

I. OPENING

CALL TO ORDER: The General Business & Developer meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Wednesday, March 4, 2009 at 7:07 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. Glenn Kern, Council President, presiding.

ROLL CALL: Present – Glenn Kern, President; Tom Maxfield, Vice President; Priscilla deLeon, Ron Horiszny, Council members; Jack Cahalan, Township Manager; Leslie Huhn, Assistant Township Manager; Brien Kocher, Township Engineer; Linc Treadwell, Township Solicitor; Judy Stern Goldstein, Township Planner. Absent – Sandra Yerger, Council member & Stephen Prager, Jr. Council member.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ANY EXECUTIVE SESSION (IF APPLICABLE)

Mr. Kern said Council met in Executive Session this evening to discuss personnel issues.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Kern said for citizen agenda items – Council operates under Robert’s Rules. What that means is during agenda items, Council will talk amongst themselves and amongst staff and the interested parties. At the conclusion of that, we open it up to the public for public comment. There is an opportunity for non-agenda items at the end of the meeting to discuss whatever your business might be. We do have a microphone and there are microphones up at the table. There is a sign-in sheet in the back of the room. Please print your name and address and email address. It is very helpful in transcribing the minutes. For those who want to receive emailed agendas, please give your email address to Leslie or Jack or call the Township office. Please state your name and address. If you can’t hear, please let us know. You can check the minutes on the website, which is www.lowersaucontownship.org. Mr. Kern asked if anything was taken off the agenda this evening? Mr. Cahalan said no.

III. PRESENTATIONS/HEARINGS

A. ORDINANCE #2009-01 – SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION ON A PORTION OF APPLE STREET – PUBLIC HEARING & CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved to open the hearing.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

Mr. Kern said Ordinance #2009-01 has been advertised for a public hearing and consideration of adoption to provide for a speed limit reduction from 35 mph to 25 mph on a portion of Apple Street between the Hellertown Borough line and Wilhelm Drive.

Mr. Cahalan said this is the follow up to the request that came from Hellertown Borough concerning the reduction of the speed limit on the streets leading from the township into the borough. There was a problem with enforcement of their speed limit because they were lacking a transition zone of at least 500 feet between the two speed limits. If approved, we will post the proper signage. Mr. Kern said this was also brought up at the monthly COG meeting which is an opportunity once a month for the

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

Borough of Hellertown, Lower Saucon Township and the school district to get together to discuss mutual items that affect us all. This was brought up to Council and here we are. Is there any further discussion on this? Is there anyone in the audience who cares to speak about this issue? Hearing none, is there a motion to close the hearing?

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to close the hearing.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of Ordinance 2009-01.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

IV. DEVELOPER ITEMS

A. ZONING BOARD VARIANCES

1. JOSHUA MALIK (PICHEL) – APPLEBUTTER ROAD – VARIANCE REQUEST TO CONSTRUCT HOUSE ON PARCEL WITH NO DIRECT ROAD FRONTAGE

Mr. Kern said the applicant is proposing to construct a single-family dwelling on a vacant lot that does not have frontage onto a public street and requires a zoning variance.

Attorney Thomas Houser, 345 Gaffney Hill Road, Easton, PA 18042, was present. He said Joshua Malik is also here. This matter was before the Board a month or so ago. Mr. Harte was here previously, but he's in the hospital now having an operation and he couldn't make it tonight. This is a request for a variance because this particular lot lacks direct road frontage. However, the position of the owner is that the parcel has existed in its capacity with a pre-existing non-conforming condition since 1985 and it does have an access to Applebutter Road, so the request will come before the Zoning Hearing Board and we are looking for a favorable position from the Council.

Attorney Treadwell said if Council recalls, the last time this proposal was in front of you, you directed myself to go and oppose this application, and there was a question if Mr. Pichel owned various parcels that surrounded it and if there was a way to get road frontage by further moving the lot lines. At that meeting, it was mentioned, but I don't know if it was clear, that there was an agreement of sale that Mr. Malik had agreed to buy this property from Mr. Pichel and I think since that time, the applicant agreed to a continuance of the Zoning Hearing Board hearing in order to allow some further discussion and also a view of the property. Tonight it's back here because it's on your March Zoning Hearing Board list and its here tonight for you to decide whether you want to take the same position or change it.

Mr. Kern said what has changed since the last meeting and this meeting? Attorney Treadwell said there was an agreement of sale that has been submitted to the Township so we now know that Mr. Malik is the equitable owner of the property. Mr. Houser said it goes beyond that. A deed was recorded yesterday and he has a receipt. March 3 - Jay Pichel conveyed the property to Joshua Malik.

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

Mr. Maxfield said things have changed from my perspective. I was pushing hard for it last time and I would recommend now that we take no position as it goes before the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mrs. deLeon said she has a procedural question in reading the amended application, No. 4, and this has all changed now, but we need to revise this Zoning Hearing Board application because it's incorrect. There's blanks that should be filled in and I would think that the Township would want to have it completed and have the approved one on file. No. 5, again, my notes are wrong because things changed. It said No. 4 "if the applicant is not an owner, state applicants authority to bring in this application". That's blank. Attorney Treadwell said maybe when they submitted the revised application, they were anticipating that he would be the owner when it got to this point. Mrs. deLeon said on February 19, when it was received by the township, it was incorrect and it should really follow what is correct according to the Courthouse. Am I right? Mr. Maxfield said it's before us right now. Attorney Treadwell said I don't think the applicant will have a problem correcting any deficiencies on the Zoning Hearing Board application. Mrs. deLeon said I'd like to see it amended and submitted. The major point that I noticed was that the signature page wasn't notarized. Attorney Treadwell said I'm asking, Attorney Houser, will you fix that before the Zoning Hearing Board? Attorney Houser said yes, we just received it this afternoon. Mrs. deLeon said this was received at the township and dated February 19, 2009 without this seal. Attorney Houser said we found out about it this afternoon. Mrs. deLeon said the application was submitted to the Township on February 18 or 19, and did not have the notary seal on it, and it should have never gotten through. Attorney Houser said I understand.

Mr. Kern said the action Council can take at this time is support, oppose or take no action. We reserve supporting for something beneficial to the township and we oppose if it's something that really detrimental to the township; no action is neutral, but it's actually a good thing.

Council took no action. Mr. Houser said we will correct the application.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved to take no action.
SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

Mrs. deLeon asked if the Manager will make sure this is corrected and submitted? Mr. Cahalan said yes.

2. ROCCO & HEATHER VISCITO – 4235 LEWIS AVE. – VARIANCE REQUEST TO CONSTRUCT IN-LAW SUITE WHICH EXCEEDS THE SQUARE FOOTAGE ALLOWED

Mr. Kern said the applicant is proposing to construct an accessory relative apartment with an addition on their home. The allowable maximum square footage is 900 s.f., the applicant is proposing a 1,200 square foot addition.

Mr. Rocco Viscito was present. Mr. Kern said we do have information you submitted but if you would like, you can describe the information. Mr. Viscito said we are just putting what we term a small addition off the side of the house. It did exceed township code, but it is not out of the ordinary or doing something outrageous to the house making it obtrusive.

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

It's well within our side limits and front limits, we have plenty of room around the house. I brought pictures if anyone wanted to take a look at what it's going to look like from an architectural standpoint.

Mr. Maxfield said Brien and Judy have looked at the footprint and in your estimation, does this create any storm water problems or anything that needs to be addressed other than the normal? Mr. Kocher said they will still need to submit a grading plan application where we'll look at the storm water aspects. Ms. Stern Goldstein said from a zoning perspective, the only issue was the exceeding the 900 square feet for the in-law suite.

Council took no action.

3. HERB & JENNIFER THOMAS – 3380 LOWER SAUCON RD. – REQUEST VARIANCE OF SIDE YARD SETBACK TO CONSTRUCT GARAGE

Mr. Kern said the applicant is proposing to remove an existing accessory structure and construct a new larger one in the general vicinity. The proposed structure will not meet the required 40' side yard setback. The applicant is proposing a 26' side yard setback.

Mr. Herb Thomas was present. He said the garage is a 40'x60' pioneer pole barn and the reason I need the variance is I can't get it closer to the house because the well is situated between the house and where the proposed garage is. That's the only place on the property that it would actually fit. Mr. Kern said your neighbors are aware of the garage? Mr. Thomas said yes, the direct neighbor that would be affected is Hellertown Borough.

Council took no action.

4. KRISTINA TAYLOR – 3612 OLD PHILADELPHIA PK. – REQUEST VARIANCE OF FRONT YARD SETBACK TO EXPAND GUEST UNITS FROM 5 TO 6

Mr. Kern said the applicant is proposing to add a new unit to an existing 5 unit bed and breakfast facility. The new unit will be contained within an existing stone structure. The applicant is also seeking variances from the required 25' front yard setback and the maximum allowable number of units (5) for a bed and breakfast facility (5 existing plus 1 proposed).

Ms. Kristina Taylor was present. She said on our property, which as you know, is a historic property in the township, there was an early structure which we've called the cottage, a small stone structure, existing probably from the mid 1700's. It sat there for a long time to the dismay of many of our neighbors who we are hoping that someday we would do something with it and the time came that we decided we would like to make it another guest suite that would be one of the accommodations in our bed and breakfast, primarily because if we didn't do something now, it would fall down. We needed to stabilize it and in order to really justify the expense of stabilizing it, we decided that we would like to go ahead and have another accommodation in our bed and breakfast. As much as we are interested in historic preservation, we need to be able to pay for it. That was the genesis of the whole thing. We began the work and the work is ongoing and now we are here asking for a variance to be allowed to have another guest accommodation. It also developed that the construction of the second floor was six or eight inches into the allowed setback so we are asking for a variance for that also.

Attorney Treadwell said I am just going to clarify because this is a little bit more complicated than the other. There is a special exception because of the non conforming,

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

two variances, and there's also a site plan that we have a draft motion for you to approve. The action issues are special exception and two variances whether you want to take a position and then you need to act on the site plan. Mr. Kern said the special exception is? Attorney Treadwell said because it's a non-conformity and they are expanding it so you need a special exception to expand a non-conforming use.

Mr. Maxfield said the background information that we received says this is two parcels, basically? Ms. Taylor said our property, originally it was two parcels, a larger one and a much smaller one. Mr. Maxfield said have the two properties been merged? Ms. Taylor said yes. Mr. Maxfield said I don't know that we have that as current information. I think we show them as two different properties. There was a recommendation from our staff that we may want to require that you go through the formal process of merging these two lots and that would be a really good thing to do at this time, especially since now you've got facilities on both lots. Ms. Taylor said both these are on one lot, the inn and the cottage are on the same lot, they are not on separate lots? Mr. Kern said Chris, do you have information to the contrary? Mr. Garges said what Leslie is opening up is from our GIS system which is has been given us from the County. This is current through the end of 2008. It's actually showing two parcels for that property. On the site plan, it does show what they called a previous parcel boundary through the center of that, but the County doesn't recognize that. Linc can answer this legally, but the way that sits right there, you could look at it and say there should be setbacks from each of those property lines, but that is actually somehow formally merged. Linc can answer on the legality of that, but that's what I saw when I did this drawing and looked at their plan, we should just, somehow, cement the fact that it is one property. Attorney Treadwell said it would be beneficial to everyone if it was one parcel, and it may be because I haven't seen the deeds. It may just be a question of calling the County because they may have it from an old one. Mr. Maxfield said especially since it goes right through the middle of the garage which you will be using and there may be spaces on one side and on the other side which you will be using, and a lot of facilities that are going to share both those lots. Attorney Treadwell said maybe you, Ms. Taylor, could ask your engineer to look at this issue because as the Zoning Officer was saying, the property line, the red one goes right through the barn. It would be beneficial to you if it was all one piece of property and you wouldn't have that issue in the future. Ms. Taylor said this is the first I heard of this. Attorney Treadwell said I don't know the answer either, maybe your engineer can take a look at it and let you and us know.

Mr. Kern said if they were to call Northampton County and the line doesn't exist on the Northampton County map, then what, how would they verify that? Mr. Garges said it could be as easily as them calling me and saying they talked to so and so at the County and I can call them up as I deal with them all the time and I can just verify. They'll take that line and the next update we get, we'll have one lot there. Mr. Cahalan said there's another plan that shows the tract line and he does have the survey line on there.

Mrs. deLeon said there was another applicant here and he wanted to put up a garage and he had two lots and he had to go through a lot merger? Mr. Garges said yes, he was on Saucon Avenue, and he talked to the County. They needed a letter from us saying there weren't any issues from the Township. Mr. Maxfield said they've never gone through the formal consolidation process, like the one on Saucon Avenue, did that go through the formal process? Mr. Garges said it didn't go through a formal land development as some deeds have two tracts on them and it is actually one deed with two tracts of land described in that deed, which that could be as it has a tract line drawn on that. The County when they input this data, they input it and it has two parcel numbers on it. Mr. Maxfield said it may have two deeds? Mr. Garges said it may have two deeds and it may have one deed with two tracts on it and they put those two tracts on as two separate parcels and it's only one parcel.

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

Mrs. deLeon said I don't understand, sometimes we have to do a lot consolidation. Attorney Treadwell said right, what we need to clarify is if it's currently on two deeds, or whether, as Chris said, it's on one deed, identified as Tract 1, Tract 2, which I don't know at this moment. Mr. Maxfield said if it is on two deeds, that has to be cleared up, so a little bit more investigation from your engineer, I guess.

Mrs. deLeon said it should be a merger as a recommendation with the merger of the parcels. My question is, I understand to do that, you are going to have to put another unit there, and how many bed and breakfasts do we have in the township? Mr. Kern said one. Mrs. deLeon said what's the downside of increasing one more unit for this? The only negative I could come up with is, if the property ever sold, what would be the next use? You have no idea of what the next buyer is going to do, then we'll have this, just like the in-law apartment we have, when they go to sell the house, what are we going to do with that? That's always the "what if".

Mr. Maxfield said I think it came up at the Planning Commission that there will be no kitchen facilities in it, but there's going to be water. It can't be a full-blown apartment. Mrs. deLeon said will there be a bathroom there? Ms. Taylor said there has to be a bathroom. Mr. Garges said if they would sell it in the future and the future owner would want to change it to another use, they would have to come back before the township for special exception or some other relief because they would be changing it for a non-conforming use. Mrs. deLeon said I don't want to confuse the two agenda items, but it's hard to look at this for the Zoning Hearing Board and not think about the next time for the site plan. Can we talk about both the issues now? Attorney Treadwell said you can talk about the both issues. Mrs. deLeon said the other thing is I don't want to get into the letters. Attorney Treadwell said there are different application aspects of the project, but it's all one so we can talk about it all at once. Mrs. deLeon said what were the fire company comments that were in the letter? Mr. Kocher said they want a sprinkler system, but at the very least, a wired in smoke detection system. Mr. Garges said they also wanted a CO2 monitor which the applicant said they would comply with, whatever the code would be. Mrs. deLeon said unfortunately, in the Hanover letter, it just said address the fire company issues. Nobody knows what the fire company comments as it was not included in our packets. That's an important piece of our approval process and we don't know what the fire company wants us to do or not do. You're aware of that and you agree to that? Ms. Taylor said yes.

Mrs. deLeon said I'm a little confused with the flood plain and the proximity to the creek with the nonconforming, I'm confused. Ms. Stern Goldstein said there are existing improvements within the floodplain area. They are existing non-conformities. There are no additional structures that would encroach in the flood plain. They essentially built up over the existing structure and over existing pervious. Although there's existing encroachment of the flood plain, it exists as a existing non-conformity with no increase to that non-conformity. Mrs. deLeon said the structure was there from years ago. Right away I thought about the Heller Homestead garage as it's in a floodplain too, and its kind of grandfathered, and I did ask that question, am I right with the comparison? It's pre-existing. Ms. Stern Goldstein said the guest room is essentially on the second floor, they are not adding any other living quarters on that first floor. Mrs. deLeon said what's the first floor going to be used for again? Ms. Taylor said just a sitting room. Mrs. deLeon said I wanted to get down there before dark, and I didn't get a chance to do that, was that the ruins? Ms. Taylor said yes. Mrs. deLeon said so then you rebuilt? Ms. Taylor said we stabilized the ruins. I have a picture of the ruins. Mrs. deLeon said were there any other outstanding issues in your letters? Ms. Stern Goldstein said the issues in her letter that remained were really the two special exception variances, the approval of the site plan and

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

then the last one for you to address after the zoning issues is the waiver of land development when you get to that. Mr. Kocher said most of our comments were notes that you need to put on the plan and show some paving on the driveway. Mr. Maxfield said which of these two items, do the questions we had on the two parcels, fall under better, the second one? Ms. Stern Goldstein said under the site plan.

Mr. Kern said let's go back to the first request for variance of front yard setback to expand guest units from five to six, let's handle that issue. What's the opinion of Council? Mrs. deLeon said does anyone remember what our logic was when we chose five instead of six? That's a relatively new revision to our ordinance, does anyone remember? Mr. Maxfield said we kind of felt if it went to six, it became an apartment unit, but this is a building which definitely has a lack of facilities. I think it's kind of commendable that they've taken an old structure and redone it in such a nice way, the pictures look great. This whole thing has to be predicated on the fact that we are assuming that those are one lot. I don't know how we say that to the Zoning Hearing Board. Attorney Treadwell said we can add that to the conditions for the site plan approval that the applicant, if they aren't already consolidated, that the applicant can consolidate these two parcels into one lot. If they are consolidated, we can fix it like Chris and I spoke about it earlier. Mr. Horiszny said that's the next item. Mr. Kern said right, so we can vote separately. No action, Priscilla, on the first one? Mrs. deLeon said no, what my issues were on the first one, what I raised and I'm not really hearing any negatives. Mr. Kern said we're over the first hurdle. No action, and you can go to the Zoning Hearing Board on that issue.

B. WYDNOR HALL – KRISTINA TAYLOR – 3612 OLD PHILADELPHIA PK. – SITE PLAN APPROVAL

Mr. Kern said the Planning Commission recommended approval of this site plan in conjunction with the zoning variance request for the additional guest unit.

**WYDNOR HALL SITE PLAN
3612 OLD PHILADELPHIA PIKE
TAX MAP PARCEL Q6SW2-12-1 and Q6SW2-12-2
FINAL PLAN APPROVAL AND WAIVER OF LAND DEVELOPMENT**

The Lower Saucon Township Staff recommends that the Township Council approve the Wydnor Hall Site Plan as prepared by Joseph H. Body, PE, PLS., dated January 15, 2009, last revised February 23, 2009, consisting of one (1) sheet.

Subject, however, to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall address the review comments contained in the letter dated February 26, 2009, from Hanover Engineering Associates, Inc., to the satisfaction of the Township Council.
2. The Applicant shall address the review comments contained in the letter dated February 25, 2009, from Boucher and James, Inc., to the satisfaction of the Township Council.
3. The Applicant shall provide four (4) complete sets of Plans with original signatures, notarizations and seals. The Applicant shall also provide two (2) CDs of all Plans in an AutoCAD format (jpeg-ROM).
4. The Applicant shall pay any outstanding escrow balance due to the Township in the review of the Plans and the preparation of legal documents.
5. The Applicant shall satisfy all these conditions within one (1) year of the date of the conditional approval unless an extension is granted by the Township Council.

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

6. The Applicant shall obtain all relief from the Zoning Hearing Board that is required for this proposal.

It is also recommended that Township Council approve a waiver from the following requirements of the following Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO) Section:

1. Section 145-15 Land Development - so as to not consider this proposal to be considered a Land Development and, thereby, not be required to comply with Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements.

Mr. Kern said the motion, if there were to be a motion, what would it be? Attorney Treadwell said it's a motion to approve the staff recommendation that you have in your packet with the additional condition that the two tax map parcels/lots that are shown currently be merged and consolidated if they are or satisfactorily proven to the township that they have been merged and consolidated. Mr. Kern said is there a motion based on the statement from the Solicitor? Attorney Treadwell said the staff recommendation has a waiver of land development in it. Technically, because it's a commercial building, the fact they are adding this second story, would make it a land development, but the Planning Commission recommended that you waive that.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved to approve per the staff recommendation and with the condition as stated by our Solicitor.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Mrs. deLeon said there's enough parking, right, and enough bathrooms? Ms. Stern Goldstein said yes.
- ROLL CALL:** 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

C. BEN FRANKLIN TECHNOLOGY PARTNERS – LEHIGH UNIVERSITY MOUNTAIN TOP CAMPUS – REQUEST WAIVER OF LAND DEVELOPMENT FOR BUILDING ADDITION AND PARKING GARAGE

Mr. Kern said the applicant is proposing to construct improvements to an existing structure and construct a parking garage. The property is primarily located within the City of Bethlehem and would not divert any storm water into the Township. Improvements within the Township boundary are minimal and the applicant is seeking a waiver of the Land Development requirements. The applicant will need a zoning variance to construct a retaining wall within the front yard setback.

Kevin Markle, from Barry Isett Associates and Fred Allerton with Spillman Farmer Architects were present. Mr. Markle said Ben Franklin Technologies Partners on the Lehigh University campus is proposing a four story addition to the existing facility that is there and the construction of a parking garage adjacent to the existing parking lot. The municipal boundary happens to run along the western half of the project area. We're currently going through the City of Bethlehem for land development approval; however, the improvements that are within the township consist of the construction of a screened wall and installation of a generator. All the other improvements, storm water and everything else, will be within the city boundary. We're here to ask for a waiver from going through land development for this project. We will be submitting a zoning variance because the screen wall does fall within the front yard setback, and that will be handled separately and we'll be back to you next month or later for approval to go to the Zoning Hearing Board, but for right now, we're looking for a waiver from land development for the project.

Mrs. deLeon said what about traffic? Mr. Markle said they are anticipating increase of probably about 100 employees now in the existing building, it probably will double that, so they are building a two story garage and adding adequate parking for the employees. Mrs. deLeon said the road is in the City of Bethlehem, are there any improvements there? Mr. Markle said no, not at this time. As

General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009

of yet, no one is asking for anything. Mrs. deLeon said this is the road that has those storm drain inlets if you go off a little bit, you end up in them. Is there any way we could ask that they get fixed? Mr. Kocher said are those inlets in the City? Mrs. deLeon said yes. Mr. Kocher said you could reject this and write a letter to the City asking that it be a requirement of the City. Mr. Kern said they are in the Township from the time they are on Mountainside until you get to Lehigh's overlook. Mrs. deLeon said they start at the overlook. Mr. Maxfield said what was the story, they were originally manufactured by Bethlehem Steel, and were a non-traditional size and they were really hard to replace? Mrs. deLeon said they keep putting macadam on them. It's an opportunity to ask. Mr. Maxfield said for the really minimum thing they are doing in Lower Saucon, that's a bit much to ask for.

Mrs. deLeon said we could be writing to the city and ask them that it's an issue to be looked at. Mr. Kern said the tie in is it's going to increase traffic somewhat and there is an existing issue with those inlets. It's just a matter of who is going to pay for them and get them fixed. It's going to increase traffic and more people are going to complain about dipping into those things. Mrs. deLeon said in all fairness, the township has them also in the same way. Also, with the traffic, the casinos are coming and that will be a short cut for people. It's going to happen. Mr. Kern said the only portion of this project in Lower Saucon is the road and the screen wall. We have no influence on the building and structure. Mr. Markle said both the parking garage and the building are not going to be within the township. Mrs. deLeon said is it going to be higher than the star? Mr. Markle said I don't know the height of the star and don't know the elevation. Mrs. deLeon said there was a big concern when the FAA wanted to put in a tower, we were very concerned and very vocal about opposing it because of the view shed that you are used to seeing with the mountains and the trees, and this is obviously, going to cut a big hole in those trees. Mr. Kern said that's a good question, does the height require any FAA lighting? Mr. Markle said not that we're aware of, but that's a good question. It's lower than other buildings on the Mountaintop campus. Mr. Maxfield said this is pretty minimal but I really like the idea of sending off a letter to Bethlehem and have them address that issue. Can we make that two separate motions?

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved that we grant the waiver request to the Ben Franklin Technology Partners as requested by them.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Ms. Stern Goldstein said in the short memo that I prepared for you, there were two conditions to go with that. One was that they obtain the required variance from Lower Saucon and the other they obtain the acquired land development approval from the City of Bethlehem. Mr. Maxfield said this would be conditional upon the granting of those two? Ms. Stern Goldstein said correct.

ROLL CALL:

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to amend his motion to add the above statement by Ms. Stern Goldstein

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny amended his second
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Mark Wirth said exactly where is that located? Mr. Markle said east towards the Y intersection, then go to the right and toward Lehigh Mountain Campus. It's in that area. The first building to the right to the entrance into Lehigh.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved that we address a letter to the City of Bethlehem asking that remediation to the depressed storm drain inlets be addressed with this land development application.

SECOND BY: Mrs. deLeon said she would ask you to consider asking, will we get a chance to review anything as an adjacent from the City? Mr. Cahalan said we can ask them. Mrs. deLeon said my point being, it's at the top of the hill, it's a mountain, and we have storm water issues with the people down the hill. Mr. Kocher said what they are essentially asking you is that we don't review those

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

very issues, and depend on the City of Bethlehem review to address those issues. That's the core of what they are actually asking. Mrs. deLeon said I thought this was so they didn't have to submit a plan to us. Mr. Kocher said it is, so we won't review it. Mrs. deLeon said under our regulations, not the City's. The City sometimes usually send us stuff to review. Mr. Kern said Priscilla's comment here was that we have the opportunity to look at the City of Bethlehem's plan. Mrs. deLeon said not that it meets our regs. Mr. Kern said and comment. Mr. Maxfield said ask for courtesy copies. Mr. Kocher said that can go in Jack's letter. Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL:

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield will amend his motion to request a courtesy copy of the plans from City of Bethlehem, and as a follow up our staff would be able to look at it for storm water issues.

SECOND BY: Mrs. deLeon amended her second
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger)

D. COTTAGES AT SAUCON VALLEY – EXTENSION TO COMPLETE IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Kern said the developer is requesting a one-year extension of time to complete the improvements of this subdivision.

The Lower Saucon Township staff recommends that Township Council approve an extension until March 14, 2010 for completion of improvements at this development. This approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The owner/developer shall enter into an Extension Agreement with the Township satisfactory to the Township Solicitor and Township Council.
2. The Improvements Security shall remain in full force and effect until April 14, 2010, to the satisfaction of the Township Solicitor.
3. The owner shall pay any outstanding plans and appeals account invoices owed to the Township.
4. The Township Engineer is hereby directed to inspect the erosion and sedimentation controls for the project and notify the developer of any deficiencies. The developer must correct any deficiencies noted by the Township Engineer within 60 days of receipt of his report.

Mrs. deLeon asked if there were any outstanding issues? Mr. Kocher said there is none glaring, but this authorizes us to go out and check the erosion control facilities. Mr. Maxfield said there's a pretty substantial stockpile out there. Have you been out there to see if it has sufficient E&S stuff around it? Mr. Kocher said we were out in the fall and did a pretty comprehensive inspection, but we haven't really been out there over the winter as they really haven't done anything since then. We'll go out and check on it.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

E. GREENWOOD COURT – EXTENSION TO COMPLETE IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Kern said the developer is requesting a one-year extension of time to complete the improvements of this subdivision.

The Lower Saucon Township staff recommends that Township Council approve an extension until March 4, 2010 for completion of improvements at the Greenwood Subdivision. This approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The owner/developer shall enter into an Extension Agreement with the Township satisfactory to the Township Solicitor and Township Council.
2. The Improvements Security shall remain in full force and effect until project completion or April 4, 2010, to the satisfaction of the Township Solicitor.
3. The owner shall pay any outstanding plans and appeals account invoices owed to the Township.
4. The Township Engineer is hereby directed to inspect the erosion and sedimentation controls for the project and notify the developer of any deficiencies. The developer must correct any deficiencies noted by the Township Engineer within 60 days of receipt of his report.

Mr. Kocher said the same issue as in the Fall, we did an erosion control inspection and there's some things we'll want to check to make sure they followed up with. Mr. Maxfield said I think I have seen changes there and they are moving ahead. Mrs. deLeon said any outstanding issues? Mr. Kocher said we had a request to dedicate the street and we said no as there are only one or two lots there.

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved to approve per the staff recommendation.

SECOND BY: Mrs. deLeon

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

V. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS

A. CONTRIBUTION FROM FIRE EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT FUND TO LEITHSVILLE FIRE CO. FOR PURCHASE OF NEW TANKER

Mr. Kern said per the established rotation policy, the Leithsville Fire Company is due next to replace its tanker and has prepared specifications and obtained three quotations for the vehicle through PA COSTARS. The total cost of the tanker will be \$347,395. The Fire Services group at its last meeting on February 24, 2009, reviewed the Leithsville request and recommends that the Township contribute 70% toward this cost or \$243,000 with the Leithsville Fire Company contributing 30% toward this cost or \$104,000.

Mr. Cahalan said Scott Krycia from the Leithsville Fire Company who has done all the work on the specifications to the tanker, is here to run through it.

Mr. Krycia said I'm the Deputy Chief from Leithsville Fire Company. Basically, we are in the process of specking the new tanker. A little information about our Fire Department, we've been serving the township for 78 years. We ran 252 responses in 2008. We ran 45 calls as of the

General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009

beginning of March already; 16 active fire fighters; we provide mutual and automatic response to Lower Saucon Township, Hellertown, Bucks County, Lehigh County and pretty much everywhere. We have an aggressive training policy, operational and safety policies. Our department consists of Fire Chief Lynn Keck; myself as the Deputy; Assistant Chief Tony Medei; Fire Captain Justin Ziegler; and Rescue Captain Scott Ziegler. The guy in the blue shirt is Fire Fighter Peters. We have a modern fleet consisting of an engine which is 6111, which was purchased in 2001 with township funds. We have a rescue unit 6142, which is a 1991 unit purchased with township funds. We have a brush truck, which is 6141, a 1973 Dodge utility, and that's our most current truck. We also have a heavy brush or off road brush truck and it's a 1985 AM General. It was given to us by DCNR through the cooperation program. We retrofitted it and it's on the road, and it's 6143. The last truck we have on the road is our tanker, which is 6132. It's a 1984 Four Guys, Ford Tanker. That actually used to be Southeastern's tanker which the Township graciously donated to our Fire Department three or four years ago. It holds 2,000 gallons of water and has a 500 gallon per minute pump. We do have a tanker which is currently out of service, which is 6131, it's a 1976 Four Guys Chevy tanker. It holds 320 gallons of water and has a 500 gallon per minute pump. That truck was taken out of service in May 2008 because we've had several mechanical issues as it's a 1976. Our request is simple. It's for the Council to approve continuing 70% toward the cost of the replacement of 6131 and 6132. We're going to replace two trucks with one truck, thus reducing the size of our fleet. The current price for this is \$347,395.00. This is as of 03/01/09. The Township's share would be \$243,176.49. The Fire Departments share is going to be roughly \$104,000. Both trucks will be replaced by the new truck. We will renumber it 6131. The new 6131 will be a 2010 International Tanker. The chassis will be purchased through the COSTARS program from Five Star International in Allentown, PA. The body will be manufactured by Faust Bros. Fire Equipment in Georgia.

Mr. Krycia said some features of the truck: it will carry 3,000 gallons of water, have a 1750 gallon per minute pump. It's a side mount pump panel, side hose cross lace, rear inside dump valves from inside the cab. It will have a rear hose bed which is common for a truck like this. It will have an AKW generator, side ladder rack, side mounted holder tank which holds 3,000 gallons of water. It's going to be fully NFPA compliant and it'll have the 2010 emissions equipment on it.

Mr. Krycia said the process for this truck: It's a two year bidding process for the department. We contacted every tanker manufacturer there is. We reached out and touched every fire department that we respond with. We pay special attention to the township fire departments, but also special attention to Bucks County fire departments, Lehigh County fire departments, because we are part of their cooperative tanker task force and the unit runs into those areas. We also assess their needs along with our needs. We have full support from the three township fire chief's. We have full support from the Hellertown fire chief. We spoke to Upper Saucon on this extensively because their tanker is actually what we are going to build, so we had a lot of meetings with Upper Saucon. He handed out pictures of the tanker that they are planning to purchase.

Mr. Cahalan said Scott and his team have done a lot of work on this. They've been working on this for about two years, so it's a lot of time and effort that have gone into this. The fire services group did review this, and it was scrutinized by everyone before we came up with a recommendation from that group.

Mr. Krycia said their truck will look pretty much like Upper Saucon's, except their truck will be white. Mrs. deLeon said I was at the fire services meeting and I just have to say my hat goes off to you guys. It was great sitting around the room with all the entities present and the spirit of cooperation really filled the room. It was great. I know I appreciate that. Just so that it's on the Township record, I know we talked about a lot of things. I just want to make sure the minutes tonight, reflect that the Township fire expert, the guy that reviewed your specs, that took place, and you went through COSTARS. Mr. Krycia said the problem that we had with this truck is that a

General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009

tanker is very much not like a custom engine, so what we did, is the chassis is COSTARS but the tank manufacturer is actually not COSTARS. We talked to everybody that was in the COSTARS program, and the first person we actually talked to was Four Guys because they actually built the last tanker, and actually pulled out of the COSTARS program. Nobody would really build what we wanted because they want to build their COSTARS truck, and this is a little more of a custom truck as it's designed around the needs of our district primarily. The chassis comes from Five Star in Allentown, but the building of the actual truck is from a non COSTARS in Georgia.

Mrs. deLeon said what I am trying to do is establish criteria for the next purchase and I went back and did find the minutes from April 2007 and we did set up a criteria list, and unfortunately, it was just in the minutes. I'd like to set up a policy so we have it in writing, the procedure you went through, that all the other ones went through so that everybody is treated the same and they are not sitting around the room for 45 minutes talking about what did we do. I think it was a good feeling that night.

Mr. Horiszny said does it have a drop down on it? Mr. Krycia said drop down for the folder tank? Yes, it will be on the passenger's side. It's going to have ladders on the side, it's going to have a 14 and a roof ladder on the side. It's a T-tank, so the bottom of the T is where the folder tank will sit in, it will slide in there. We're setting it up to be a day timer response truck, so if we have something that confirm fire hydrogen area, non hydrogen area, we can roll that truck and pretty much have the same equipment that is going to be on the engine. It's just going to have 3,000 gallons of water which could be a huge asset for a knock down. Mr. Kern said how many gallons do you normally go through for a house fire? Mr. Krycia said it depends. It could be as little as a few hundred or as much as 1,000. It depends on the fire, the origin of fire, combustibles involved in the fire, damage, etc. Mr. Kern said 3,000 is a pretty good capacity. Mr. Krycia said 3,000 is a good capacity. If you have a bedroom fire, you should be able to knock that down with 500 gallons, hypothetically. It really depends on what is in the room. A lot of the other fire departments are running one truck with 3,000 gallons.

Mrs. deLeon said, Linc, you drew up a contract last time for Steel City? Mr. Cahalan said no, we didn't. We just reviewed the specs. Mrs. deLeon said have you done that with this yet? Mr. Cahalan said no. Mrs. deLeon said I'm just trying to establish a policy so that we have it in writing, the steps to do so we are not spinning our wheels all the time.

Attorney Treadwell said what happens to the old two trucks? Mr. Krycia said they are up for sale. 6131 the white Chevy is up for sale. We actually put it in the PA Firemen, which is a trade magazine for fire departments. We've had no response yet. The current tanker, 6132, it is the fire companies intent to sell that truck and then give that money back to the apparatus replacement fund. Whatever we would get for it – the blue book value is about \$6,000. The problem is that typically fire departments don't buy old trucks, they like to buy new trucks, so you don't get much value for it. It could get sold to a construction outfit that needs to haul water on a job site, or even a township. Mr. Cahalan said we did discuss the idea of getting a tanker up at the compost center, but told us it would be better if we called the fire people to come up and douse anything because you never know, it could flare back up again and burn. Leithsville said call them, they will gladly come up.

Mrs. deLeon said will the fire truck be red? Mr. Krycia said no, it will be white.

Mr. Cahalan said the resolution contained in the packet, 37-2009, we do have funding in the fire equipment replacement fund, but it's in the contingency line item and this would be requesting approval to transfer and we will change that amount to \$243,176.49 from the contingency account, 30.493 to the account 34.11.500 and that will cover this grant for the Leithsville Fire Company.

General Business Meeting

March 4, 2009

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of Resolution 37-2009, with the change.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

Mrs. deLeon said I'd like to direct the Manager to prepare a written policy. Mr. Cahalan said I have that prepared. Mrs. deLeon said it's not an official policy and the other night we spent a lot of talking about minutes that we never had that night, and I really think that policy on a piece of paper really would have gone a long way that night.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved to direct the Manager to repair a written policy based on the procedures that we just went through for the future, and have it for the next meeting on March 18, 2009.

SECOND BY: Mr. Kern

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

B. APPROVAL TO EXECUTE LETTER OF INTENT TO DCED FOR FACILITATOR FOR FIRE SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE

Mr. Kern said the Fire Services group which is comprised of representatives from the Township's four (4) volunteer fire companies and Dewey Fire Company in Hellertown Borough, and representatives from the Township and Borough Councils, will be forming a Steering Committee to explore opportunities for regional fire services and has requested the assistance of the DCED Governor's Center for Local Government Services to facilitate the establishment and start-up of this group. DCED requires the submission of a Letter of Intent, executed by the two municipalities, in order to provide this assistance.

Mr. Cahalan said Scott and several of his representatives were there at this meeting on the 24th of February. It was a good meeting with Rob Brady from the Governor's Center. We covered a lot of issues and he recommended we form a fire services group. The first meeting will be on April 2, here at the township. The fire companies will be coming back with their recommendations for representatives to the group, which includes members of the public, and we then need the letter of intent approved to send it to the DCED so that they can provide us with a facilitator who can help us guide the group and start up working through some of these issues.

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for approval of the letter of intent.

SECOND BY: Mrs. deLeon

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

Mrs. deLeon said there was a lot of talk over our budget amounts and I would like to make a motion to direct Jack to really prioritize the fire department line item this year for the budget. I'm not suggesting you didn't in the past, I'm merely saying that it really should be top priority in this township and I know we planned and came up with ways and numbers for the line item, but that didn't seem to work. Based on the meeting from a couple of weeks ago, we are going to have a shortfall, so more money has to be put into the line item. I'd like to make a motion that the fire equipment is given the top priority in the township. You always send out a request in August to all the organizations for their wish list and for the budget, so I'm giving you my wish list early. Attorney Treadwell said that's fine, I'm just trying to understand from my own perspective what it means. The motion is any available monies. Mrs. deLeon said no, the first priority of the township, should be our fire protection. It's going to come

General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009

to the fact where we are going to have paid personnel, and we really need to take another direction. That's just my opinion, but we need to start planning now.

Mr. Cahalan said Cathy Gorman and I were at the meeting and we did hear loud and clear that Se-Wy-Co will be coming shortly for another piece of equipment and we have to come up with some options for Council to consider funding those purchases. So we have started to work on that and we definitely will make that a priority in the 2010 budget.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved that the fire equipment is given the first priority in the township for your budget preparation.

Mr. Horiszny said I'm not really sure that we need it. I think we have top priority on fire now and that we have prioritized police and everything else. It seems to me that we have everything in place to fund it, to set up a fund. Mr. Maxfield said it's got to be balanced with everything. Mrs. deLeon said according to what we were talking about, we're going to have a shortfall. Se-Wy-Co is going to be coming. Right now, we're at the bottom of our list for our equipment. There's not going to be enough money in the line item, so we really need to look at this. That's why I want the policy put in place.

Mr. Cahalan said just for discussion, the policy that you are asking for, you're not asking for a policy that sets down what the township will contribute? Mrs. deLeon said the previous policy was about going with COSTARS. Mr. Cahalan said that covered the township review of the fire companies requests for funding for the fire equipment. Mrs. deLeon said the review by the township fire expert, the four chief's signing the letter, and again, 70/30 was the suggested number. Again, there was a discussion on whether or not that was the real number to use, but that was a start and it could be a negotiated from that depending on what the fire chiefs say. It was a disadvantage to the fire companies because they didn't know what number we were going to come up with to offset their costs. Was it going to be 90/10, so how do you plan to build a fire truck and pay your share based on your selling hoagies or whatever, if you don't know what that number is. That's why we talked about that, and then giving the township the invoice, the logical steps that was on paper that everyone would know – what's the township going to ask of me when I go and pay for part of this equipment, that way it's all fair. Mr. Cahalan said that was the policy we brought out in 2007, which we'll bring back again. My question is, are you asking to be included in that policy, this 70/30 contribution formula or whatever? Mrs. deLeon said we talked about a percentage. Mr. Cahalan said that wasn't in the original policy. Mrs. deLeon said I know. Mr. Cahalan said I'm just asking is that what Council wants me to bring back or just the equipment policy? Mrs. deLeon said I'm asking for all those other things plus the percentage and with a phrase in there that this isn't set in stone. We spent a lot of time talking about "what ifs" and if we had a written policy in writing, it would have been a lot easier. Mr. Cahalan said in the equipment policy, it didn't get into what the township or fire company would contribute. I know you have been in favor of a percentage from back then when it was discussed, but the other Council member representative, Glenn Kern, wasn't in favor of that and some of the fire companies weren't either. I don't think there was a council direction on the 70/30 formula. I know there was a decision made the other night, and a decision made back in 2007 for Steel City, but I don't think there was ever any policy set in stone as far as what the Township would contribute. I think it's being done on a case by case basis. Mrs. deLeon said it's a case by case basis, but we did talk about the percentage. Scott, I don't want to put you on the spot, but 2007 was two years ago. Mr. Krycia said we did talk about the 70/30, but it depended on the type of truck. The concern was there should be a special exception like if Se-Wy-Co came, because it serves the whole township. Mr. Cahalan said it was mentioned that 25% of \$1.3 million is a lot more than 25% of \$347,000. Mrs. deLeon said that's why I am suggesting a phrase, that it's not a cut in stone thing, it's what the fire chief's are recommending, but at least there is a number that future requests can base it on. I left that meeting feeling more comfortable that there was a number to go by.

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

Mr. Horiszny said isn't all of this part of the fire equipment purchase policy and it has nothing to do with the motion that you just made? Mrs. deLeon said that was the previous motion. Mr. Cahalan said I wanted to clarify that the fire equipment policy, the one that I brought to Council in 2007, does not contain any information or direction on the amount of the contribution that the township will make and the fire companies will make toward the equipment. It lays down seven or eight steps that the fire companies will have to go through in preparing their request for the township's contribution. Mrs. deLeon said in other words, we don't want a fire company, and I don't think they would do this, showing up here, and say we bought this truck and now we can't pay for it, and we don't want that to happen. We want to be part of the process prior to the truck being ordered. Don't come back to us and ask us for money if you didn't go through the process like everyone else did, and right now, there's no official document that's been approved by the Township. It was in the minutes, but it wasn't voted on specifically, and I want a specific policy.

Mr. Maxfield said I'm going to have to disagree with that because I think that when you start adopting policies that stipulate percentages and things like that, you are actually treading on Council's responsibility to actually discuss these things and deal with them on a one to one basis. When you start interfering with priorities of the budget, this is one of the most important things that Council does is review its budget and determine where these things are going and with the instability of the financial climate, these things must be dealt with in the future on a one to one basis. The process might be a little cumbersome as government always is, but so far it's been working and the equipment is there and we are finding ways to get what we need to get and we still have to continue along that process. There is a phrase that you have used a million times about binding future Council's; I don't want to put in place a policy that binds a future Council on how it deals with the budget. The budget is a balanced, complex thing and must consider as was mentioned earlier, police and many other important things to the township and I think we should just pursue the policy that we've been on. I shouldn't say policy, I should say procedure that we've been doing seems to work, so far.

Mrs. deLeon said we're talking about two different things, let's just get the budget out of this mix for a second and let's go back to the procedure. The procedure was taken out of the minutes, it was never really voted on. It was kind of yes, that's the process. That night at the meeting, I asked for the policy and no one really knew. Mr. Cahalan said I don't recall you asking for the policy. I made a presentation. Mr. Kern said let me interject here. What Priscilla is saying, there is a policy, you've been following it, but it's never been officially voted on by Council, so we can surely vote on the policy by Council, and we can. Now the other question was the percentage, which I don't think should be in the policy because as we've been discussing, and the fire company has been discussing, it all depends on the fire apparatus that is up for review. If we just make mention that the budget of the truck will be discussed as part of the policy with the Committee and then brought to Council, which covers it. Mr. Cahalan said thank you, that's the clarification I was asking for.

Mrs. deLeon said whatever, but I do want an official policy at the next meeting that we can vote on. Is that okay? Mr. Kern said that's what we voted on. Mrs. deLeon said make it part of the record, my wish for our fire protection, our number one priority, which we asked for every year, what do you want to see in the budget, what is your wish list. I'm just stating on the record, so everyone knows what my position is, and I thought it wouldn't hurt to have a motion, but I made the motion, so you know what Robert's Rules says. Mr. Kern said okay, we appreciate that. Mrs. deLeon said if no one wants to support that. Mr. Kern said don't say we're not supporting the fire companies, we're not supporting your motion. Mrs. deLeon said that's on the record, thank you. Mr. Kern said we certainly support the fire companies, and that's on a case by case basis, and we'll contribute what the township can contribute. Mrs. deLeon said and if you remember, my motion didn't have a dollar amount in there.

SECOND BY:

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL:

No second, motion failed.

C. REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF MAINTENANCE POLICY FOR TOWNSHIP PARKS

Mr. Kern said the draft Maintenance Policy for Township Parks has been reviewed by Council, the Park & Recreation Board and the Environmental Advisory Council and their recommendations have been incorporated into the policy which is now ready for Council adoption.

Mr. Cahalan said this has come before Council prior and been reviewed by the Parks and Rec board, and also by the EAC, and we've gotten in many comments from all of you and have incorporated those requests into the policy and we believe it is just about ready for adoption unless there are other changes, comments or revisions that you have tonight.

Mrs. deLeon said the issues that were brought up last meeting? Mr. Cahalan said we have addressed those. There were issues concerning the EAC doing the inspections, that has been changed. We have worked on the language in here for the fertilization. Judy and I are working on further amplification of the integrated pest management (IPM). Ms. Stern Goldstein said there was one more about the plowing of the parking lots and snow removal, and that was in the amended draft also. Mr. Cahalan said we did give you copies of the minutes from the different meetings. Ms. Stern Goldstein said we did look closely at the general statements for the IPM in his policy and they are totally consistent with what we will be further developing for you to review and approve.

Mr. Maxfield said I think I'm addressing the right document. Last night at EAC, we attempted to review, but we had gotten an older version, or was that of a different policy? Mr. Cahalan said there is a Facilities Use Policy that is in draft that is out circulating. Mr. Maxfield said that's what it is then. Ms. Stern Goldstein said Kevin discovered this yesterday when our packet came in the mail and I was preparing Kevin for last night's meeting, meanwhile we didn't have the agenda, so I copied the section of the maintenance policy out of Council's packet for him. When they received the EAC packet, he had last month's version and he made extra copies of the newer version.

Mr. Maxfield said there were some suggestions last night, but we had to put it off until the next meeting, but the suggestion was to receive comments, via email. Maybe if we could postpone a vote on this until our next Council meeting, we could incorporate the EAC comments. Mr. Cahalan said do you know what the comments were, Judy? Ms. Stern Goldstein said the comments from the EAC meeting from February were incorporated, and their minutes are in the packet tonight. All the revisions were done. Last night's discussion with Kevin and Sandy really dealt with the application of fertilizers and making sure organics were being used and things like that and the desire of the EAC to have their chemist who is a member, review all of that. That would be appropriate for the detailed IPM wherein in the general statements were in the park maintenance guide, so it seems that if the IPM were ongoing and the EAC looked at that further, it might actually work. Mr. Maxfield said I was assuming Sandy was going to be here tonight and she had the marked up copy. There were some word changes in the text that seemed to make a difference and some also focused on there was a cutting policy and who was going to prune and judge that a certain tree needed to be pruned, etc. It had to do with professionals and things like that looking at that. There were some changes with the IPM. Mr. Cahalan said we should hold off and wait to see what those recommendations are. Mr. Maxfield said if we can collect them, via email, and forward them to Council and have Council look at them. Mr. Cahalan said we can bring this back on the 18th. Ms. Stern Goldstein said essentially the lawn mowing bids have gone out. Mr. Cahalan said this policy was used as a guide for that. Ms. Stern Goldstein said the only time sensitive thing is we're getting closer to the season but March 18th shouldn't hurt you at all. Mr. Cahalan said we'll

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

have further information on the IPM, where we're heading. Mr. Maxfield said we had quite a bit of information to review on that.

Mr. Cahalan said we'll bring this back again on the 18th, so no action. Mr. Maxfield said the changes were minor.

D. AUTHORIZE COLLECTION OF 2009 REAL ESTATE TAXES & 2008 DELINQUENT TAXES

Mr. Kern said Council should authorize the Manager to direct the Finance Department to collect the 2009 real estate taxes in the amount of \$1,816,838.06 and to forward the 2008 delinquent tax list to Northampton County for collection.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny so moved to authorize collection of 2009 real estate taxes and 2008 delinquent taxes.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

E. APPROVAL OF NATIONAL REGISTER PLAQUE FOR THE LUTZ-FRANKLIN SCHOOLHOUSE

Mr. Kern said the Lower Saucon Township Historical Society is requesting the Township purchase a plaque showing the National Historic Register designation of the Lutz-Franklin Schoolhouse that will be placed at the site.

Mr. Cahalan said we included a memo. Diane has been working with Sue Horiszny, Keri and Fran Robb and came up with the various prices on these plaques and we're asking for Council's approval to move forward. Mrs. deLeon said whatever they are attached to, they'd better secure it because she read an article they are being stolen. Mrs. Horiszny said they are going to be put on a post. Mr. Kern said is there a plaque you are recommending? Mr. Cahalan said the circled one. Mrs. deLeon said what will it say? Mrs. Horiszny said it will say "Lutz Franklin, 1880, Schoolhouse. Mr. Maxfield said they will space it out. Mrs. Horiszny said they are going to do a model and send it to us for approval. Mr. Kern said good. Mrs. Horiszny said it's bronze. Mr. Maxfield said he likes that one, good choice.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Kern moved for approval of the Franklin Bronze plaque for a cost of \$356.00 for the Lutz-Franklin Schoolhouse.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

F. REVIEW OF DISCUSSION ITEMS TO BE SUBMITTED TO PENNDOT

Mr. Kern said a list of items for discussion and of concern regarding State Roads within the Township has been compiled from input by the Public Works Dept., Hanover Engineering, Council and staff. This should be reviewed by Council for any additional input prior to submitting the list to PennDOT and requesting a meeting with them to discuss these items.

Mr. Cahalan said we collected these from all the various comments that have been given to us over the past year or so and put them together on a list. If you have any further ones, please let us know. Brien

General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009

is working on setting up the meeting with Michael Reibert, the 5-0 District Executive. Mr. Kocher said I would like a list ahead of time, and the reason is because these are either construction related, maintenance related, traffic related, so we may not want to pile all of that into one meeting, but I'll leave that up to him. Mr. Cahalan said the only thing I indicated to Glenn that I would add, we had brought to PennDOT's attention at a previous meeting that Jim Birdsall attended with the District Executive, concerns about the storm water on Route 412, and Flint Hill Road, so we'll pull those out and reiterate those again. Mrs. deLeon said what about Apple's Church Road? You need to add that then. Mr. Kocher said that's No. 18. That's Flint Hill Road in general. Mr. Kern said you might want to indicate if there is a separate drainage issue on Flint Hill Road. Mr. Cahalan said there is, the police tell me it's not drainage, it's other problems like icing up at the Waldheim. Mr. Kern said you might want to specify icing concerns on Flint Hill Road and drainage concerns on Flint Hill Road and 412. Mrs. deLeon said I'd like No. 12 to be a little more specific because Riverside Drive starts at the bridge and goes through Steel City and turns into the Narrows, so there's separate issues there. Mr. Cahalan said we'll pull out those issues and pinpoint what they are. We didn't put everything down here. That was just the general area. We'll put down all the issues. Mrs. deLeon said the Narrows has to be added and if you follow the Narrows through, I'm not sure where Redington Road starts, where the curve is, is that where Redington starts? Didn't Sandy or Tom say on the side of the road, there's erosion around that curve? Mr. Maxfield said yes. Mrs. deLeon said that needs to be on here. When we were talking about those two subdivisions on Redington, someone brought that up. No. 14, what's a stop bar placement? Mr. Cahalan said that had already been sent to PennDOT and they had indicated they would do it, it hasn't been done yet. No. 19, what does that mean? Mr. Cahalan said that one is Seidersville Road, and 378. They will work with Brien on that and make it more specific. Mrs. deLeon said No. 20, Road Maintenance Policy, are you asking PennDOT for their Road Maintenance Policy? Mr. Cahalan said actually one of the things we were doing was waiting for the Road Maintenance Policy to be adopted, and it's been adopted by Council, and we will be sharing that with PennDOT. Mrs. deLeon said you are going to put this in writing to PennDOT? Mr. Cahalan said we'll put together another revised list and we'll share that with you and give it to Brien and then he'll be in contact with the District Executive. Mrs. deLeon said can you make sure that at the top of the letter, it says these are not prioritized. Mr. Cahalan said yes, they'll do that. Mr. Maxfield said where did No. 17 come from? Mr. Cahalan said that's right over here at this intersection. If you pulled up there, you may be going south on 378 or straight across on Black River Road, if someone is turning north on 378 going toward the shopping center, sometimes you've got three lanes of traffic. Mr. Maxfield said I participated in that and don't think it's a PennDOT problem at that intersection. There seems to be this new trick, in the old days, people used to use turn signals or didn't use turn signals, now people are pulling up to the light and then they put on their turn signal. Mr. Cahalan said I noticed that too. Mr. Maxfield said if you want to go around and sit there, and wait, you know his signal is going to come on, and that's why we have three lanes of traffic. Mr. Horiszny said make that a left turn only lane in the center and let the other one be right and straight, and that would resolve the problem. I think they claim there's not enough room. Mr. Kocher said I suspect there's not enough room on that side of the street as they want the facing road to have the exact striped configuration and that's why they didn't want it over there, but we can do mention it. Mr. Horiszny said we already mentioned some of the turns by the Hess Station. Mr. Kocher said it should be striped, there's no doubt about it.

Mr. Kern said that brings up another question on Friedensville Road, Bingen Road and Hickory Hill or Friedensville Road, at that light, same thing happens, and technically that's not legal. Mr. Cahalan said we can talk about it. Mr. Kern said the shoulder lane is so wide, it looks like a lane. Mr. Maxfield said that's my problem about PennDOT paving all the berms. You're just inviting people to do that, you are just inviting accidents. I'd like to hear the census behind that. Mr. Kern said maybe we can add that to the list. Up in Bethlehem, they put NO.

Mr. Cahalan said the other issue, who wants to attend this meeting? Mr. Kocher said we have to let them know who is going to attend. If we have four people, they want to make sure they have at least

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

four. Mr. Maxfield said that's one he really wants to go to. Mr. Kocher said we should make a definitive list and it can be two Council members. Mrs. deLeon said I'd like to know when it is. Mr. Cahalan said we should probably bring Roger along, as they'll be maintenance issues. Mr. Maxfield said Roger should definitely go, and if we have to knock off a Council member to let Roger go, we can do that. Mr. Kocher said we can say Roger, the Manager, two Council members and the Engineer, and we'll see what they say.

Mr. Kocher said are we bringing a list back here again? Mr. Cahalan said what we'll do is get a revised list and circulate it to Council and to Brien. We can put it in a letter. Mr. Kocher said Rebert is asking for an email, so get the corrected list to Brien. Mr. Maxfield said if we do that, we should be more specific about items as intersections.

Mr. Kern said back to No. 14, what did PennDOT say about placing that bar? Are they going to do it, it's just a matter of when? Mr. Cahalan said I don't think we got anything back or did we? Mr. Kocher said I don't remember getting anything back. Mr. Cahalan said there's been no written response, there might have been some verbal response. Mr. Kocher will check and bring it to their attention.

VI. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – FEBRUARY 18, 2009 COUNCIL MEETING

Mr. Kern said the minutes of the February 18, 2009 Council meeting have been prepared and are ready for Council's review and approval.

Mr. Horiszny said page1, line 16, after Executive, add "Session". Page 9, line 29, assuming should be "assume".

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of the February 18, 2009 Council members, as corrected.
SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 3-1 (Mr. Horiszny – No; Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

VI. COUNCIL AND STAFF REPORTS

A. TOWNSHIP MANAGER

➤ Mr. Cahalan said the first item was a recommendation to appoint Bill Ross to the Park and Rec board. Bill had been a member of the Park and Rec board for many years, and those are one year appointments. At the time, last year, we were doing the reappointments, and he declined reappointment, due to some job conflicts. He indicated at the last Park and Rec meeting, he'd like to be reappointed to the board, so I'm recommending that Bill be appointed to the Park and Recreation board for the remainder of the one year term which will expire December 31, 2009.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval to appoint Bill Ross to the Parks and Recreation board for a one year term ending December 31, 2009, as per the recommendation of the Manager.
SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009

- Mr. Cahalan said the fire companies are forming a Saucon Valley Citizens Academy for residents 14 and up. They will be giving them hands on experience, the four in the Township and Dewey Fire Company. Each fire company will have a different type of program. It will be every Wednesday in April in the evening, April 1, 8, 15, 22 and 29. The letter received today requested a Council member attend the sessions for the five weeks during the month of April to show your continued support for the fire services as well as for the community and to see first hand what your local fire fighters deal with firsthand. We have a meeting on April 1 and 15 and the SVP is on April 8. PSATS is April 20, 21st and 22nd. That about wipes out April. Mrs. deLeon said she could possibly go on the 29th. Mr. Cahalan said it's at the Dewey that night, from 7 PM to 9 PM. Mr. Kern said maybe we can get Ron to go on April 8th. Mr. Cahalan said we'll send this out tomorrow. It's for residents 14 and up.

B. COUNCIL/JR. COUNCIL

Stephen Prager - Absent

Mr. Maxfield

- Mr. Maxfield said this came up at the EAC, a plan prepared by Boucher & James, about trees that needed to be assessed in relation to the walkway from the school and the parking, and the word assessed made me a little bit nervous, and I wanted us to reaffirm our commitment to saving the two our in front of the Herman's house and we talked to him and that was part of the deal that we shouldn't touch those trees. I want to make sure we're still okay.
- We're asking for a report from an arborist on the condition of those trees and a couple of the other trees, and he'd like a message go to the arborist about those trees. We promised Mr. Herman that he get copies of anything dealt with that whole transaction, but we promised him appraisals, so this report would fall in line, and make sure this is forwarded to him. Mr. Cahalan said we're not at the point of actually hiring an arborist. Mr. Maxfield said we revived the RFP last night. Ms. Stern Goldstein said we are compiling a list of arborists right now and will come back with the cost and fees for the scope of service. Mr. Cahalan said we'll give the arborist direction about saving the trees then. Mr. Herman's attorney was given a copy of the appraisal.

Mrs. Yerger - Absent

Mr. Horiszny

- He asked about the three tire companies, do they go out and pick the tires up? Mr. Cahalan said one is by Philadelphia and one by Scranton. Lafarge gets the tires for them, and the motorcycle club could hook up with them. They haven't called the Freemansburg area person yet. Mr. Horiszny said did you check out the PA Clean up Week and see if they would waive their fees. Maybe we could get a conservation group to haul tires. Mrs. deLeon said the EAC has recycling on their website, and if you could send it to Laura Ray, she could put it on the EAC website Mr. Cahalan said he's not sure of the tipping fees, etc. Mrs. deLeon said if you have the name of the company and phone numbers. Mr. Cahalan said sure.

Mr. Kern

- He had a question about recycling, we had kind of promoted the concept of relocating the recycling center that's currently at IESI to the compost center. IESI seemed to be receptive to it when it was proposed and he wants to know if there's been any progress on it? If not, how can we make progress as it seems the compost center would be an ideal spot to have a recycling center. Mr. Cahalan said I think when Sam Donato was here at one of the

**General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009**

meetings, he reported they ran that by DEP and he doesn't think they got the go ahead to proceed, but we'll verify that. Mr. Kern said DEP might need a letter in support. Mr. Cahalan said they will find out. Mrs. deLeon said you have to keep in mind, as part of their harms benefit analysis, they are supposed to be providing a community benefit with their recycling program on site and for the people that live on that end of the township will use it and 70% of the township. I don't think residents will travel down to the end of Hellertown on a Friday or Saturday to get rid of their recyclables. Mr. Kern said I don't see why they couldn't retain the one that is there. Mrs. deLeon said I would not be supportive of eliminating the current drop off at IESI. Are they going to pay for another employee sitting at the compost center. Mr. Cahalan said we'd have to get permission from DEP as we're only permitted as the compost center to accept yard waste. Mrs. deLeon said the idea is good, but I'm not sure. Mr. Kern said it's centrally located, if it was either/or, there's no question that the central location that would be superior to the IESI landfill center would be the Bethlehem Recycling Center. More people go to the Bethlehem Recycling Center than to IESI and he'd like to change that. Mr. Maxfield said it's a good goal but might be more complex. At the landfill, there's always stuff dropped off that is inappropriate. We'd have to have a lot of plans in place. Mr. Kern said it's not manned and Bethlehem Recycling Center is manned. You can't possibly drop off a toxic substance at the Bethlehem Recycling center, at IESI it's a free for all. Mrs. deLeon said where I live close to the landfill, you will encourage that end of the township to go to Bethlehem. How are you going to address only two days being open in Hellertown? Mr. Maxfield said it would take planning and time, start out with a limited recycling center and build your permitting over time.

- He got a letter after he asked Jack if it was possible to forward emails that were sent to lowersaucontwonship.org to his home email. It was from Alice Naydyhor from Leithsville Road and she had a bunch of issues which have been addressed. She asked that the Leithsville Road/412 corridor be placed on the list for drainage and storm water issues. The second item is can you please have the huge trailers parked on the pallet property on Apples Church Road, moved to a part of the property where they are not in the neighboring properties view. You don't allow us to put trailers on our property, but allow these trailers to set there all year long and they are not used for business. Chris has been apprised and has responded. Mr. Cahalan said the trailers are actually permitted, as part of the business as he stores some of his materials in there. The solicitor and zoning officer have been meeting with the property owner and they are winding down that business as he's retiring. The third issue is burning the pallets. Mr. Cahalan said the Leithsville Fire company representative can fill you in on the number of times they have gone there. He has been sited a couple of times by the PD. Mr. Maxfield said how much is the fine? Mr. Cahalan said it's \$500 or \$1,000 but what we also asked the Magistrate was to have him reimburse the cost of the emergency services. Mr. Maxfield said the resident can now call DEP. They'll fine also. She was also wondering when the sewer was going through. Mrs. deLeon said you need to go back to the Authority and get it moving. Mr. Horiszny said you need to go to the SVP and see if our partners will allow the sewer line, it's a tough one.

Mrs. deLeon

- She said when you scan the pdf pictures for our packet, it's terrible, it's like a waste of a page. Ms. Huhn said she can email them to her. Mrs. deLeon said they are useless.
- Jack sent an email today which I found very interesting about the unused gaming revenue for fire companies and EMT's. Did everyone get that email? She said they are asking to use any leftover money towards our fire companies and EMT's, so she'd like to make a motion to send Freeman, Boscola and Beyer a letter saying we saw this in the paper and we'd ask for them to support this. Mr. Cahalan said there's \$7.5 million setting in an account and it goes to grants. The Police Department received a grant for enforcing gaming, and there's money sitting in the account and they are saying the leftover money

General Business Meeting
March 4, 2009

should be given to fire fighters and EMT's, and they would be able to apply for it through the PA Fireman's Services Retention Program Fund, which they apply to every year.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved that the Township send a letter to Freeman, Boscola, and Beyer saying we saw the article in the paper regarding the unused gaming revenue for fire companies and EMT's and we'd ask them to support it.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

- Mrs. deLeon said on February 25, Hellertown – Lower Saucon Township held a business spotlight event. Denise Knauss and Lynn Kemmerer from Klassic Gold were welcome guests and it was an opportunity to meet other Chamber members and different business owners in the area. Craig Medei was here asking to try to get more businesses involved and to meet each other, and this was very well attended.
- On Wednesday, March 11, the Hellertown Lower Saucon Chamber in conjunction with Southern Lehigh Business Organization, SOLEBO, is going to hold a breakfast meeting featuring Mimi Griffin, Director of Marketing for the United States Golf Association. The program will focus on the 2009 LGPA Open. If anyone is interested in learning about that, it's at DeSales University. The doors open at 7 AM and the program starts at 7:30 AM. The fee is \$12 for Chamber members and \$15 for others. We would get the reduced rate.
- A gentlemen from Bushkill Valley Motorcycle Club was here last meeting talking about tires dumped on Riverside Drive on their property and down the hill on the tracks. I had a landfill meeting the next day, and Allan from the landfill said he spoke to Sam earlier and Sam and Gene from the landfill went and took a look and saw all the tires neatly stacked in piles. No one from the Hill climb was around and Sam wasn't aware if they were planning to use them. She emailed Sam back with the minutes from the last meeting. We're waiting to hear back on that. Mr. Cahalan said if Sam isn't able to help them out, we did come up with a couple different sites that do accept tires. There's Northampton Co-Generation Plant up north that does accept tires. There is a tipping fee. There is the Lafarge Company that also accepts tires with a fee. We are going to give him the name of a gentlemen in Freemansburg who also accepts tires. They would be picked up, but there is a fee. Mrs. deLeon said at the landfill meeting, we talked to Al about the concern the Township had regarding the traffic plan. Al wrote back, "after reviewing Lower Saucon's comment letter, with Jim Burger and Ed Duddick from PADEP, at the Thursday meeting, on February 26, IESI will provide a comprehensive, written report to address all concerns that the township has submitted to the department. However IESI has initiated the truck overweight policy effective March 2, 2009 that we discussed during the Landfill Committee meeting which includes the existing traffic control plan as well as suspending the truck and driver for a period of three days for all vehicles three percent overweight. This trial period will last until June 30 to evaluate the effectiveness of the vehicles suspension. The department was informed of the additional trucks suspension during the February 26 meeting as well." That is what they are supporting and I did tell them Council was very supportive of calling the police when there was overweight trucks there. They wanted to implement this other policy. In all fairness, Haz and I said let's try your other policy, but keep in mind, Council was really excited about learning about this. Then we also apologized for calling the trucks on Applebutter Road a staging because it really wasn't staging, it was just a lot of traffic on Applebutter Road. They said in event there is a backup of truck traffic, on Applebutter Road, at the entrance of the landfill, IESI will provide landfill personnel to direct all waste disposal trucks into the landfill to minimize any potential delay buildup on the local and residential traffic. We also learned that they have increased their out of state truck traffic because of the decrease in the local tonnage, so you are seeing bigger trucks on Applebutter Road now, so that all makes sense. That's the reason in the last two months you are seeing the increase.

General Business Meeting

March 4, 2009

- She just wanted the Township minutes to reflect that the township did receive a letter from PHMC regarding the approval of the emergency stabilization for the Heller Barn.
- March 15, 2009 – there’s a guest bartender fund raiser at Casa Toro for the barn stabilization from 6 PM to 9 PM, very good food, and we get a percentage of the food sold. April 5, 2009 – we have a young artist reception at the Heller Homestead. April 25, 2009 – we have an annual Civil War Living History Day. May 9, 2009 – we are holding an annual plant and garage sale – spaces are available. We are hopefully going to have a lot of stuff to get rid of for the garage sale. The spaces are \$15.00 for non members, \$10.00 for members of the Conservancy.
- That brings me to the committee that was started, and they are sorting through the contents of the maintenance garage. Mr. Cahalan said the township was there and they removed the SauconFest materials except for the trusses, which a resident was interested in obtaining, so we left them there. Everything else has been disposed of from the maintenance garage. That brings me to the next request, is there any way the Township can provide us a dumpster? Mr. Cahalan said we can rent one. Mr. Maxfield said he doesn’t think we should be paying for a dumpster to get rid of the Heller Homestead stuff. That’s a private organization and the Township shouldn’t be paying to get rid of that stuff. They should rent the dumpster. Mr. Kern said if it’s Township stuff, we should pay for it. Mrs. deLeon said in all fairness, the Township took out stuff identified as SauconFest stuff. The other stuff, when we took over in 1993, nobody took an inventory of what was there. We are going to try to sell whatever, but there is stuff in there that needs to be tossed. Mrs. deLeon said because of the volunteers helping with the garage, it will be between now and the July 1 deadline. Mr. Kern said if it’s not township stuff, we shouldn’t pay for it. Mrs. deLeon said we don’t know that. Mr. Cahalan said it doesn’t belong to the township. We removed what was stored by the Township. Mrs. deLeon said that was SauconFest stuff, but when the Conservancy began leasing the site, we don’t know what was left in the garage from the owner. Mr. Maxfield said that really makes it not township stuff since it was put there before the township owned it. Mr. Horiszny said wait and see how much it is at the end and see if the SVC can get rid of it voluntarily, particularly if IESI will accept it. Mr. Kern said are some of the things recyclable? Mr. Horiszny said you can take it to Blinderman’s and get some money for it.

D. SOLICITOR - None

E. ENGINEER - None

F. PLANNER - None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for adjournment. The time was 9:38 PM.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

Mr. Kern asked if anyone had any questions? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 5-0

Submitted by:

Jack Cahalan
Township Manager

Glenn Kern
President of Council