and that is it has limited development potential for three lots in the before scenario. As to Marson, the Zoning Officer determined it could be subdivided to create a maximum of three lots. That was a given for the appraisal and presumably because of limited access. The situation that would happen after the easement is owned, is that there would only be the existing residence on a 2.6 acre building area; and that in their minds, it also impacted the development potential. They wanted to know whether that changed your mind on the desirability of pursuing this. Other rankings you gave were a 5 based on availability; and you gave all three of these properties a 2 based on linkage potential. You gave 3 based on farmland; 1 based upon the ag soils, then there's a little difference in hydrological features, Marson got 3, Carber got 0 and Smith-Buroff got 1. Sensitive natural resources you gave it a 3. Carbonate geology there isn't any. Scenic value you ranked it a 2. Stormwater a 1, and bargain sale and matching funds a 0.

Laura Ray arrived. The time was 7:09 pm.

Mr. Maxfield said Council's discussion about the property and why it's back here now is because part of it is they assumed that either the two properties other than Marson would not want to participate because the money would have been so small or that they didn't want to spend the money on those two properties, which left Marson; and which, basically eliminated the connectivity that existed between all of the properties and Dravec being over the hill. Then Council said if it was being asked to be preserved because of the connectivity, then they wanted the Sub-Committee to look at it again with development potential. Because of connectivity, if those two properties are gone, then the connectivity is gone. We said the ranking is the ranking basically, but Council wanted you to look at it again. Basically, they want to know if you still think that the Marson property is worth preserving and why.

Mr. Clemons said he understands the appraisal is not made available to the EAC. The appraisal for the Marson tract standing alone was modest as compared to what we have gotten from past ones. The appraisal though when you add Smith-Buroff and Carber, only really went up about \$50,000.00 so they would each get \$25,000.00 out of it. Council thought that there probably wouldn't be much interest on their part in putting their land in a conservation easement with nominal value.

Mr. Beardsley said if they put a conservation easement on Marson, it's really going to protect the other two anyway. Mr. Maxfield said what Council was saying is that those two properties are protected, so why spend money on them. He said Chris Garges came up with the hypothetical of 3 units with Marson. Chris used the ordinance to judge it by, so basically they threw it back to the EAC.

Mrs. Yerger said what is the acreage on the Marson tract? Mr. Clemons said it's basically 27 acres. Mrs. Yerger said it's a decent tract of land. Mr. Clemons said the combined three properties are 73 acres. Mrs. Yerger said it's her understanding Marson still wants to go forward with this. Do we know that for sure? Mr. Beardsley said we don't know that. Mr. Johnson said in his opinion, he's pretty interested. He feels Mr. Marson would like to preserve his property. Mr. Beardsley said his interest is above and beyond the money. Mr. Marson spent two years restoring that stone farmhouse and rebuilding the barn.

Mr. Johnson said Marson's property has the most water on it. There's a lot of water on it. He has a big pond and there's a little stream that runs toward the road. It's wet and all swampy. Even around the pond it's swampy. There are a couple of acres of swampy land. The other two properties don't have anything like that. Marson had considerable amount of woods around his house and it's all steep slopes. Whenever Mr. Johnson goes out, he looks at the natural resource value of the property. He doesn't try to analyze too much the capability of development. He doesn't know that much about it. Mrs. Yerger said that's the whole point. You're not supposed to approach this with "you are protecting it so you can't put houses there". Mr. Johnson said he looks at it like protecting the natural resources. Mrs. Yerger said exactly. Mr. Johnson said that's what they are supposed to be doing, the water, the land, the scenic value. Mrs. Yerger said that's her point. She views it and Mr. Johnson views it and most of us view it that our job is to protect the natural and scenic views and value of the property. What makes Lower Saucon, Lower Saucon plus the habitat and the environmental issues that come with it and all the things that are important for various environmental reasons. In light of that, she thinks the evaluation of the Marson property is dead on. The Sub-Committee did a great job.

Mr. Beardsley said it's legitimate to buy conservation easements on properties that are threatened by development or have high development potential so that they can direct development to where they want it in the Township. That's a legitimate planning theory. It's not just the things that Mr. Johnson is looking at, it's the development potential. The categories they have there and the numbers that might change would be development potential. He thinks that the numbers they put on development potential was based on the acreage of the properties. Smith-Buroff is bigger than

Carber so he got a 5 instead of 4. Mrs. Yerger said it's still subjective to some degree. We have to rank them somehow and there is development potential for all of them. Marson has the access, so it stands to have potential development on it. Mr. Beardsley said talking to the property owners, they think they have development potential.

Mrs. Yerger said the other thing is a variance where they can petition the Township and say they want relief because they want to develop their land. Mr. Maxfield said it wasn't a decision that was made, but it was acted upon as if it was a decision that was made, to not to offer the other two properties anything. He would still like to encourage Council to offer something to try to get all three of those properties. They still might be interested in \$25,000.00 for sitting and doing nothing other than what they are doing there.

Mr. Clemons said he detected some pushback himself from Council. He thinks that just looking at the real world, there is a sense if there was to be any development of the Carber and Smith-Buroff, the likely way would be through Marson and if Marson would be preserved, then there would even be less likelihood that it could be developed. There could be an assemblage. We all know they could assemble an outside debt and that's the way developers work and he emphasizes it doesn't mean it, but at this point, it's somewhat conjecture as to whether someone is going to come along and do that when the most likely prospect is through the Marson property.

Mr. Maxfield said we know 100' is big enough for a Township road and it's the specs for a Township road. Mr. Beardsley said if we put a conservation easement on that right-of-way it would be held out. Mr. Clemons said one of the things he hasn't looked into and probably should is we don't know whether there is a deed, or easement here. The subdivision plan is the first place he would expect to see it. The subdivision plan shows something by metes and bounds that actually does not extend to the Carber lot. This at one time had multiple lots as there was 2A and 2B, but he's curious if it says anything or not about access. He can't read the notes as they are too small. He found a Declaration of Easement, and said a perpetual easement for ingress and egress, vehicular traffic, and utilities. There is an easement of record. The legal description that appears to be attached to this easement is actually for Lot 3. It is a continued page, but he's looking for something that tells us the width of that easement. This easement does not recite whether the easement area is restricted for use by one resident or whether these lots could be further subdivided. That's the first problem with this easement. The second problem is that it does not describe the width, so you don't know whether it would be wide enough to permit a public road to be constructed in the easement. Mr. Johnson said the arrow that goes to the road, it looks like 30'. Mr. Maxfield said it's wider than most of our public roads. Mr. Clemons said most roads require a width of 50' of right-of-way. Mr. Maxfield said we have some that are 24' or 28'.

Mrs. Yerger said let's back up to what Mr. Johnson was saying. We have to look at this too. You were on the property. Mr. Johnson was mentioning natural resources on that property. Regardless of subdivision or no subdivision, you've got a 27-acre tract that has apparently significant natural resources on it, and do we want to see those resources protected through a conservation easement no matter who owns that property as that's the other part of this equation. If Mr. Marson sells this property tomorrow, and somebody decides to go in and disturb three-fourth of the natural resources that are there, are there resources of value enough to pay to have a conservation easement to be put on this property? Mr. Maxfield said we have natural resources, habitat and development potential. Mrs. Yerger said that's what she is saying, but there are all kinds of levels on why you may want to preserve a property. It just isn't a developer is going to come in and put a house on it. That's part of it, but it's not the only thing.

Mr. Beardsley said Ms. Baird went to Benner's property and walked it and made a list of all the reasons it should be preserved. Why don't we do that with this one? Mrs. Yerger said she could probably do both of them at the same time. Mr. Beardsley said she was there with us, but the

report she wrote for the Benner property was much more detailed than anything they've ever done and she knows what to look for.

Mr. Maxfield said we need to address the other question that Council had and he'd like to see them offer to the other two properties. Do you think we can accomplish our open space goals if we buy a conservation easement on the Marson property? He knows it eliminates possible connectivity to the one property in between Smith-Buroff and Dravec. That would eliminate that. Mr. Johnson said not really. The adjacent property is Petco or something like that and it stretches all the way down to Dravec and that is adjacent to Marson. Mr. Maxfield said that's if you were able to get it. He's saying if we were able to put a conservation easement on Smith-Buroff, it would only be one property right now and we'd have real connectivity. You walked the property, what do you think? Mr. Johnson said the more land we can preserve, the better off we are. Mr. Maxfield said connectivity is one thing. If we have control of Marson through conservation easement, which would virtually prohibit anything major happening on the other two properties, we still have habitat connectivity. We don't have connectivity to put a trail in, but we have habitat connectivity where animals can go as we'll be maintaining what is there.

Mr. Beardsley said if the right-of-way is held out of the easement, (**could not hear**). There are a couple of things here that aren't on this list. One is that this was the first group of people that we had who seemed to be interested in doing this as they weren't in it for the money. They were in it to preserve the land. That was his impression. He heard from Marson that when Carber approached him about how we were going to appraise it, if it was three or not, he said how much money are we talking about. He knows that \$25,000.00 might be important to him as he's starting his own business, but \$25,000.00 to pay down his mortgage is nothing for his payments. It depends how he looks at it and how he wants to preserve the land. He did ask that question.

Mrs. Yerger said there's the whole question of perpetuity whether they want to see the land stay the way they like it through future generations, and that's why her family did what they did and why Laura did what she did. There's a lot of that to be said for people and we're here to help them.

Mr. Clemons said we are answering these questions for property owners based upon some assumptions. Mr. Johnson thinks they are not likely to be interested in conveying a conservation easement for only \$25,000.00. You have the impression that their conservation-minded and may want to do it to preserve the property. Then this easement is about as clear as mud and appears to be 30' and certainly extends back to the Smith-Buroff property, which does lend some future subdivision potential except you might have a length of cul-de-sac. He doesn't see how you put a loop road through here. This is 750' back to the lot, so that negatively impacts the developability. Maybe what you want to come out of here, is to speak the same language that he heard the Council speaking, and that is how would you rank the property knowing what you know now, and is it a property that you still think there should be an offer on? You may, based upon what we heard about natural resources on the property, those may move up. The developability may move down based upon this assessment, and you may still feel that certainly there is a reason to make an offer on Marson, and while it may be unlikely that Carber and Smith-Buroff would accept a modest offer, there may be value in finding out. We can't go there without someone authorizing us to make an offer.

Mr. Maxfield said if you think the other two properties are worth making an offer, you are going to have to say that to Council as they are not going to make that offer without your recommendation. Right now they are saying no.

Mr. Johnson said why wouldn't we say that we think it's worth making an offer. From that point of view, there are two large properties. There are lots of woods when you take Carber and Smith-Buroff together, it's up near the top of our ridge, which is important from a natural resources point of view. The fact that the development potential isn't very large; there is still a lot of acreage and

sensitive woodlands as they are on a steep slope. Mr. Maxfield said do you think we can accomplish our open space goals with just Marson or do we need the other two properties to do it. In other words, what are our goals with this property and how do we get there? That's what you have to tell Council.

Mr. Beardsley said he thinks we can justify Marson without a stand-alone. The other two properties would be nice to have. All the water that Mr. Johnson was talking about comes off of those other two properties. That's how it gets to Marson. From the environmental point of view, he thinks it would be good. If you agree that maybe Laura Baird should go out and look at it again and write up a report of what the conservation values are, that would give them a little better standing with Council.

Mr. Germanoski said the recharge areas are up slope. He's looking at the Benner Whitmore property and it's 76 acres and one of the things Council was impressed with was it's a large tract and with the Wassergass properties, it's the same thing, 73 acres. Mr. Johnson said this property has much more mature woodlands than the Benner property. A large part of the Benner property is farmland that's coming back and relatively small trees covered with invasive vines.

Mrs. Yerger said she's hearing yes? Any hesitation? You need to put it into words.

MOTION BY: Mr. Beardsley moved that the conservation values of the three properties are enough to justify purchase of a conservation easement. If Carber and Smith-Buroff turn us down because there's not enough money, there's still enough conservation value in the Marson property to purchase an easement on that piece based on the natural resources, the habitat, and development potential; and he doesn't think their scores would change.

SECOND BY: Mr. Johnson

ROLL CALL: 5-0 (Mr. Guerra and Mr. McCormick absent)

Mr. Germanoski left. The time was 8:00 PM.

Martin Property

Mrs. Yerger said there was some discussion around the Martin property. Mr. Beardsley said we were talking about the Columbia Pipeline, it goes through Dravec and it goes through Martin. He was on the website from Morris County and there was a press release that talked about a trail they were developing by the Columbia Pipeline. They said the pipeline starts in Hellertown, PA. Mrs. Yerger said we may be able to hike all the way into Morris County, NJ.

Mrs. Yerger said there were some issues with Martin at the Executive Session. Mr. Maxfield that was one of them, the gas line. Mr. Clemons said there were questions about linkage; and the gas line also seems to have been played into that. Those who were there at the Executive Session, weren't really clear where the nearest preserved property would be. Mrs. Yerger said there's a map of all of the preserved properties, and you should have that when you do your Executive Sessions.

Mr. Johnson said one thing to consider is if Hellertown Water Authority property is nearby. During the meeting with Hellertown, they encouraged us to preserve properties near them. This one, although it's not directly adjacent to it, is definitely up slope. There's a woman who owns property next door who was with them when they walked the Martin property, and she indicated she may be interested in doing something like this depending on how the process works.

Mr. Beardsley said Mr. Martin is on the ridge and it drops off steeply at the back edge of his property and that's her property. Mr. Johnson said part of her property wraps around the bottom of Martin's property where the big cliff is. She also owns a lot of land to the east of the Martin property. She has a farm. Mr. Johnson said just a little south of her property, there's a property

that Polk Valley Run runs through. It's not that far away from Martin's property and it's even closer to her property. Her property is adjacent to Hellertown's Water Authority.

Mr. Clemons said under this old criteria checklist, it says the parcel to exist within the watershed protection overlay district as defined by the zoning map. Is that the same thing you are referencing? Mr. Johnson said in our open space plan, we have a lot of maps. One of those maps has the watershed protection overlay zone overlaid on it, and that's not the same as the Hellertown Water Authority. It's bigger and it covers more area than the Hellertown Water Authority area. Mr. Clemons asked if they have a wellhead protection area? Is this property actively farmed now? It says it contains prime agricultural soils and of state-wide importance. Mr. Johnson said once again, that's from our open space plan. The maps in our plan have soils and those soils are the same as what the County has. Mr. Clemons asked if it is actively cultivated now? Mr. Johnson said he was growing hay on it. Mr. Clemons said if it's in the zoning ordinance, he has it. The group looked at a map of the property. Mr. Johnson said he knows what Mr. Martin would like to do, but doesn't know if he presented it officially.

Mr. Maxfield said there was a question about road access and if his building envelope would eat up any of the road access that he currently has now, then how would we get back into the property to monitor it. Mr. Johnson said he only needs 50' of that to build a road into his property. Mr. Maxfield said in order to maintain zoning, he probably needs 200'. Mr. Johnson said if he builds a road from here into here, he'll have 200' of access on that road on this eastern boundary of the property. Mr. Maxfield said if he has 300', he easily has the 200' that he needs for that zone plus the 100' for the access. Mr. Clemons said there's 375' of uninterrupted frontage along the south side of Silver Creek. Mr. Johnson said if he builds that road, he has all this frontage on that road and doesn't have to worry about the frontage.

Mr. Maxfield said he's not really talking about development potential, he's just talking about being able to get back to monitor the property. He could easily put it under conservation easement, outside of his building envelope and still maintain 200' within his building envelope and we'd still have plenty of access to get back through there to monitor. Mr. Clemons said we've done it more than once and we've done it to Benner, provide that access is through the building envelope for monitoring. There's only the 50' access for Benner. What size building envelope is he hoping to have? Mr. Johnson said he uses the one building as a shop. Another building he rents out. He'd like to maintain access to the one building that is a shop. The rental property he would want out of easement as maybe someday he'll sell it.

Mr. Clemons said this really changes the assumptions on which this appraisal was based on because it went from 5 lots to one building envelope on a two acre building envelope. That was the assumption of this appraisal. Mr. Beardsley said when the appraiser came there, Mr. Martin was going to give the appraiser an actual survey of the property and he was going to show him what he wanted to keep out. Mr. Clemons said he's only reading the appraisal. He didn't give any special instructions to Indian Valley when they went out. This is the first he's heard that there was a possible excluded area that he would want to exclude from the easement. Mrs. Yerger said she doesn't think that's official. He's been kind of moving his options around a bit.

Mr. Johnson said he can build a Township road 50' wide back into this area. Then he has a couple hundred feet of frontage. Even if this isn't 200', he still has it here. Mr. Clemons said if it's a public road or cul-de-sac, then he has a 300' access. Is there public sewer there? Mr. Maxfield said no, not up there that high.

Mr. Clemons said the assumption that was made in this appraisal was that in the before scenario, you could get four lots out of this property including the existing one, so a potential for five lots. That's what Mr. Garges analysis was based on - access to it and the irregular shaped lot, and probably length of cul-de-sac, and that the after condition is based on the retention of one building

right, which would be just like Benner to build one home on a two acre building lot. Even at that, this wasn't one of the highest appraisals he has seen. Mrs. Yerger said what is the proximity to the Hellertown Watershed area? Mr. Maxfield said if you go down Silver Creek Road, it can't be more than a couple hundred yards as you are going right into it.

Mrs. Yerger said the question is they wanted us to reevaluate your evaluation and how it was evaluated. In light of the appraisal, and in light of the discussion, do we have any feeling that we want to change the evaluation and/or our recommendation that it should be moved forward for preservation?

Mr. Clemons said the parcel does have linkage potential through the Columbia Pipeline. It does have prime agricultural soils and it exists through the water protection overlay district and he's hearing on close proximity to the Hellertown watershed. He's at least hearing Mr. Johnson say the property may have greater subdivision potential than what was anticipated because you could get a cul-de-sac or looped road granted, and that there are some constraints in terms of the irregular shape.

Mr. Johnson said the lady next door who is interested, the eastern edge of her property borders on the Hellertown watershed property. It's in proximity. Mr. Clemons said you are also saying there are potential linkages because there's an adjoining property owner who expressed interest in conserving her property. Mr. Maxfield said with regard to the cliff, there's also value given to outcrops. Mr. Beardsley said it's not shown on the map how steep it is. Mr. Clemons said that's a pretty steep slope.

MOTION BY: Mr. Beardsley moved that based on a reevaluation of the scoring of the Martin property, the EAC feels the Township should go ahead and make an offer to purchase a conservation easement because the Columbia Pipeline presents linkage possibilities, it's in a watershed protection overlay district, it is near the Hellertown Water Authority lands, it has prime ag soils, unusual unique geographic features in one area (environmentally sensitive area) and it adjoins property in which another property owner has expressed an interest in conveying a conservation easement.

SECOND BY: Mr. Johnson

ROLL CALL: 5-0 (Mr. Guerra and Mr. McCormick absent)

Mr. Clemons said he may prepare an email to Leslie and ask her to forward it to Council summarizing this discussion. Mr. Maxfield said we could also have Mr. Beardsley come to the Executive Session at the Council meeting so he could speak for the Open Space Sub-Committee.

Benner/Whitmore Property

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Clemons if he was going to talk about the easement he wrote for the Benner property? Mr. Clemons said they talked about that at the last meeting. Mr. Johnson said did you revise it already? Mr. Clemons said he did. There's a little bit of confusion because he sent a track change version that showed the changes the EAC had recommended. There was just a clean copy and no copy of his track changed version. Mr. Johnson said he was reading the one in their packet and he didn't see anything in there about marking off a boundary. Mr. Clemons said it's not in this one. They have instructed the surveyor to do a metes and bounds description that will show monuments along the divider between the agricultural area and the natural areas. Mr. Johnson said he's going to put some kind of markers there? Mr. Clemons said yes, that was explained to him that evening.

Mr. Kun Lam Property on Leithsville Road:

Mr. Johnson said there was a map in our packet of this property. This landowner showed some interest in a conservation easement. Mrs. Yerger said he was sent the information. She looked at

the map and hasn't figured out what's on it. Mr. Maxfield said when you go down Route 412, you look up a bank, and there are all those 55 gallon drums. It's near the turn at Apples Church Road. You go past that road, look up the hill, and this guy was dealing with 55 gallon drums. Mr. Beardsley said it was a place that made shipping pallets and went out of business. Mr. Maxfield said there are a lot of things there. Mrs. Yerger said she doesn't know what the woodlands look like behind it. She asked if they feel it's worth investigating and trying to score it? Mr. Beardsley said we shouldn't turn it down without looking at it. He said to Ms. Palik if the application is sent back, send it to him so he can get in contact with Mr. Lam.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. COMMUNITY WIDE EARTH DAY PROJECT – APRIL 22, 2012

Mrs. Yerger said this is a copy of an email that went to Mr. Cahalan. There's some interest by some people in the Saucon Valley area about a combined Earth Day event on April 22, 2012. They are holding a meeting at St. George's Episcopal Church on February 29, 2012. Mr. Cahalan has expressed that he will be attending. If anybody else wants to attend, please do. Mr. Johnson said at the latest Saucon Creek Watershed meeting, they discussed another progress on the Tumminello Polk Valley property that Hellertown owns. Jim Wilson from the County said they have about \$20,000.00 to do some work on that property. He said what they need is labor. He asked if there was any way we can use this effort for something on Earth Day? Mrs. Yerger said is it the riparian corridor? Mr. Maxfield said it's the riparian corridor, a rain garden, and it needs a refurbished bridge that is going to go over to the rail trail. There's plantings and things like that. Mrs. Yerger said we could mention that as it is community-wide and you can come up with the labor. Mr. Maxfield said Jim Wilson told him it's in excess of \$40,000.00. Mrs. Yerger said you may want to mention it to the Saucon Creek Watershed. Mr. Johnson said maybe Mr. Cahalan could go. Mrs. Yerger said if you think of anything, email it to Mr. Cahalan. Mr. Johnson said does this have to be done on Earth Day as the Saucon Creek Watershed may not be ready by Earth Day. Mr. Beardsley said he thinks that's what they are trying to do is have a project for Earth Day.

IV. DEVELOPER ITEMS – None

V. UPDATES/REPORTS

A. ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COUNCIL CONFERENCE – MARCH 3, 2012 – MONTGOMERY COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mrs. Yerger said this will be held on March 3rd this year. It's down in Pottstown. If you would like to go, let Mr. Cahalan know. She will be going, so if anyone wants to carpool down, let her know.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF JANUARY 10, 2012 MINUTES

Mrs. Yerger said there are a couple of areas where Diane couldn't hear Mr. Maxfield speaking. Mr. Maxfield said on page 11 of 13, line 28, it should read "He was told once this subdivision occurred, the Easton Road access would have to be opened".

Mr. Maxfield said page 11 of 13, line 38, it should read "Mr. Maxfield said there was a map drawn proposing a link to Lower Saucon Road. Everyone who lives in the area said it was never connected to Lower Saucon Road".

Environmental Advisory Council
February 14, 2012

Mr. Maxfield said page 11 or 13, line 44, it should read "Surveyors have discovered that a dog stake was surveyed as a property stake".

Mr. Johnson said page 2 of 13, line 13, the word should be "buy-in". Page 6 of 13, line 33, it should read "better defined because of the shrub/scrub". Page 8 of 13, line 17, the word feel should be "field".

MOTION BY: Mr. Beardsley moved for approval of the January 10, 2012 minutes, with corrections.
SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
ROLL CALL: 5-0 (Mr. Guerra and Mr. McCormick – Absent)

Mr. Johnson said he had a couple of questions from the minutes. They are not corrections. When Mr. Clemons was discussing the Benner easement he wrote up, did he check to see if the owner of the property owns the mineral rights? Mrs. Yerger said she didn't know. She will ask Mr. Clemons if he did. Mr. Maxfield said we don't know about any of the mineral rights on any of these properties. We should know that the way things are going. Mr. Johnson said Mr. Clemons mentioned the only thing that could be hunted on the property was deer, turkey, and two other things. Four things in all, and he didn't mention varmints, but then later on he did talk about that it's okay to shoot ground hogs. You qualify those things as pests. According to the minutes, Mr. Clemons was supposed to go to the Council meeting and discuss the easement he wrote up. Mr. Maxfield said he did attend the meeting. They had a couple of questions which were clarified.

VII. OLD/MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS – None

VIII. TERRY BOOS – HELLERTOWN REPRESENTATIVE – REPORT – Absent

IX. NON-AGENDA ITEM

- Mrs. Yerger said Northampton County is trying to do a regional EAC meeting on February 29, 2012. It's either going to be in Plainfield or Bushkill Township. If you have an interest in going, let Mr. Cahalan know.
- Mr. Johnson said the people from the Natural Lands Trust did come and walk around the Dravec property. He and Ron Horiszny went with them. They spent a good two hours walking around so they got a good look at the part we own and the conservation easement part of it. They felt we had a really nice property. They are going to do a draft report and send it to Mrs. Yerger. He thinks it was a successful trip. He thinks we will be getting a report that says we have a valuable natural resource piece of property and easement that we bought from Dravec. Mr. Beardsley said we had talked in meetings here about the Parks Department opening that up as soon as possible, whatever happened to that idea? Mrs. Yerger said there are some boundary issues. That's where it is right now.

X. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY: Mr. Beardsley moved for adjournment. The time was 8:27 PM.
SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
ROLL CALL: 5-0 (Mr. Guerra and Mr. McCormick – Absent)

Sandra Yerger, Chair