

I. **OPENING**

CALL TO ORDER: The Environmental Advisory Council meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Tuesday, December 2, 2008 at 7:05 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Sandra Yerger, Chairman, presiding.

ROLL CALL: Members: Chairman, Sandra Yerger; Vice Chairman, Tom Maxfield; Hazem Hijazi and Allan Johnson, EAC Members; and Stacy Ogur from Boucher & James. Absent: Laura Ray, Dennis Aranyos, Ted Beardsley.

Associate Members: Absent: Glenn Kaye, Bob Davis, Tom McCormick, and Glenn Clouser.

Hellertown Liaison: Terry Boos.

Jr. EAC Member: Jessica Null - Absent

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **INTRODUCTION OF JESSICA NULL – JUNIOR EAC MEMBER**

Mrs. Yerger said Jessica did not show up tonight.

B. **REVIEW “DRAFT ROAD MAINTENANCE POLICY”**

Mrs. Yerger said last month you were given the Road Maintenance Policy. Has anyone reviewed it? Do we have any recommendations? Mr. Johnson said there are several areas in there that are associated with the environment. Mr. Maxfield said did anyone find areas that it seemed they weren't addressing correctly, like in the beginning it says, Township policy on erecting street signs on private property.” It doesn't really say if it's by homeowner request or what the parameters or circumstances are. It does say they will bill the cost to the homeowner. That's a real question about purpose of sign on page 3. He's assuming that it's a request by the homeowner for a sign. It should be clearer if it's going to be a policy. Mrs. Yerger said one of the omissions that came to her mind were they didn't talk at all about road treatment for winter weather. We don't know what they are using, what the chemical agents are. We need to know, and a request should be made. There are various types of materials that can be made, and some are more environmentally sensitive than others. We should encourage the Township to use the most environmentally conscious materials. Mr. Johnson said it might cost a lot more. Mrs. Yerger said yes, but they don't talk about it at all. Mr. Maxfield said he thinks we are using something that is a little bit more environmentally friendly, but it should be in the policy. Mrs. Yerger said we need to have a clarification on winter road treatment. Mr. Hijazi said from what angle? Mrs. Yerger said some of it is really nasty stuff, environmentally, and it gets into the water. Mr. Hijazi said that is a concern. His question is how is that going to be addressed? Mrs. Yerger said there are different types they can use. Some are not as nasty as others. It may have to get balanced with cost also, but we should at least be aware of what's going on and have some say in the recommendations, especially since they have way in the beginning, the very first or second paragraph, says it's the disclaimer. If you look at that, it's a policy, it's not mandate, it's not an ordinance. If it becomes cost ineffective, they can certainly use other materials. Mr. Maxfield said he couldn't quite figure out what they meant, on page 3, it says “typically the width of the shoulder is 12 to 18 inches off the side. Public Works will shape the shoulder, where necessary, and will determine on a case by case basis on whether revegetating the shoulder is necessary”. What circumstances would occur if you have to revegetate the shoulder? Mrs. Yerger said scraping in the wintertime. Mr. Maxfield said that could be, but why wouldn't we vegetate the shoulder. Mr. Hijazi said he's seen sometimes on the edge of

the road, you build a little berm to prevent the water, is that something we have an interest in or any question that we prefer to have a berm or do we want to discourage the berm so the water gets infiltrated? Mr. Johnson said they address that towards the end. It's a storm water direction. Mr. Maxfield said there's also the storm water discharge on page 4. Mrs. Yerger said they use the word vegetation loosely, some areas it's good, and some areas it's not good, and we need clarification on the vegetation. Like vegetated swales, the one area it's not good and we have to keep it mowed. In other areas, it's like you can vegetate the swales. She didn't see the consistency. Mr. Johnson said on page 12, "berms". Mr. Maxfield said they talk about the township should take every opportunity to sheet flow the water off into the vegetated areas, whenever possible, so he's guessing they only put up those curbs to direct water, when necessary. You do see a lot of them around. Mrs. Yerger said on page 13, it says "tree and shrub trimming – the trimming of roadside vegetation has two major benefits." This is where they talk about keeping it low, but then, on page 5, the second paragraph, it says "the township should minimize the rise of erosion at each point of discharge by utilizing any one of many techniques of vegetated swales or other energy dispersion devices, flow velocity from the discharge point should be minimized." They are talking about, depending on the discharge, vegetating the swales; and on page 13, they are talking about keeping the vegetation trimmed. She doesn't know if this is a case by case basis. Mr. Johnson said along the roads, parallel to the roads where they scrape the shoulders, there's a swale that runs parallel to the roads. Many places in the township the water is collected from those swales, from what runs off the roads and from catch basins and it's directed into a swale that goes down into a field. On that swale, you have a lot of water flow and that's where they should be planting some heavy duty plants. Along the side of the road, there is supposed to be pretty much sheet flow off the road and in some places, you have a lot of flow.

Mr. Hijazi said what they are talking about is vegetating the swales. This is the Road Department and they are only interested in the areas along the road. Mr. Johnson said it says they have the right to go on people's land and maintain those swales that he was talking about. Mr. Hijazi said going back to your question, when they talk about vegetating swales, he assumes they are the swales right along the sides of the roadway. Mr. Maxfield said maybe that's what they mean by vegetation. Mrs. Yerger said we really don't know what they are talking about. To her, it isn't clear. In one area, they are talking about vegetated swales, and you go back on page 13, and they are not allowing vegetation to grow in the swales. Mr. Hijazi said maybe because we are novices. There are people specialized and there are requirements by regulatory agencies, and probably a design requirement, specifications for swales carrying water along roads and highways and how you design it and maintain it. Mrs. Yerger said that's her point. She doesn't have the expertise, all the more reason it should be clearer. If this is a policy we are going to hand out to residents, it should be clear enough that people can pick it up and understand what it's saying to them. This is a township policy.

Mr. Johnson said on page 12, under gutters, it says "Public Works policy is to use vegetated gutters whenever possible along Township roads whenever erosion problems make vegetated gutters impractical, the Public Works will pave the gutters". Mrs. Yerger said what's the difference, what's a vegetated gutter as opposed to keep vegetation trimmed along the roadside? Mr. Johnson said keeping vegetation trimmed – that's when they cut the high weeds along the roadside with the machine they have. Mrs. Yerger said it talks about water flow and cutting it really short. It's not a matter of site. This is all about storm water again. It says "Trimming of roadside vegetation produces the amount of shade that road trees receive during the day. It keeps the roadside swales already installed, functioning properly, allowing water to flow alongside of the road and not on top of it". She said when she drives up from Bucks County, they actually vegetate a lot of the roadside swales with cattails and deliberately do their swales vegetated. She's a little confused. Mr. Johnson said when they say "trimming the roadside vegetation in many instances reduces the amount of shade that a road receives throughout the course of the day", earlier in this policy they talk about how the sun heats the road up and causes the oil to bubble out of the macadam, which

Environmental Advisory Committee
December 2, 2008

isn't good, so if you have a lot of shade, that doesn't happen. They must be talking about the tall weeds and the tall trees as the little plants don't give any shade. Mr. Maxfield said they weigh the two out in that the one problem where there's too much heat on the road, it's easier to correct it then to have too much shade on the road. Mrs. Yerger said she's seen in other municipalities where they deliberately revegetate the swales with water absorbing vegetation and it gets taller. Mr. Johnson said that would be good as long as it doesn't interfere with the vision. Mrs. Yerger said this isn't where you have right of way issues.

Mr. Hijazi said do they say how often they do the trimming? Mr. Johnson said they say they do it two times. In a lot of places, that's not enough. Mrs. Yerger said she can understand the trimming, especially if you have garbage coming up in the swales, you do need to keep it trimmed.

Mr. Maxfield said there's one major thing that is not in this report and it is that the Council has been talking for years, about how they want to maintain the rural characteristic of this Township. There's no statement anywhere where it talks about rural roads, and none of this policy seems to point in the direction of maintaining the rural characteristic of the Township. They seem to be following a policy like paving the shoulders and gutters and then the roads become wider and become less rural and become less pervious. In the beginning of this report, they should have statements like this. This is a restatement of the old policies that they were using in the Township for 25 years, but things have changed. That needs to be reflected in this policy.

Mrs. Yerger said we should commend that there's been an attempt to have a Road Maintenance Policy. We haven't had this before. We need to clarify some of the vegetation issues with the storm water management on what is meant by vegetation and vegetated swales. Mr. Johnson said this is pretty much written in engineering speak, and it made sense to him and probably to Mr. Hijazi. What needs to be done, they need to define every term in the beginning, and then when they write up the report, it will be clearer and would force them to define each word they are using. Mrs. Yerger said this was one of the things that they know what they meant, but when they put it down on paper because they knew what they meant, they just assumed everybody else would know, and that's not the case if you don't deal with this on an everyday basis. Mr. Maxfield said they should be more clear on what approach works where. We don't get that clarity in this policy. Mr. Hijazi said the concerns can be categorized in two or three areas. Obviously, none of us are arguing about how to fix a pothole or a cracked pavement, so the concern here is rural character, and paving versus grassy areas. If those are the areas we are interested in, we can characterize and focus on them. Mr. Johnson said when they collect water along certain portions of the road and they divert it into a ditch, a lot of times those ditches go into a wetland or some area that is swampy.

Mr. Mark Wirth said he has ridden bicycle over thousands of these areas, and he sees areas that are unkempt, there is silt and stones and pollution. Mrs. Yerger said if it's a PennDOT road, it's running under different jurisdictions. Mr. Wirth said back in 82 or 83 when he graduated, and he was 18 years old, he could remember the State before every late spring, would come through before summer and they used to come down Black River Road with a grater and they used to clean the grates out. When he started to do construction, all the general contractors, it became non-existent and every thing went business management. When that happened, everything went construction management, not just in the building trade, but it went to road crews, etc. The bottom fell out of everything and they pass the buck. It's not in just construction, it's in PennDOT. The State doesn't come out as it costs too much. They'd come out with a grader but now they don't have the money for it.

Mr. Johnson said another area, it says "groundwater trapped under the road surface should be drained away from the road, in those cases, where sub surface water is creating road surface deterioration". We have that a lot. They are taking care of it pretty well.

Mrs. Yerger said the recommendations are as follows:

- a statement reinforcing the desire to maintain the rural character of the Township;
- a section addressing road treatment methods, particularly during the winter season;
- clarification of the treatment of vegetated swales (trimming); and
- further clarification of signage on private roads, (i.e., who is responsible for requesting sign placement, who pays for the traffic study.)

Mr. Maxfield said if you have a private lane and want a sign, the township doesn't pay for that, you are responsible to pay for it, but also, above there, it says about a traffic study...who is going to pay for the traffic study...the homeowner or the township? It could get really expensive on private property.

Mr. Johnson said he noticed two spelling errors, on page 13, item D, all fines shall be "paned" into the general fund, it should be "paid". In the last sentence on that page, "cast of misdemeanor", it should be "case of misdemeanor".

Mr. Johnson said they do talk about keeping the roads in a rural manner. Mr. Maxfield said they talk about rural roads, but they don't talk about maintaining the character. They talk about it as a detriment.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for the four (4) recommendations as stated above by Mrs. Yerger.
SECOND BY: Mr. Johnson
ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Absent – Ms. Laura Ray, Mr. Dennis Aranyos, and Mr. Ted Beardsley)

C. SAUCON CREEK EXCEPTIONAL VALUE (EV) WETLANDS

Mrs. Yerger said the Saucon Creek Exceptional Value Wetland item is being tabled, per the request of our Planner. They need to do some more investigation work on that particular issue before they come back to us on a recommendation and are looking into the mapping. Mr. Hijazi said we're trying to delineate the wetlands associated with the Saucon Creek? Mr. Maxfield said we are trying to increase the buffer. Mrs. Yerger said this came down from the Lehigh County Conservation District. They mentioned the fact, did we know the Saucon Creek had, according to DEP, exceptional value wetlands. Any of the wetlands that are contiguous with a trout bearing creek could be classified as EV, and therefore, they may warrant extra protection by strengthening the setback of the buffer, so we're trying to add 25 more feet and make it 50 feet. If we decide to recommend an amendment to the ordinance to increase the buffer for EV wetlands, you still have to define them as a developer has got to know what an EV wetland is, what distinguishes it from a regular wetland. Mr. Maxfield said when we say define, what we are talking about is singling out and giving the name EV, it's just identifying them. Mrs. Yerger said it's hard to identify them without mapping them.

D. NATURAL AREAS INVENTORY UPDATE

Mrs. Yerger said there is nothing new to add on here and Boucher and James are working on it.

E. CONSERVATION EASEMENT POLICY

Mrs. Yerger said the staff at the Township has asked the EAC to start putting together a Conservation Easement Policy, particularly with regards to the stewardship and monitoring of the properties, that once an easement has been placed on the property, who is going to be responsible for the monitoring, how is it going to move forward, and how are we going to be sure that the easement stays in place? That's going to be a policy that is going to have to be put together by the

**Environmental Advisory Committee
December 2, 2008**

Township. Staff has a few recommendations, and she'll circulate it to the EAC, and hopefully, by January, we will be able to discuss it.

III. DEVELOPER ITEMS

A. ADAMS OUTDOOR ADVERTISING - SITE PLAN #SP 03-08 FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION REVIEW

Mrs. Yerger said she has the plan. It's for the special exception. She doesn't know what we are really supposed to do with this. The lighting issue is the same recommendation we've been giving them all along on this. Mr. Hijazi said at the presentation, they were saying the lighting is special and one that is supposed to not cause any black pollution. Ms. Ogur said they've also indicated they've hired a light consultant to design the plan based on the zoning requirements. Mr. Maxfield said why don't we just restate our previous recommendations. Mr. Johnson said there are a lot of things that the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (LVPC) said they have to do with the building of the foundation for that huge signs. One of the things we recommended was that they follow everything that the LVPC said they should do.

Mrs. Yerger said we would make the following recommendations and reinforce the comments previously made by the EAC at the October 7, 2008 and November 11, 2008 meeting:

- concerns regarding visual impacts specifically lighting and scenic views; and
- outstanding issues as stated in the Northampton County Conservation District letter dated October 16, 2008.

MOTION BY: Mr. Hijazi moved for the two (2) recommendations as stated above by Mrs. Yerger.
SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Absent – Ms. Laura Ray, Mr. Dennis Aranyos, and Mr. Ted Beardsley)

IV. OLD/MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

A. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 11, 2008 MINUTES

Mrs. Yerger said we have the minutes from the November 11, 2008 meeting for review and approval.

Mr. Johnson said on page 2 of 9, line 7, nail should be "mesh". Line 9, should read "one that goes directly into the stream and one that is out in that area". Page 2, line 12 & 13, take that sentence out. Page 3 of 9, line 27, it should be "He" and not "She". Page 6 of 9, line 9 and 10, should read "let them know that Lower Saucon Township is not in Lehigh County". Page 7 of 9, line 47, should be "quality" in the blank line. Page 8 of 9, line 3 should read "make he EV Wetlands stand alone or do we need to incorporate into the Open". Page 9 of 9, line 4, should read "Why don't you then make that" Page 9 of 9, line 35, change NRA to "NAI". Line 45, change NIA to "NAI". Same page, line 42, change NIA to "NAI". Page 9 of 9, line 28, the time was 8:35 PM.

MOTION BY: Motion by Mr. Johnson for approval of the November 11, 2008 minutes, with corrections.
SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger
ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Absent – Ms. Laura Ray, Mr. Dennis Aranyos, and Mr. Ted Beardsley)

B. ANNUAL MEETING OF THE GREEN VALLEY COALITION – DINNER AND PROGRAM – ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS OF BATS – DECEMBER 5, 2008 – SPEAKER SANDRA YERGER

Mrs. Yerger said the Green Valley Coalition is doing a dinner. She is doing a presentation on bats. If you'd like to come, please do. For dinner, they are using a "green" caterer with whole and natural foods. It's supposed to be excellent food.

V. UPDATES/REPORTS

A. OPEN SPACE SUB-COMMITTEE

Mr. Johnson said Ted Beardsley and himself, on Friday, visited the Mease property and also the Skrabin property.

Mr. McCormick didn't visit the Mease property, but he and Mr. Johnson visited the Skraban property a couple of months ago.

Mr. Beardsley and Mr. Johnson had a meeting this afternoon, and evaluated the Mease property and they recommended it for preservation. There are a couple of interesting things with the Mease property. There's a little stream that runs along the driveway, but the water for that stream originates on a piece of property that is not his. It originates by the driveway, but on the other guys property. There's a little pond there, and wetlands, and there must be a spring as he noticed running water. The property is west of the driveway, he doesn't know their name. The way Mr. Mease told them, his property runs along the driveway and that's where the water comes from. Mr. Johnson noticed a little flowing stream and then it disappeared into the ground, which is interesting. That's a limestone area. The little stream along Mr. Mease's driveway is dry. The wetlands are on the property immediately adjacent to Mr. Mease's property. There is water there, but it just doesn't happen to start on his property. Mrs. Yerger said do you want to make an official recommendation to the EAC? Mr. Johnson said he and Ted Beardsley recommend that the Mease property be recommended for a conservation easement.

MOTION BY: Mrs. Yerger moved that based upon the evaluation, conducted by the Open Space Sub-Committee, of the Mease Farm, the EAC recommends the site be preserved through a conservation easement.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Absent – Ms. Laura Ray, Mr. Dennis Aranyos, and Mr. Ted Beardsley)

Mr. Johnson said they did not get the time to evaluate the Skraban property. He believes the property will be recommended for preservation. He had Mr. Garges make up two maps. The important thing about the Skraban property is that the property they have north of Springtown Hill Road is fairly close to the Polk Valley Park. There are only two properties between them. Possibly in the future, maybe we could make some arrangements to get a right of way or easement so we have access from Polk Valley Park to the Skrabin property. He thinks all together, it's about 66 acres. He says Mr. Skraban wants to put it all in conservation and wants to do public access. The only thing he's concerned about is liability, if people walk around and hurt themselves; he wants to know how that would be handled. Mrs. Yerger said when that's done, there are legalities that are grandfathered in with the coverage. She will take this to Council tomorrow night. She said we are still in negotiations with Springfield Township. The temporary hold up with the Mease property is that we were petitioned by Bucks County and Springfield Township to have the lower portion of the Mease farm (19 acres) be put into the Ag security zone. For a farm to qualify for Ag preservation in any county, it has to be part of an Ag security zone. In the past, we were never allowed to cross county lines with Ag security zones. We are getting a legal clarification on this because she doesn't want to agree to put them in the Bucks County Ag security zone if it's not binding as it will mess them up when they go for their funding for Ag preservation. Nobody seems to be sure about this, so we're running it by lawyers right now. Anything that we ever wanted to put into Ag security, we always had to approach Williams Township as they are an adjacent

municipality. Her question was does the 19 acres in Lower Saucon have to then be put into Williams Township's Ag security to keep it in the same county or can we cross the county line because it's a joint property. Her instinct is that it makes more sense to Bucks County, the way the law is written, the Ag security at the State level, we're not going to be able to do that.

B. COOKS CREEK COLDWATER HERITAGE PROJECT – JOE HOFFMAN

Mrs. Yerger said Mr. Hoffman is present. He said what he has so far from all of you are things they are working on to fix regarding the maps and some grammar situations that need to be fixed up. The one specific mention Mrs. Yerger had given him regarded trying to better locate where these potential proposed monitoring stations were. They are doing that. The question would be how would it best help them. Do you have a map data base you want it on? Do you have some kind of system where the other stations are on? Mrs. Yerger said you talk about the stations, so can you take the mapping with those stations marked and just add the new ones and include that map in the plan? Mr. Hoffman said those stations are in your township, so there is no need to tack that on to any of the stations in Bucks County. In addition, as he read through it, he wasn't as quite at ease with it when he wrote it. There's a couple of areas in the recommendations for discussion. One has to do with areas that need habitat improvements and buffers. Mrs. Yerger said could you please number the pages. Mr. Hoffman said yes. No. 2, we did mention where the priority area for habitat area and buffers existed, and this was based on personal direct survey. This is another case where, like the others, we categorize it and put it on a map. That same general issue applies to No. 6 where he talks about the need for invasive vegetation removal. Again, if you read it, he thinks you can figure out what he's talking about, but the more he looked at it, the more he thought, we've got to actually map that and put it in a place easier to get at. In regards to the other recommendations, he's going back to No. 1, the two area high schools are both of a mind to do something here. He's wondering, based on your experience, with starting up the Saucon Watershed forum, first came the association and then Rebecca came in and helped you start a forum and it's been continuing on, can that model be used here also? Could Northampton County's watershed specialist have Bucks County's be the point people to organize this? Mrs. Yerger said she can ask Jim and can make contact with Bucks County's conservation district. She does know that there's a couple of watersheds that are very active in Palisades, not only is it the Cook's, but also the Gallows Run. Todd is very active. Palisades encompasses several watersheds. You will have to really talk to them. Mr. Hoffman said throughout the spring and fall, students would be working on projects and then they would have a forum that was opened to the general public on a school week night where all these displays would be there and you'd have speakers and an evening for the community and region to learn more about the watershed and to get the students more actively involved. The next recommendation, No. 5, is regarding areas of potential land acquisition and conservation easement. Besides there being a need again to identify these properties, this one he is being reluctant. Mrs. Yerger said she has a question mark next to his first paragraph and she wonders where that information came from. A proposal for the acquisition of 500 acres is in the process even as this report is being written. Five hundred acres is a nice chunk of property. She wasn't aware of that. Are you talking development, purchase or easement purchase? Mr. Hoffman said there was a proposal for development that was being countered by people wanting to preserve the area. It's a bunch of contiguous properties, in the Cooks, in Lower Saucon. If it's causing you difficulties in identification, then he needs to go back to the original source. He will go back and check. His question overall for the whole section, how does he go about getting this information to you so it's not in a public report. Mrs. Yerger said she's not sure. You should probably convey this to our Open Space Committee in a meeting, at this point, whether through an email, and ask what would be the best place to disclose the place. We do have a process that the Open Space Committee can provide to you for any landowners that are truly interested in preservation. Mr. Hoffman said the information you started to share tonight about trying to develop a policy leading to stewardship and monitoring capabilities, should that be reflected in here or maybe are you in need or want any particular suggestions relating to stewardship monitoring capabilities, needs, over

Environmental Advisory Committee
December 2, 2008

how much period of time? Mrs. Yerger said theoretically, we are talking in perpetuity. That's the way the easements are being written. That was what we are working our way through – who is going to be responsible for the monitoring? Who is going to do the baselines? Who is going to do the reporting? Who is going to receive the reporting, whether it's just the township or multiple entities? Will there be third party co-holders of the easement to insure that's all of the process we are working through? Mr. Hoffman said and how it's going to get funded. Mrs. Yerger said one of the things that has come forward is the very fact that some of our conservation easements, we are getting outside funding. We have just been approved by DCNR for the Dravec property and that will demand that we meet certain goals for monitoring and stewardship for that property as we are utilizing public funds and they have certain criteria we must follow. The same is true with Northampton County. If we accept public funds, because we have a property before them for funding, we have to follow their criteria for monitoring stewardship. Mr. Hoffman said those agencies are giving you money to accomplish the easements, they are assuming you are going to fund the monitoring or you are going to find the funds, not ask them for more. Mrs. Yerger said yes, and we will accept the bulk of that responsibility whether we do it in house or through a third party.

Mr. Maxfield said because the initial part of the conservation easement can be so mushy sometimes, tying it together with a consistent monitoring policy that we can rely on so once we get all the specifics in place, then it's a standard, it's looked at every so often. Mrs. Yerger said we have not worked our way through that. We hope to have it done in a month or two. We can add it as an addendum when we get this done. Mr. Hoffman said in regard to recommendation No. 8, endangered and threatened species, he doesn't think there is anything in there that is a surprise to anybody. He'd like to know what do you feel this report could do to make that more likely. Mrs. Yerger said the first paragraph is incorrect. There are no endangered species in the Durham Bat Mine. There haven't been any since the early 90's. The Indiana Bat hasn't been present since the 90's. We did have a state threatened species which is the small footed bat. That needs to be amended.

Mr. Maxfield said back when the NRI was done, he thinks it was general knowledge that in headwater areas there were some rare and threatened species.

Mr. Hoffman said is there any kind of idea going on that will result in more funding or opportunities for protection? Mrs. Yerger said other than pursuing conservations easements in these areas, that in turn, will protect the species as they will be identified and singled out. Mrs. Yerger said with regard to this is we were talking about this whole NAI or NRI area, there is now an area that's been identified in the 2005 NAI of Northampton County called the Springtown Marsh. That's the entire headwater area along the 412 area that should be singled out and discussed. We were not aware of that until a month ago.

Mr. Hoffman said recommendation No. 9, it has to do with what was a subject of a lot of your conversation tonight regarding vegetated swales and when they are a good thing and when they are a bad thing. They are trying to work with Perkiomen now and there are storm water communities where they do the education work for. In order to identify areas that their crews can go out and vegetate as well as areas where a hard engineering solution might be needed as they are completely shot and haven't been paid attention to. He wants to try to do, if it would be valuable, identify where some of those areas might be. Mrs. Yerger said we receive data from the Cooks Creek Watershed Association about the whole Polk Valley Run – the ridge – and the protection area up there that overlaps, which came from their EAC. Have you gotten that data as well? It's part of our ordinances. It's an overlay zone. You could call Chris Garges on that. We have to have that data as we initiated the overlay zone. As far as the Perkiomen Creek, we are working with Boucher & James with some detention basins and retrofitting it in Polk Valley Run. You may want to take a look at our NRI. We're going to include the new NAI data which will probably be next month.

**Environmental Advisory Committee
December 2, 2008**

Mr. Hoffman said he wants to try to set a final calendar now. If he knows there is information available between now and January 31, he won't push to have it done by the 6th of January to have it done. Mrs. Yerger said if you want to incorporate most of this, he shouldn't have it done before February as they will have the data and it will give him time to incorporate the Springtown Marsh.

Mr. Hoffman said is there anything else you want to see in here that's not in here? He tried to go back and look at everything that was created and he thinks the key things are covered and he hopes this will be used when people write grant applications which will be another document to be referenced. He said he has a much clearer idea where he's going with the rest of it and he will take their suggestions and advice and you will see a more detailed mapping.

C. APPROVED GRANT FOR DRAVECZ ACQUISITION AND EASEMENTS FROM DCNR

Mrs. Yerger said as an FYI, we were awarded the \$244,000.00 from the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to purchase the easements on the Dravec property. Our lawyers are sitting down and drawing some of the lines.

VII. NON-AGENDA ITEMS

➤ Mrs. Yerger said Majestic dropped off plans, it straddles Bethlehem and Lower Saucon. It's the Brownfield's redevelopment project. They wanted to know if we have any environmental comments on this particular parcel. Mr. Maxfield said since a large stretch is eroded, but it has some wetlands, why don't we suggest they do an easement and do some restoration along Applebutter Road. Mrs. Yerger said when she talked to Scott from Majestic, he realized there's not a lot they can do in that area because of the wetland area. They looked over the map and made several recommendations for Majestic Bethlehem Center, Commerce Center Boulevard, as follow:

1. To reinforce the comment regarding the preservation of the water quality, and flora fauna, which exists along the Northern tributary of the Saucon Creek abutting Applebutter Road as stated in the Pennoni letter, dated December 1, 2008; and
2. That the best possible environmental management practices, including long-term protection, be implemented for the treatment of the riparian corridor and wetlands along Applebutter Road.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of the above recommendations.

SECOND BY: Mr. Hijazi

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Absent – Ms. Laura Ray, Mr. Dennis Aranyos, and Mr. Ted Beardsley)

Mr. Maxfield had concerns about the traffic on Easton Road. Mrs. Yerger said they are very well aware of how quickly already Cherry Lane backs up to make the swing on I-78. It can't handle the non-commercial traffic during the day. For them to try to access it that way, they realize they will be backing it all the way up. That's why the County funded that huge Commerce Center Boulevard.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY: Mr. Hijazi moved for adjournment. The time was 8:50 PM.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Absent – Ms. Laura Ray, Mr. Dennis Aranyos, and Mr. Ted Beardsley)