

**I. OPENING**

**CALL TO ORDER:** The General Business & Developer meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Wednesday, June 6, 2007 at 7:30 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. Glenn Kern, Council President, presiding.

**ROLL CALL:** Present – Glenn Kern, President; Thomas Maxfield, Vice President; Priscilla deLeon, Sandra Yerger and Ron Horiszny, Council Members; Jack Cahalan, Township Manager; Assistant Township Manager, Leslie Huhn; Brien Kocher, Township Engineer; Township Solicitor, Linc Treadwell; Township Planner, Rick Tralies; Jr. Council Member, Vanessa Segaline.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Mr. Kern asked audience to stay standing for a moment of silence as there was a tragedy that occurred this week to a community family that is very near and dear to us, Tricia and Courtney Achey who were killed in an accident on I-78 and to the survivors, Allison and David Achey.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF ANY EXECUTIVE SESSION (IF APPLICABLE)**

**Mr. Kern said Council met in Executive Session. Last November you instructed us to purchase land and we have been busy in Executive Session in potential land acquisition discussions. We also met to discuss potential litigation.**

**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 Diane, Leslie, or Jack or call the Township office. Please state your name and address. If you can’t hear, please let us know. Mr. Kern asked if anything was taken off the agenda this evening? Mr. Cahalan said Fire Hydrant tax has been taken off.

**III. PRESENTATIONS/HEARINGS**

**A. RESOLUTION #45-2007 – HONORING JUNIOR COUNCIL & JUNIOR PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Mr. Kern said resolution 45-2007 has been prepared honoring Vanessa Segaline, Jr. Council member and Steven Kirchner, Jr. Planning Commission member for their dedicated service.

**LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP  
RESOLUTION #45-2007**

**PROCLAMATION HONORING VANESSA SEGALINE, JUNIOR COUNCIL MEMBER**

**WHEREAS**, the Lower Saucon Township Council appointed Vanessa Segaline to serve on Lower Saucon Township Council; and

**WHEREAS**, Vanessa participated in the meetings of the Council during the 2006-2007 school year and provided input from a student's point of view; and

**WHEREAS**, Vanessa will be a graduating member of the Class of 2008; and

**WHEREAS**, Vanessa has done a great job and brought with her the eagerness of learning more about local government in her community.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, the Council of Lower Saucon Township, Glenn Kern, President; Tom Maxfield, Vice President; Priscilla deLeon, Ronald Horiszny; and Sandra Yerger do hereby commend Vanessa Segaline for her exemplary performance on behalf of the Lower Saucon Township and Saucon Valley High School."

Mr. Kern said it has been a pleasure to have Vanessa with us this year. She has been the shining star of our Jr. Council Person. He said her parents must be proud to have her as a daughter, and it's Council's honor and pleasure to have her with us also. She participates not only at Council, but participates in programs at her school.

- MOTION BY:** Mrs. deLeon moved for approvals of Resolution #45-2007 for Vanessa Segaline.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP  
RESOLUTION #46-2007  
PROCLAMATION HONORING STEVEN KIRCHNER,  
JUNIOR PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER**

**WHEREAS**, the Lower Saucon Township Council appointed Steven Kirchner to serve on the Planning Commission; and

**WHEREAS**, Steven participated in the meetings of the Planning Commission during the 2006-2007 school year and provided input from a student's point of view; and

**WHEREAS**, Steven will be a graduating member of the Class of 2008; and

**WHEREAS**, Steven has done a great job and brought with him the eagerness of learning more about local government in his community.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, the Council of Lower Saucon Township, Glenn Kern, President; Tom Maxfield, Vice President; Priscilla deLeon, Ronald Horiszny; and Sandra Yerger do hereby commend Steven Kirchner for his exemplary performance on behalf of the Lower Saucon Township and Saucon Valley High School. Stephen Kirchner was not present.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of Resolution 46-2007 for Stephen Kirchner and his work on the Planning Commission.  
**SECOND BY:** Mrs. Yerger  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

IV. DEVELOPER ITEMS

A. ZONING HEARING BOARD VARIANCES

1. R.M.S. FAMILY LTD. PARTNERSHIP – 1850 FRIEDENSVILLE ROAD – REQUEST VARIANCE TO REPLACE TWO EXISTING SIGNS WITH ONE

Mr. Kern said the applicant is requesting a variance to replace two freestanding signs with one sign.

Eric Schoch, Attorney, was present. He said this is the small shopping center on Friedensville Road. There is existing right now two free standing signs with various business names for the business entities that are in the center. It's located in a residential zoning district so technically there wouldn't be commercial signage permitted in the district. What the proposal is by the new landlord is to do away with the two signs and make one sign and to reduce the overall size of the signage, below what exists now. There's a 64 square foot sign, which he had a photo of. The large sign is the 64 square foot, and the other one, which is at the Hellertown side of the property is the 48 square foot sign. What they are proposing to do is get rid of that sign, put one free standing sign where the Bagel Basket and Cleaner sign is, but incorporate all of the businesses and reduce the overall signage on the property from the 112 to the 96. The only other issue would be the existing sign because of where the legal right of way is on that property, it doesn't meet the setback as now would be applied. He's promising to keep the same post, in all instances, he'd be decreasing the existing non conformity...decreasing the number of signs from two to one and decreasing the area by 16 square feet and also keeping the setback the same and not moving it any closer to the road. One thing that is unique about the property, while people in commercial districts are allowed to have wall signs, it doesn't do much good for the people in the rear. It's important that it has a sign with all the tenants out front. The sign company recommended they go to the 96 so they can fit all the tenants on there instead of having the two signs at 112. To crunch all that down into one, they are taking away 16 square feet. The older sign is being proposed to be removed, which has two boards on it. The sign company is going to attempt to use the same mounts which is in the right-of-way. It's been there and it's going to be one post. They are keeping the maximum of what the ordinance allows, but it's just going to use the one post. If they replace it, they'll move it back so that the front of it would still be that front post. The only problem you have with moving it back further, it's in the middle of the parking lot then. There's only so much area where that sign goes. Mr. Horiszny said if they want to be subtle and sophisticated, they'd go on the other site with a similar sign, keeping it low. It's a nice post, but it's ugly, and it's in the right-of-way. Mr. Kern said he concurs with that opinion. The nicer of the two signs is the two wooden post. They are going to put all the signs on that post and the final size will be 96 square feet (8x12). It will be a modern and nicer sign.

Mrs. deLeon said your application, No. 15, it says if you are requesting a variance, complete the following, the nature of the variance is for...and your comment is...a variance to replace modernized existing signage and the MPC requires five things to complete to get the variance. Attorney Schoch said in his supplemental statement he discussed those and it should have been attached.

Mr. Maxfield said what he's understanding from the history that's been given to them by the Zoning Officer is we don't have an existing non-conformity as much as we have an existing violation. When you have an existing variance allowing the 4x8 to replace it with a 96 square foot sign, he doesn't know why we would do that. He can't support that. We should replace both signs with one 4x8 sign which is what the business has been given the right to do.

**General Business Meeting  
June 6, 2007**

Chris Garges said on the second page, the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet, June 1980, there was a 3x4 sign permitted and then in October 1980, that 3x4 was removed and replaced with a 4x8 sign. That 4x8 sign is the one on the same post we're talking about now and that's the one in 2001 that was granted a variance to replace the sign that was permitted in October 1980. Attorney Schoch said he believes it would be 64, as there are two 32' square foot ones. Mr. Garges said the second 32' was never permitted, it just appeared. Mr. Maxfield said what is permitted there right now? Chris Garges said when he went through all the records, it's one 32 square foot sign. Attorney Schoch said any business would be permitted a 75 square foot sign in another district. It's very difficult with the rear building being obscured by the front building. You are going to do worse with 32 and all of these tenants attempted to be jammed on the one 32' in the front. If 64' is the limit it's tough to get the tenants on...it's the impossible to get on the one 32'. Mr. Maxfield said you are talking about tenants, how many do we have and how many are permitted? Attorney Schoch said there isn't any issue with the tenants. Chris Garges said maybe we should sit down and talk about this at another time. Some of the history he read through looks like there were two permitted tenants in the front building. The rear buildings were permitted there as warehouses, and represented as warehouses through the 80's. There's no records of any permits to convert those warehouses into additional tenants.

Mr. Maxfield said what's going on here is we have a history of things that have grown in an organic way, but not a legal way. The best recommendation would be to sit down with our staff and figure out where we really should be from a legal point of view and figure what has been given permission to be there right now. Otherwise, he would make a motion to oppose this at the Zoning Hearing Board on those grounds. He would call it an existing violation.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved to oppose this at the Zoning Hearing board as it is an existing violation and as stated above.

**SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Mrs. deLeon said she asked the question about your supplemental statement not including certain requirements that the MPC asks for, hardship, character of the area, etc. That wasn't in here. Attorney Schoch said when you are talking about signage, you do the best you can with respect to the developments. It's existing commercial use in a residential district. Mrs. deLeon said the purpose of Council is to look at an application and look at all the pieces of the application so we can make a fair decision whether we're going to support, oppose, or take no action. If she doesn't have all the pieces, she can't make that decision. Mr. Maxfield said he'd like to amend his motion.

**ROLL CALL:**

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield amended his previous motion and moved to oppose this at the Zoning Hearing board as it is an existing violation and as stated above, and to send the needed representatives to the ZHB to represent us.

**SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny amended his second.

Mr. Kern said for a matter of further discussion, those two signs will remain as is. That's not the ideal situation either. Attorney Treadwell said the question at that point would become whether the Zoning Officer decides to issue a notice of violation that those signs are not in compliance which can create another whole issue. Attorney Schoch said he can certainly discuss with them ways to improve what's there. Mr. Maxfield said we need to get back to the core of what should be there. Should we modify this to say we would oppose unless it is withdrawn. Attorney Treadwell said if they withdraw we don't go anywhere. Mr. Horiszny said if they went to the second sign instead of the real ugly one, he'd be agreeable to it. They need signage there. Mr. Schoch said is there any support for that if they could put up a sign with reasonable square footage that would be determined

reasonable by our staff. Council said yes, that would be agreeable. Mrs. deLeon said would the sign allow for changeable names? Attorney Schoch said he can't imagine that he's not asking to do that, but he can relay that. He'd be more than willing to say they would work with the staff to try to move to that one, appropriate to what's permitted for business. You've got regulations. One sign 75 square foot is what this business would have anywhere else in the township. He can certainly address this with his client. Mr. Maxfield said one sign of 75 square feet would be much more reasonable than what was proposed. Mr. Kocher said with that location, on the left side of the driveway as you are pulling out, those two signs are higher. If you are going to put the new signs on that post in that location, they are going to get closer to the ground, so when you come back in with staff, you are going to have to do site distance measurements as that might interfere with site distance where the existing sign does not. Attorney Schoch said what would the minimum off the ground for the site distance have to be? Mr. Kocher said he doesn't know off hand, just make sure he has that as part of his packet. Dave Gunstra has the property next door. He spoke to Chris on several occasions. He wanted to make sure that even besides the side of the sign that zoning approves the actual sign itself. There's a lot of way doing that so it fits in with the rest of the area there. If he comes back with 75 square feet, it could look terrible or it could look nice. He wants to make sure the final approval will be done on that also. Mr. Kern said he thinks it was made clear we are looking for something attractive. Attorney Schoch said he indicated to the client we'd need to see a rendering of the actual sign that would be going up. Mr. Maxfield said that will be handled at staff level even before it gets to the ZHB.

**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Kern said based on our Executive Session, he'd like to move to request the Solicitor to enter the Township's appearance as a party to the appeal of the T-Mobile variance. Council would also request Staff to notify the surrounding property owners as outlined in Ordinance 2003-07 of the pending appeal.

**SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Attorney Treadwell will report back to Council.

**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

Mr. Kern said our second housekeeping item was our Jr. Council member had requested some time to introduce a special member of the audience. Vanessa Segaline said she invited her friend Meeka along with her tonight. She's an exchange student from Germany. Vanessa thought it would be a good experience for her to see how our government is run. Council welcomed Meeka.

**B. HERITAGE BUILDING GROUP – SKIBO ROAD – MAJOR SUBDIVISION PLAN SUBMISSION DENIAL**

Mr. Kern said the developer has submitted a revised plan submission which the township has determined was an incomplete submission. Staff is recommending that Council formally deny the plan submission as incomplete. See the Zoning Officer's letter dated May 1, 2007 and the recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Jon Tressler, Sr. VP was present representing Heritage Building Group. Mr. Tressler said he's really not prepared to debate this issue. They did make a resubmission of a previously accepted plan. In making the resubmission, they believe they address every item in the various review letters. They are just here to see what the board is going to do with the recommendation from their PC and their Zoning Officer.

Mr. Maxfield said as far as the application, was the incompleteness of it detailed to the applicant? Chris Garges said the only communication to the applicant was that the letter that was in the packet, the three items. Mrs. deLeon said there were revisions that needed to be made to the plan based on past reviews. Chris Garges said that's when they determined it hadn't been addressed and it wasn't a complete submission and it should be distributed to everyone for further review. Mrs.

deLeon said when the plans come in, in theory, they are supposed to meet certain requirements by the township and then they are reviewed by the PC and procedure starts. Chris said correct. Mrs. deLeon said they reviewed the plans, and staff's review of the plans, they felt that they weren't meeting the review letters? Mr. Garges said if there were recommendations that our professionals made that weren't addressed, then basically everyone is just going through and writing the same comments over again and reviewing the same plan with the same issues, so the PC would be reviewing the same plan that had similar, if not more, deficiencies than were there previously. Mrs. deLeon said she knows what he is saying, but didn't know what the process was when a revision comes in. Attorney Treadwell said the process is that when the plan comes in to the Township, before it gets distributed to the Engineer and the Planner, the Township staff looks at it, which Chris Garges did, and made the determination it was incomplete and needed more information. The next step was it went to the PC, and the PC made a determination it was incomplete and made a recommendation to Council that it was incomplete. It's not a hard thing to solve, they just need to put more information on the plan. It's not a rejection of the project as a whole, it's just there needs to be more information on the plan before it gets submitted to the Engineer and the Planner. Our ordinance says it needs to come to Council to reject the submission based on the Zoning Officer's recommendation. Mr. Garges said it is in the packet and right out of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny said based on the information presented before us tonight, he moves to deny the plan submission.

**SECOND BY:** Mr. Kern

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Mrs. deLeon asked what other options there are? Attorney Treadwell said the other option is you could say you'll accept the plan for review and let the Engineer and Planner look at it. She said this wasn't discussed before the motion was made and she doesn't understand what the problem would be if we just told them to go back and fill in the blanks like they are supposed to do. Mr. Horiszny said it would be a vote of no confidence for our PC. Mrs. deLeon said the PC made a recommendation to Council. Attorney Treadwell said if the motion that was just made is passed tonight, then the applicant will have to come back with new plans with more information so they can be reviewed. If that motion does not pass, then the Township will have to give the plans to the Engineer and the Planner to review as they are, and we'll be back here next month with the same letter we had from both of them before. Mrs. deLeon said she doesn't want to see that happen, she wants the deficiencies addressed. Attorney Treadwell said if the motion that was just made passes, then the applicant will have to address the deficiencies. Mrs. deLeon said does the whole plan process start all over again? Attorney Treadwell said it'll be a revised plan submission. Mr. Maxfield said the point here is the staff has determined it is incomplete and if you would allow it to go through the process, and it got to the PC, all they would do is identify the incompleteness once again. Things were identified before and they need to be addressed and it needs to be done in the proper system. Mrs. deLeon said she's not suggesting that it doesn't. She's just asking for options so she can make a decision. Mr. Maxfield said the other option doesn't make much sense at this point.

**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**C. DRAVITZ MAJOR SUBDIVISION – 2845 COUNTY LINE ROAD - FINAL PLAN APPROVAL**

Mr. Kern said the applicant is proposing final plan approval of a four lot subdivision. The subdivision proposes a new cul-de-sac road and over 12 acres of open space.

Terence Smith, applicant was present. David Martin, Keystone Consulting was also present. Mr. Martin said they have received Boucher & James comment letter dated May 23, 2007 and HEA's letter dated May 31, 2007. They have also received the letter that sets forth the conditions dated May 31, 2007 and they have no objections to any of the conditions outlined in the letters.

Mr. Kocher said No. 4 deals with the drainage easement deeds and the only discussion item, David, if you want to explain the disposition of the open space. Mr. Martin said they are proposing to dedicate the ten acre piece to the LST. There are also two other parcels, .88 acres, and this will be conveyed to the adjoining property, and then there's another 1.3 acre piece that will be conveyed to another adjoining property. Mr. Maxfield said have you had any contact with conservation agencies yet? Mr. Martin said no. Mr. Maxfield said they had made a contact and were waiting for information just like you. It's not the fault of the developer. At this time, the conservation agency hasn't picked up the ball yet. Mrs. deLeon said this is final plan approval, when are we going to find out? Mr. Maxfield said we tried to make a contact also through the township, and we are going to have to find another route at this point. Mr. Kocher said if you approve the final plan, it'll be approved with that being dedicated to the township. That doesn't preclude you in the future from turning it over to any conservation agency, but if you approve it tonight, it will be transferred to the township. Mr. Maxfield said that means if conservation easements go it, we are responsible for getting easements on it? Attorney Treadwell said correct, you'd be the owner. Mrs. Yerger said do we want it that way? That's not the way we originally discussed it. Attorney Treadwell said he doesn't mind having that as a condition of the approval and we can change that. The question is do you want to own it or would you rather have an easement? Mrs. Yerger said she'd like to see it go into conservation easement. It would be simpler. Attorney Treadwell said the other option is could you attach that to one of the lots and have it owned by the lot owner with the deed restriction and a conservation easement on it to the township. If we can't get a third party, Heritage, or Wildlands to get themselves interested, that's the only other option if the township is not going to own it. Mr. Maxfield said there was a second agency that expressed an interest in putting it under conservation. Mrs. Yerger said that doesn't answer the question on whether the township wants to own it. You can have a conservation organization plus the township be co-holders of easements without either entity owning it. Mr. Maxfield said he's in agreement with her. He doesn't think we should own it. It should be under conservation attached to a property. It should be the responsibility of the developer to establish that conservation easement. Mrs. Yerger said yes, she would prefer it and that's the best scenario. Mr. Maxfield said since an interest was expressed in this other route, we can guarantee you it's going to go smoother and faster. If we can do that, we can go in that direction, that would satisfy his wishes for the property. Mr. Martin said so some one else is expressing interest in taking the property? Mr. Maxfield said another conservation agency. Mr. Smith said it sounds you are telling me he has to reach out to this conservation agency and he doesn't know who it is and no one gave him the information. Mr. Maxfield said we haven't yet because we are still waiting for the other one, but if that's not going to work, then we will put you in contact with the people who you have to be in contact with. Mrs. Yerger said we still need to clarify the fact that most people are looking more towards having the property actually owned by one of the lot owners within the subdivision and the easements being held by the township and another conservation entity. Mr. Martin said that's not a problem. Attorney Treadwell said it isn't a problem, we just need to change that condition. Mr. Smith said does he have to go in front of Council again? Attorney Treadwell said Council can approve the final approval motion tonight with that condition and then we just work it out. Mr. Smith doesn't have a problem with that. Mr. Kocher said No. 8 is the improvements agreement and insurance certificates. No. 9 is maintenance agreement. No. 10 is erosion control approval. No. 11 is signatures. No. 12 is to get the Solicitor's approval on the maintenance covenants if the infiltration areas do go across the lot lines that do deserve special attention and we need to make sure Linc is aware of it. No. 13 is recreation fees. Mrs. deLeon said No. 12, she doesn't know what the well defined maintenance covenant is. Mr. Kocher said there's a standard agreement that Attorney Treadwell has drawn up that we need to make sure is signed by the developer and recorded. Mr. Kern said moving on to Boucher & James letter. Mr. Tralies said No. 1, on page 2, in fee in lieu of was not decided. Mrs. Yerger said there was a discussion over it because there was an existing property and exactly how many properties that they would be paying a fee in lieu of. What is the decision? Mr. Kocher said at that time it was three recreation fee. Mr. Smith said they are okay with the three, before it was four. We're okay with three. Mrs. Yerger said that would be cash contributions for three parcels. Mrs. deLeon said we need to add that as a condition, where

does it finally say that somewhere? Council said they will add No. 7 which will say the applicant will pay for recreation fees for three lots of \$9,339.00. Mr. Kocher said No. 3 in their letter says three recreation fees. The disposition of the open space is different. Mr. Tralies said the second comment is addressing the infiltration areas being on both the open space and private lots which if it was already discussed to your satisfaction, then no, there's no further comment. Mr. Maxfield said No. 3 covers everything we talked about for a condition for a conservation easement, are we okay with that? Mrs. Yerger said since it is dedicated and/or deed restricted with conservation easement, that covers it. Attorney Treadwell said he's fine with it. Mr. Horiszny asked what is with the escrow situation? Mr. Cahalan said it's paid up.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved to approve with No. 7 added, applicant will pay for recreation fee for three lots at \$9,339.00.
- SECOND BY:** Mrs. deLeon  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**D. HIDDEN MEADOWS – LOWER SAUCON ROAD – PRELIMINARY PLAN APPROVAL**

Mr. Kern said the developer is proposing to subdivide the site into five new lots consisting of single family detached cluster dwelling on Lower Saucon Road. The applicant is proposing a new cul-de-sac road and approximately 13.5 acres of open space.

Mr. Jeff Ott, Ott Consulting, Bob Kostival Owner, Mike Waldron, Ott Consulting, and Paul Dreyer were present.

Mr. Kern said the outstanding issue before us is the issue regarding the fire. Mrs. Yerger said there are two. There's the fire and there's just the treatment of the .8 acres of open space on that side of the road. Mr. Kern said what has happened since we last spoke regarding the fire tank issue? Mr. Ott said they met with staff and some representatives from the fire company. Our clients have done research and what it boils down to is cost. The cost of purchasing the tanks is anywhere between \$35,000 to \$40,000 just to purchase two 10,000 gallon tanks which doesn't include installation or any design changes to the plan or approvals which would go along with that sort of installation. Looking at all the project costs we've already sunk into this, the project can't absorb any more cost. They explained that to the Fire Chief and although we're sorry we can't help him out, we did make note that there are perhaps other things that can be done with the plan such as the money being saved to install the trees could be diverted to the fire company. Perhaps the Township could give them waivers on user fees, such as recreation fees instead of paying that to the township, they could pay it to the fire company so they could defer those types of costs. They are trying to cooperate with the township. At this point, they have to forge ahead.

Mr. Dave (no last name given) from the Fire Company said he wasn't involved with the meeting with the developer but from their discussion last night, he knows they did meet with them. The one thing the Fire Chief did point out was that although the cost of installing these tanks is rather high, the cost of getting water to a house fire today is far greater. They carry 3,000 gallons of water, and if you are going to get 30,000 gallons of water like you have in the tanks at Long Ridge, that's ten tankers. You start counting them up, we're going to have tankers from Hanover showing up a fire in LST. It's a costly item, and if there's something the township can do to help the developer by easing some of the other burdens, it's a big deal. They're also looking at reducing their ISO rating. Mr. Kern asked if there was a cost benefit to the township for reducing the ISO rating? Dave said there's a cost benefit to each and every resident in the township in that area. We're a 4-9 right now, 4 being the areas covered by hydrants and 9 being areas that do not have hydrants. Your homeowners insurance is calculated on the ISO rating in the area you live in. It's a substantial savings. Mr. Kern said we're talking about five houses, is that significant? Dave said he doesn't

know, he can't answer that. The tank in that development is going to serve more than just that development. Mrs. deLeon said we should be concerned about fire service. Dave said it's a wonderful idea. It's water available to them all year long, any time, and you just can't replace it. Mr. Kern said it's unfair to ask the developer to foot the bill on this as it's way after the fact on his part. Mrs. deLeon said how many times has this development been before Council for this issue? Mr. Kern said not for this issue. Mrs. deLeon said right, so you keep saying that and there is a procedure from when the application is presented to the township, it goes before all the various boards, and then it gets to Council. It's almost like all these decisions are made, and then it gets here and we have to rubber stamp things. That offends her as a Council person. She's very disappointed that she wasn't included in that meeting. You can sit up here and make all the motions you want, but she'd like to see one legal basis for having a Council not support a Council person going to a staff meeting. She was very, very offended. She asked the Manager to let her know when that meeting was. As an elected official, she has every right to attend any meeting that this township has as long as there isn't a quorum of Council. She's very upset that a Council person who has the right to gather all the information, the person wants to, to make a decision, is kept out of a requested meeting. She hopes it never happens again. When you say all the decisions have been made, they haven't, because we're the final board and it's not the first time we've asked the developer to do something.

Mr. Maxfield said we are late in the process. This is a design issue, and that's why it's being addressed by the new SALDO changes right now. To go in at this late stage after the design has been set since preliminary plan to require excavation or removing more trees or losing more of our ruralness to put in tanks, especially when we don't have it covered by ordinance, he totally agrees with Mr. Kern. He doesn't think it's fair. He doesn't think we can do it. They've offered something that they don't have to offer which is offsetting it by contributing to the fire companies and we should graciously accept that.

Mrs. Yerger said when this whole process started, maybe we need to look at when the fire companies weigh into this. This did come up late into the planning process, and maybe it's something we need to address procedurally in the township so that if this is an issue and a concern, it's brought before the developer at a much earlier stage so they know what they are potentially dealing with. Mr. Ott said when a developer comes to him and says they are looking at a project in LST, what are my costs going to be. He sits down and tells them they have a recreation fee, perhaps a traffic impact fee, other user fees, engineering fees, legal fees, all these fees add up. Then the developer decides if he's going to do the project or not. Mrs. Yerger said we can correct that situation now. Mr. Ott said many townships send it right to the Fire Chief on the first submission. Mr. Cahalan said that was done. Mrs. deLeon said she doesn't have a copy of the recommendation from the Fire Chief. Mr. Maxfield said the request for comments goes out the same time the information does to the EAC. He can't tell you how many times they get the PC level, and there are no comments from the fire companies. When we start the process, they are not there. If that's a problem with fire companies getting those comments there, that's where we need to address that issue. This one, it wasn't there in the beginning. It's late in the process, we don't have the ordinance to back it up. Mrs. deLeon said it's never too late. We could hear a comment from the public that could change the entire plan and you would have to go back if we decided to. This isn't part of the regs, but it is health, safety, and welfare, and she respects the fire company's recommendations. Mr. Kern said we all do. The issue is who is going to pay for it. It's not fair for the developer to pay for it because we dropped the ball early in the process. Mrs. deLeon said we did not drop the ball. Mr. Kern said we didn't get the recommendations that we needed to include fire tanks. Mrs. deLeon said it's never too late until this meeting. Mr. Kern said it's unfair to ask the developer to foot the bill. Mrs. Yerger said the whole thing comes down to it can be asked, but they don't have to do it. Mrs. deLeon said she doesn't want anyone to think she doesn't listen to anything and that's it's all decided by the time it gets here because that's not the public process. Mr. Kern said he doesn't know where that came from. Mr. Maxfield said it's never too late if it's covered by ordinance, but this isn't. Mrs. Yerger is a little leery of starting the practice of trading

off rec fees and other requirements in place of this which is not in our regulations. Mr. Maxfield said even if it is a precedent, it won't last long. The new SALDO changes will be coming in and this will be addressed from step 1 at the design stage. Right now the concern is the ability of the fire company to serve the development and the additional funds will help that. Attorney Treadwell said do you want to put the tanks in and have the township pay for it? Mrs. Yerger said has anybody gotten any information on what these tanks are going to cost to maintain? Who is going to be responsible for maintaining them? Does a procedure need to be put in place. Attorney Treadwell said the first question is where are they going to go as they aren't on the plan right now. If the township is going to pay for the tanks, someone is going to have to design the location. Mr. Kern said see what the developer was faced with now that it's in our court. Mr. Ott said he has engineering experience with underground storage tanks and you've got a lot of installation details that really haven't been thought out, the maintenance issues, how often are they tested? What kind of test do you do. What about the water that is sitting stagnant in those tanks for 10 to 20 years before they are used. You have to deal with treatment issues, mold growth, what if the tank doesn't work when it's needed, who is liable for that? They asked all those questions when they met with the fire department, and it needs to be thought out from a design standpoint.

Mr. Kern said are there any other potential developments in that neighborhood? Mr. Maxfield said he doesn't think so. There's a property or two in between that and the high end of Kefallonian Estates, but there's nothing else close to it. It's a small neighborhood. Mr. Kern said the alternatives are the township takes upon all those details just described on its own including the design and the maintenance issues or we don't put tanks in. Mr. Horiszny said we should have the information before we do SALDO requirements. Mrs. Yerger said exactly. We need to know what we're getting into. It's a good thing, but we need to know all the parameters. Attorney Treadwell said didn't we hire that guy to do the analysis of the fire companies. Mr. Cahalan said that is only for specs for fire apparatus. Mr. Ott said the tanks are plastic and they can be broken, and then who pays to replace the tanks? Mr. Maxfield said all costs, you are probably looking at \$75,000 to \$100,000 for five units. Mrs. Yerger said we are not putting a dollar value on safety, which is not what we want to sound like we're doing, but we also are coming back to the reality that they don't have to do this. Mr. Horiszny said even if there is a risk, every tanker in the county will come if we ask them and they'll be there. They might not be there on time, that's the real risk of it, but they'll come and because we have no legal basis, he moves we approve it.

Mrs. Yerger said last night the open space issue came up at the EAC. Mr. Tralies said their comment 1B and three bullet points, all deals with the disposition of the open space. There's a sliver of open space on the five lot side of the development that is needed to meet, combined with the open space on the other side of the road, to get to the 50% requirement for the cluster subdivision option. We need to figure out how exactly we want to handle that open space. They are recommending that the open space be put under conservation easement for a few different reasons. One of which is at 49% of the required open space is on the other portion, and we'll call it 1% on this side of the road, if the first 49% is all under conservation easement, they'd like to see that last 1% under the same conservation easement. Secondly, conservation easement takes the burden of enforcement off of the township. It would again get a third party involved. They would deal with enforcement rather than having burden of enforcement with the Zoning Officer. Mrs. Yerger said would you recommend that acre go with those parcels? Mr. Tralies said correct. Mr. Waldron said when this came up, they met with Judy and Chris before the PC meeting to address this issue. There is a small area and the entire area behind the three lots isn't needed to make up that difference. Because that area is behind the PPL easement, it would be hard to get back there. The proposal in front of you is to not just have the minimum area needed to complete the open space requirement to use deed restriction across all the three lots. Most of the land is behind lots 4 and 5 and there's a little tiny triangle behind lot 3 which was to make it continuous behind the PPL easement. The three lot owners would own it. Instead of going into conservation, there's a deed restriction that says nothing can ever be done with the land. Mrs. Yerger said that's what a conservation easement would do. Attorney Treadwell said it's basically the same thing. Mrs.

Yerger said a deed restriction goes into the courthouse. Her biggest concern with a deed restriction is they go into the courthouse and that's where they stay and the property owners do whatever they feel like. Mrs. deLeon said a deed restriction can be changed by a Judge. Attorney Treadwell said it can be a deed restriction with an easement to the township that we have the right to enforce. Do you want a third party involved again? We keep having this issue every time we try to get a third party involved it takes awhile to get it accomplished. Mrs. Waldron said we're talking about 3/100<sup>th</sup> of an acre. Combined, it's 13.33 acres in preserved open space.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved we approve this per the staff recommendation.

**SECOND BY:** Mr. Kern

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

**ROLL CALL:** 4-1 (Mrs. deLeon – No)

**E. CARMEN & DIANA VALLONE – 2546 ALPINE DRIVE – LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT**

Mr. Kern said the applicant is proposing to reconfigure the lot lines on two adjoining lots. Carmen Vallone was present. David Martin, Keystone was present. Mr. Martin said Mr. Vallone owns both properties at Alpine and Lower Saucon Road. This existing parcel is about 4 acres and the other piece is 3 acres. Mr. Vallone's intent is to do a lot line adjustment and cut a 2 acre piece off to give to his son so in the future, his son could build a home. The remaining 11 acres would be conveyed onto the 4 acres. The 13 acres are in farm preservation and he would like to keep the remaining land in farm preservation. That's why he didn't want to just convey the 13 acres to his son. Mr. Maxfield said has the county been notified of those potential changes and will it still qualify? Mr. Martin said the remaining land is still over 10 acres. He would think it would meet the intent of that. Attorney Treadwell said when you take those 2 acres, he thinks you have to pay retroactive taxes, just so you know that. Mr. Vallone said his question is the recreation fee, he's giving his son 2 acres of land to build of home. He had no intensions of even doing anything with the land, so he doesn't understand why he has to pay a recreation fee. He has no intention of selling any of the land, it'll be in the family forever. Mr. Kern said there shouldn't be a recreation fee. Attorney Treadwell said he thinks under three, there is no recreation fee, but he's not positive of that. Mr. Tralies said they are checking the ordinance right now.

Mr. Tralies said the first comment on their letter is regarding site plan approval. Since it's a 2 lot subdivision, site plan approval doesn't have to go before you or PC. Since they are in a carbonate geology overlay zone, they will have to meet all the site plan requirements and those will go before the Zoning Officer at the time of building permits. No. 1 is just a reminder to the Zoning Officer. No. 2 they are looking into. No. 3A, in their letter, it's just a general comment dealing with the irregularly shaped lot. Those are all the comments in their letter.

Mr. Maxfield asked about the zig zag on the map. Mr. Martin said Mr. Vallone wanted to keep the barn on his property and the last little jog was because they had to go around the existing driveway that accesses the barn.

Mr. Kocher said No. 3 they are asking for a waiver of showing existing features within 500 feet. No. 4 is the deed of right-of-way for the road right-of-way. No. 5 is certification for pins and monuments prior to recording. No. 8 is sewer module or non building waiver. No. 9 they would like a deferral from roadway improvements other than monumentation. No. 10 they would like a waiver from the provision to have regularly shaped lots. No. 11 is a waiver of recreation fees. The only exemption they see in SALDO is if you have a lot with an existing dwelling on it. They can do this as a waiver. Attorney Treadwell said it goes back to a definition of residential subdivision and whether this lot line change is actually considered a residential subdivision. We'll do it as a waiver. Mr. Kocher said the last waiver they would like is from the sewer ordinance which requires a three acre lot for sand mounds which you've revised the other ordinances to make the two acres, but the sewer ordinance is not revised and it is not part of SALDO. Mr. Maxfield said the

inconsistency existing right now is not going to give us any problems? Mr. Kocher said he didn't think so because you actually revised SALDO to be consistent.

- MOTION BY:** Mrs. deLeon moved to approve the Vallone lot line adjustment dated June 6, 2007 with the other comment that says we grant a waiver to waive the recreation fee and strike condition No. 3 and add waiver No. 3.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**F. COBBLE CREEK – SKIBO ROAD – REQUEST FOR SECURITY REDUCTION**

Mr. Kern said the developer has requested an inspection for a security reduction for work completed to date. HEA has done an inspection and is recommending a reduction in the amount of \$58,707.11.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved to approve per staff recommendations.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Kern  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**G. COTTAGES AT SAUCON VALLEY – MOUNTAIN VIEW DRIVE – REQUEST EXTENSION TO COMPLETE IMPROVEMENTS**

Mr. Kern said the developer has requested a one year extension to complete the improvements of the subdivision.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved for extension to complete improvements.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**H. O'BRIEN'S FARM – MEADOWS ROAD – REQUEST EXTENSION TO COMPLETE IMPROVEMENTS**

Mr. Kern said the developer has requested an extension of time to complete the improvements of the subdivision.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved for request of extension to complete improvements.
- SECOND BY:** Mrs. Yerger  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**I. IESI BETHLEHEM LANDFILL – APPLEBUTTER ROAD – REQUEST EXTENSION TO COMPLETE IMPROVEMENTS**

Mr. Kern said the applicant has requested an extension of time to complete the improvements associated with their land development. Mr. Cahalan said the length is one year.

**General Business Meeting  
June 6, 2007**

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved for approval.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**J. ESTATES AT SAUCON WOODS - REQUEST EXTENSION TO COMPLETE IMPROVEMENTS**

Mr. Kern said the applicant has requested an extension of time to complete the improvements associated with their land development.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Kern moved for approval.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**V. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. BIO-DIESEL FUEL BID AWARD**

Mr. Kern said an invitation for bids for bio-diesel, unleaded gasoline and home heating oil was advertised for a bid opening on May 31. Staff will provide a spreadsheet to Council tonight.

Mr. Cahalan said we were seeking bidders for bio-diesel. There is no state contract for this. The difficulty was finding a supplier who would deliver less than 5,000 gallons. With the help of Allan Johnson, they were put in touch with the PA Clean Cities, and they gave us a list of interested suppliers and we were lucky to get a bid from "Farm and Home Oil" in Telford, PA. They submitted the loan bid and they are asking for Council's approval. The bid would contain and cover bio-diesel fuel B5 at \$2.093 and a fixed price of 22 cents per gallon with a .03 cents for winter treatment; unleaded gasoline at \$2.285 and a fixed price of .18 cents per gallon; home heating oil at \$1.9212 and a fixed price of .28 cents per gallon; ultra low sulfur diesel remains as an alternative to the bio-diesel and this would be a one year agreement subject to review possibly to extend to a five year agreement...contract to be renewed annually. We're the first municipality in Northampton County to switch to bio-diesel fuel. There was no response from the school district. Any additional funds will be submitted to the state for a grant fund which is an alternative grant program. Mrs. Yerger asked to send a letter of thanks to Allan Johnson.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved to approve the bid from Farm & Oil Home Company of Telford, PA for our bio-diesel needs.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**B. HISTORIC COMMITTEE – REQUEST PERMISSION TO SUBMIT APPLICATION TO PHMC FOR MEADOWS ROAD BRIDGE**

Mr. Kern said the Historic Commission and Karen Samuels have been preparing PA Historical Resource Survey forms to submit to the PHMC for the Meadows Road Bridge for consideration of listing of the National Register. The forms are complete and they would like Council's approval to submit.

Karen Samuels was present. She said they were hoping to get Council's approval for submitting this survey to the PA Museum Commission to feel if they feel it's historically significant. This could be useful to you. Mrs. Yerger said Karen did a lot of work on this and contacted staff at Lehigh University. Karen said it's the oldest existing bridge in LST.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved that we approve the submittal.  
**SECOND BY:** Mrs. deLeon

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Mr. Cahalan has authorized Mr. Garruchi to come up and take a look at the bridge. He emailed Jack back that he'd do it and he quoted \$200 for the type of structure. He has indicated for the fee, he will come on-site and spend ½ hour or so looking at the conditions and about ½ hour typing a letter which gives what his observations and thoughts are. Mrs. deLeon said this guy does lectures for PennDOT and with his expertise, it should be good information.

**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**C. ENGINE BREAK RETARDERS –RESPONSE TO COUNCIL**

Mr. Kern said residents of Saddle Ridge Development have submitted a request to Council requesting a barn on the use of engine brake retarders by trucks traveling on Flint Hill and Meadows Road. The Township Manger will provide a report and recommendations to Council.

Mr. Cahalan said the residents want to ban the truck using retarder breaks because of the noise. He forwarded the letter to Police Chief Lesser and Roger Rasich and asked their opinion. Both of them indicated they would not support or recommend banning of the brakes as they are an important safety feature for trucks of that weight coming down that hill. The research he did indicates they are very effective at reducing the speed of trucks on a downgrade. Jack Cahalan had a diagram showing how the retarder breaks work on trucks and slows the trucks down. The downhill grade can't be greater than 4% and Flint Hill Road has a downhill grade that ranges from 15% to 20%, so if the township approved a ban on the reduce of the retarders, PennDOT would allow them to put up signs on Flint Hill Road. What can be done if Council cannot ban the engine retarders – the information out there have indicated truck manufacturers from 1978 required to have those trucks emit less than 80 decibels of noise when they drive. The noisy truck problem is caused by trucks with modified exhaust systems.

**D. FIRE HYDRANT TAX – REQUEST TO RETIRE BALANCE OF ASSESSMENT**

Taken off the agenda. Mr. Cahalan said the Director of Finance has investigated a Fire Hydrant Tax that was repealed by Council in December 2000. There have been some outstanding invoices the Finance Department has repeatedly tried to collect but in accordance with the ordinance at the time, we cannot pursue these accounts. She is recommending that Council retire the balance of \$4,245.21, however staff would like to investigate this further and we will bring this back to Council.

**E. APPROVAL OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH CITY OF BETHLEHEM TO DEVELOP A JOINT ENTERPRISE ZONE**

Mr. Kern said the City of Bethlehem has provided the Township with a Memorandum of Understanding Agreement (MOU) for Council's consideration to develop a joint venture Enterprise Zone application and plan. If Council is in support of this, they should authorize the execution of the MOI.

**General Business Meeting  
June 6, 2007**

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Kern moved for approval.  
**SECOND BY:** Mrs. deLeon  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**F. APPROVAL OF POOL PASS REFUND FOR RESIDENTS**

Mr. Kern said Council approved in the 2007 budget a line item to reimburse Township residents the difference between the resident and non-resident fee for use of the Hellertown pool and should now approve the reimbursement requests.

Mr. Cahalan said the family pass you get reimbursed \$60; Senior Citizen \$10; Season Adult \$40; and Season Youth \$25. Mrs. deLeon asked Jack to find out how old the Sr. Citizens must be.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Kern moved for approval of pool pass refund for residents.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**G. WATERSHED COMMITTEE – REQUEST TO LEASE OFFICE SPACE**

Mr. Kern said the Saucon Creek Watershed Committee has requested to lease office space in Seidersville Hall.

Mr. Cahalan said they will take up 96 square feet. They have been charging \$25 for internet and phone. Per month, the costs are \$4.71 – electric; \$6.77 – Sewer/water; \$79.61 – heat; \$7.42 – janitorial; \$1.27 – Internet; \$1.80 – phone, total of \$101.37 per month.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield move to go by what Jack approved and award Saucon Creek Watershed Committee to lease office space for \$25.00 per month.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 4-1 (Mrs. deLeon – No)

**VI. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. APPROVL OF MAY 16, 2007 MINUTES**

Mr. Kern said the May 16 minutes have been prepared and are ready for Council’s review and approval.

Page 9 – Mrs. deLeon said she said something about a room full of people and it wasn’t in the minutes. Diane will listen again. Page 10, roll call – Mrs. deLeon abstained because her husband is involved with excavating. Page 19, line 9, take out “of”. Page 22, line 45, after setback, add “for road”, line 47, accord should be “buffer”. Mrs. Yerger said on page 17, line 35 insert “not”. Mr. Horiszny said on page 19, line 9, delete “of”. Page 22, line 45 insert “for off-road”. Page 22, line 45 “corridor”, not “accord”. Page 16, line 23 Mrs. Segaline’s question about yard waste hours. Page 18, line 22 Mr. Horiszny said we need to do something and there is to be a Final Report in the fall.

**General Business Meeting  
June 6, 2007**

**MOTION BY:** Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of the May 16, 2007 minutes, with corrections.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Kern  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 4-1 (Mr. Horiszny – No)

**VII. PUBLIC COMMENT /CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

- Stephanie Brown said the development behind her is causing her a lot of problems. She has been flooded out four times from that development. What has HEA found out? Attorney Treadwell asked if this had to do with the litigation her Father has against Toll Bros. She said yes. Attorney Treadwell said they can't discuss this then. Have her Father's attorney contact Attorney Treadwell. She also said the inlets are backing up and the filters are clogged. She has eight complaints on her property. She thinks it is a nuisance issues. Attorney Treadwell said this is part of the litigation complaint. She wanted to know what the Meadow's was zoned to do and what not to do? Mr. Cahalan said Chris Garges doesn't think there is a violation. They will monitor it. If Chris thought it was a violation, he would do something about it.

**VIII. COUNCIL & STAFF REPORTS**

**A. TOWNSHIP MANAGER**

- Mr. Cahalan said when he asked for Council's approval of the lawn mowing contractor to mow the Township parks and properties, it was conditioned on us reducing the number of seasonal employees from the 4 that were approved in the 2007 budget to 2 because we did not need as many to cut grass. With the opening of the Compost Center, we have to staff that facility with a Public Works employee from 9-1 p.m. on Fridays and Saturdays, which means that with our summer hours schedule starting this week, we have to pay that individual on an overtime basis for both days which comes out to \$28.17 per hour. In lieu of this I would like to Council's authorization to hire a 3<sup>rd</sup> seasonal employee who would be assigned to the Compost Center and would be paid \$10.89 per hour for the 8 hours needed up there. The term of employment for this individual would run until the end of October.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved for approval of hiring a seasonal employee.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

- Mr. Cahalan said he is requesting Council ratify his authorization of Lawn Doctor to treat the field at Polk Valley Park at a price of \$3,565. The treatment was done in early May. This was part of the maintenance responsibilities that was in the contract with Popple Construction but with them not doing the maintenance this year, along with the lawn mowing; this was something we had to take care of ourselves.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Kern moved for approval of weed/feed pre-emergent treatment of Polk Valley Park by Lawn Doctor at a cost of \$3,565.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny  
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

**General Business Meeting  
June 6, 2007**

- Mr. Cahalan said Southeastern Fire Company has submitted an application for a grant from the Department of Homeland Security for funding to update/upgrade their 1952 brush truck to a multi-task Quick Attack/Brush Vehicle and they have asked the Township for a letter supporting their grant request.

**MOTION BY:** Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of a letter of support.

**SECOND BY:** Mrs. Yerger

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

**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

- Mr. Cahalan said Tom Maxfield is asking for Council approval of the \$129 registration cost for a one-day seminar on June 26, 2007 in Philadelphia that is being held by the National Arbor Day Foundation on Restoring Native Ecosystems.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved for approval.

**SECOND BY:** Mr. Kern

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

**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

- Mr. Cahalan said the Saucon Valley Lions Club is requesting Council's approval to plant a dogwood tree in Southeastern Park in memory of deceased former member Harry Manas. They have planted two (2) trees up there previously near the playground area which look great. We would have Boucher & James select an area for the placement of this tree and also agree on the selection of a dogwood.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Kern moved for approval.

**SECOND BY:** Mrs. Yerger

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

**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

- Mr. Cahalan said the Police Department has hired an additional part-time officer, Michael Eckman of Center Valley, PA effective May 31, 2007. This brings our number of part-time officers up to 5.
- Mr. Cahalan reported that our DARE officer, Victor Koszi has submitted the application for the annual renewal of the DARE grant in the amount of \$2,763.
- Mr. Cahalan said the Township received a letter from Tony Branco asking if the Township could host a meeting of his Northampton County Intergovernmental Affairs Committee for District 3 which includes the Boroughs of Bath, Freemansburg, Nazareth, Northampton and North Catasauqua and the Townships of Allen, Bethlehem, East Allen, Lower Nazareth and Lower Saucon on June 28, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. here in our township?

**B. TOWNSHIP COUNCIL/JR. COUNCIL MEMBER**

**Mrs. Yerger**

- There are still water issues along Saucon Creek with the detention basin behind the Giant. It was stated staff will gather the necessary information to draw down their security.
- Mrs. Yerger stated there is a meeting on Thursday on the Saucon Creek – hearing community for input and get word out on grants they are doing.

**General Business Meeting  
June 6, 2007**

**Mr. Maxfield**

- Mr. Maxfield stated since this is hurricane season he would like the issue of the additional parking lot at The Meadows taken care of before we have flooding issues.
- Mr. Maxfield asked if the Landfill has a program if there is anything detected as defective on a truck, do the refuse. Mr. Cahalan said the landfill contacts the Township if anything is detected and they refuse the truck.

**Mr. Kern**

- He said the Parks and Recs aeration program for Polk Valley Park grass – he'd like to authorize Jack to proceed to get quotes on aerating and overseeding and when is the best time of year for this to happen. Mr. Maxfield said organic fertilizer which breaks down the soil. Mr. Cahalan stated he is working on a maintenance plan for Polk Valley Park.

**Mrs. deLeon**

- She said she'd like the minutes on the Park & Rec. meeting. Park & Rec has the minutes.

**Mr. Horiszny**

- Mr. Horiszny stated he attended a talk on renewing Lehigh Valley water and wastewater project. We need to do something.

**Jr. Council Member**

- Saucon Valley graduation is June 8. June 11 is the last day of school for students. Tomorrow are all finals. The Band/Chorus is going to Cedar Park and they received 10 awards. May 31 the pop concert was held.

C. **SOLICITOR**  
Nothing to report

D. **ENGINEER**  
Nothing to report

E. **PLANNER**  
Nothing to report

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved to adjourn. The time was 10:35 PM.

**SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield

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

**ROLL CALL:** 5-0

Submitted by:

---

Mr. Jack Cahalan  
Township Manager

---

Glenn Kern  
President of Council