

I. OPENING

- A. Call to Order
- B. Roll Call
- C. Pledge of Allegiance
- D. Announcement of Executive Session (if applicable)

II. PUBLIC COMMENT PROCEDURE

III. PRESENTATIONS/HEARINGS

- A. Ordinance No. 2010-05 – Public Hearing & Consideration of Adoption – Revisions to Riparian Buffer Ordinance
- B. Ordinance No. 2010-06 – Public Hearing & Consideration of Adoption – Amendments to Chapter 170 Vehicle Code

IV. DEVELOPER ITEMS

- A. IESI Bethlehem Landfill – Applebutter Road – Presentation Regarding Cell 4-F Minor Permit Modification

V. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS

- A. Zoning Hearing Board Variance – Sheetal Patel & Jignaza Trambadia – 1867 Viola Lane – Variance Request of Rear Yard Setback for Patio
- B. Frederick Street Truck Restriction and Traffic Study
- C. Heller House – National Park Service Confirmation of Placement on National Register of Historic Places
- D. Resolution #56-2010 – Authorize Submission of Local Share Municipal Grant Applications
- E. Resolution #57-2010 – Authorizing Execution of DUI Grant Documents
- F. Award of Pervious Concrete Bid
- G. Award of Polk Valley Park Pedestrian Bridge Bid

VI. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

- A. Approval of July 7, 2010 Minutes
- B. Approval of June 2010 Financial Reports

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS

VIII. COUNCIL & STAFF REPORTS

- A. Township Manager
- B. Council/Jr. Council Member
- C. Solicitor
- D. Engineer
- E. Planner

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Next Park & Rec Meeting: August 2, 2010
Next EAC Meeting: August 10, 2010
Next Council Meeting: August 18, 2010
Next Planning Commission Meeting: August 19, 2010
Next Zoning Hearing Board Meeting: July 26, 2010

www.lowersaucontownship.org

I. OPENING

CALL TO ORDER: The General Business & Developer meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Wednesday, July 21, 2010 at 7:00 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. Glenn Kern, President, presiding.

ROLL CALL: Present – Glenn Kern, President; Tom Maxfield, Vice President; Sandra Yerger, Priscilla deLeon, and Ron Horiszny, Council members; Leslie Huhn, Assistant Township Manager; Dan Miller, Township Engineer; Linc Treadwell, Township Solicitor; Kevin Kochanski, Township Planner. Absent – Jack Cahalan, Township Manager.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ANY EXECUTIVE SESSION (IF APPLICABLE)

<p>Mr. Kern said Council did not meet in Executive Session prior to our last meeting. There will be a brief Executive Session following this meeting to discuss property acquisition.</p>
--

II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Kern said we do transcribe the minutes, verbatim, so we ask you use the microphone. Please identify yourself so our transcriptionist can get that accurately into the record. There are two microphones in the front and one in the back.

III. PRESENTATION/HEARINGS

A. ORDINANCE NO. 2010-05 – PUBLIC HEARING & CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION – REVISIONS TO RIPARIAN BUFFER ORDINANCE

Mr. Kern said Ordinance No. 2010-05 has been prepared and advertised for a public hearing at the direction of Council. This revision has been sent to the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission and the Township Planning Commission for their review.

Attorney Treadwell said last week your Planning Commission had some changes that they recommended, so we should discuss those. If we are going to incorporate those changes into the Zoning Ordinance, then we'll have to re-advertise it and send it to the LVPC.

Mr. Kochanski said there were three basic changes that the Planning Commission recommended. They recommended a definition for riparian corridor which would include "buffer areas associated with any wetland, stream, lake, or pond" be added to the first section of the ordinance. The second recommendation was that the word "woodland" be removed from the riparian corridor protection and/or management activities definition. The third recommendation was to include "pedestrian trails" in Section 180.95.b.10.b. regarding permitted crossings in a buffer area that is in association with lakes, ponds, riparian corridor, and streams.

Attorney Treadwell said if you allow those changes, it will have to be re-advertised again. Mr. Maxfield asked Mr. Kochanski to explain recommendation No. 2 as to its context that makes the difference there. Mr. Kochanski said the removal of the word "woodland". There were two issues that were raised at the Planning Commission meeting. One was that woodland activities are

**General Business & Developer Meeting
July 21, 2010**

already regulated under the Zoning Ordinance and the second one was that the riparian corridor protection and/or management activities are referring to those that are related to bodies of water, wetlands, lakes, ponds and streams. They felt that woodland area was not included and was kind of a separate category. When they looked at the Zoning Ordinance, it is already regulated as permitted activities if you were going to go in and remove invasives and sort of manage a woodland property, those activities are already permitted by the Zoning Ordinance. That's why they thought it was redundant and could be confusing, so the word "woodland" was removed from that definition.

Mr. Maxfield said he would hope to adopt these changes into the ordinance. They are good and make sense.

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

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to re-advertise Ordinance No. 2010-05 for a public hearing and consideration of adoption – revisions to riparian buffer ordinance.
SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if there were any comments or questions? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 5-0

B. ORDINANCE NO. 2010-06 – PUBLIC HEARING & CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION – AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 170 VEHICLE CODE

Mr. Kern said Ordinance No. 2010-06 has been prepared and advertised for a public hearing to amend the vehicle code to establish a 3-way stop intersection at Meadows and Skibo Roads and to provide for a reduction in the speed limit on Lower Saucon Road.

MOTION BY: Mrs. Yerger moved to open the hearing.
SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
Mr. Kern asked if there were any comments or questions? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 5-0

Mr. Miller said in November 2009, they did a speed study for Lower Saucon Road and determined that 30 MPH would be a safe speed for operating on Lower Saucon Road. The decision to go for a three-way stop at Skibo and Meadows Road was due to Chief Lesser's input. Hanover issued their comments on March 2, 2010.

Mr. Kern asked if there was any comment from Council? No one raised their hand. Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any comments? No one raised their hand.

MOTION BY: Mrs. Yerger moved to close the hearing.
SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if there were any comments or questions? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 5-0

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for approval of Ordinance No. 2010-06.
SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
Mr. Kern asked if there were any comments or questions? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 5-0

IV. DEVELOPER ITEMS

A. IESI BETHLEHEM LANDFILL – APPLEBUTTER ROAD – PRESENTATION REGARDING CELL 4-F MINOR PERMIT MODIFICATION

Mr. Kern said representatives from the IESI Bethlehem Landfill would like to provide some background on the berm and will explain the Zoning Hearing Board relief that they will be requesting.

Mr. Sam Donato, IESI Landfill; David Brooman, Attorney for IESI; and Rick Bodner from Martin & Martin were present. Mr. Donato said they have been discussing this with the Township over the past six months. What they are planning on doing with this permit modification is a new disposal area to accommodate the regrading of Basin No. 7. Throughout the past two years, they have all been discussing the regrading of Basin No. 7 and how they are going to deal with the surface water that is accumulated on the north side of the landfill. By doing that, they are going to increase in the lined area by 2-1/2 acres and that's to the north and west. It's up by the shop headed towards the Lower Saucon Authority water tank. The goal is to redirect the surface water that is going to that pond headed to the south going towards Applebutter Road. By reducing the final filling contours, they were able to achieve a minor permit modification as there is no net increase in aerospace to their facility; therefore, it's not a major permit modification. They are not changing the approved facility limits, they are staying in the current 224 acres that is currently approved by the department.

Mr. Donato said the next slide, this view is the current approved land development plan that they have. The area to the left of the shading is the Phase IV expansion. This is an aerial shot of the site, so to the right, that is all of the Phase IV area that is approved. The next slide, it's a drawing of the same area. That is what is currently approved by Lower Saucon and DEP. The final contour is 725, which is the top most elevation of the landfill that is currently approved. The next slide, the highlighted area on top in yellow is the proposed modification. The area in yellow is the Cell 4F expansion where they will eliminate Basin No. 7. In that area, it will be a lined area. The final slide should show the reduced final contour is down to 705, so they are actually lowering the landfill about 20 feet from its currently approved elevation. By incorporating the reduction in aerospace, that ties back the minor permit modification. That is a summary of it. They have some handouts for Council.

Mr. Horiszny said he wanted to see the orange and yellow slide with the 2-1/2 acres. That covers Basin No. 7 and you're not going to move the maintenance shed? Mr. Donato said that is correct. They designed around the maintenance shed. Mr. Kern asked Mrs. deLeon if the Landfill Committee has reviewed all of this and what is their consensus? Mrs. deLeon said she thinks they've addressed the main concerns, but she doesn't want to speak for Laressa. Mr. Miller said they are attempting to address Laressa's concerns. Mrs. deLeon said the next quarterly landfill meeting with the consultants is August 10. They only meet quarterly with the consultants. They meet monthly on the landfill.

Attorney Brooman said the response was on June 29, 2010 to the review letter submitted to DEP dated April 23, 2010. One of the reasons they are here is they have applied on July 7, 2010 for two variances to make that happen and they will be appearing before the Zoning Hearing board later this month to present that. Specifically the Zoning Ordinance requires two different setbacks. One is a 50 foot setback in the rear yard and the second is a 100 foot setback from property boundaries for disposal areas. That wall, for a short distance, encroaches on the 50 foot setback. They are asking for a variance to fit that wall in there with that encroachment. It's roughly 12%. Next is the 100 foot for the waste disposal area and that wall in a particular location to the north enhances by 15 feet or a little less than that. Those are the two variances that are needed to make this happen and to be able to put up the wall. In terms of DEP permit modification, the reason Mr. Donato

indicated the height differential is there is no additional capacity being requested, so in order for it to be a net swap, they cut the height down by 20 feet to accommodate a little bit more horizontal to the north and that's where they encroach into the 50 and 100 foot slightly. Mrs. deLeon said if you remember Council, they were concerned the berm was going to be too close to the property line and there would be no access to it. Attorney Brooman said people who know that area know they are backed up to a very steep slope that all's wooded down to the Lehigh and there's no homes there. There is the Bushkill Motorcycle Club. They had discussion with them and have been gracious and granted them a waiver for the DEP application, and similarly, they have granted IESI an easement to provide the access that Hanover put in the review letters, so they did cover their bases there.

Mr. Horiszny said the orange and yellow, you referred to as a wall and he thought the earlier referral was going to be landfill area. Attorney Brooman said the wall is just along the backside. The yellow represents the footprint of what they call the new disposal area, but there is a wall along the backside. Along the whole northern boundary, that would be an MSC wall. Mr. Donato said there is 2-1/2 acres of lined disposal area that is going to be created with this Cell 4F expansion. Mr. Horiszny said will it go right up against that wall? Mr. Bodner said the wall is a part of the whole subject. Mr. Horiszny asked what the wall would be made of? Mr. Bodner said reinforced earth. It's geo-grid, a grid material and it's woven into 18" layers of earth to structurally reinforce and stabilize the earth. Mr. Horiszny said does it go straight up or does it lean inward? Mr. Bodner said for every 6' vertical, it leans in one foot, so it tips in one foot for 6' rise. Mr. Horiszny said when you build a wall like that with a grid, then does it get grassed over eventually? Mr. Bodner said yes, it will have a grass face.

Mr. Maxfield said they do weigh in on all variance requests, so Council will see them again, and hopefully, IESI will give more of a real kind of layman's details to look at. Council weighs in all variances. Attorney Treadwell said you are probably here on August 18 and at the Zoning Hearing Board on August 23. Mrs. deLeon said we have our consultant meeting and they will send Council responses.

Mr. Kern asked if there was anyone in the audience with any comment or questions? No one raised their hand.

Mrs. deLeon said this is for the engineer and she's asked this before. Please make sure that all the old, old areas, whatever they were called, are identified on the plans, so that five years when we look back, we know where the original landfill was. We know where the wood fill is. All of us aren't going to be here some day.

V. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS

A. ZONING HEARING BOARD VARIANCE – SHEETAL PATEL & JIGNAZA TRAMBADIA – 1867 VIOLA LANE – VARIANCE REQUEST OF REAR YARD SETBACK FOR PATIO

Mr. Kern said the applicant is requesting a variance of the rear yard setback to construct a patio. The minimum setback is 40' of which they are requesting relief of 7' for a 33' setback.

Ms. Jignaza Trambadia was present. Mr. Kern said Council can oppose the application, support it or take no action. Ms. Trambadia said she is applying for 7' but she actually only needs 5' going back. She has land on both sides and has about 2,000 square feet left. She's under the impervious coverage percent. She only has 20' from her kitchen door to the patio, and it's rectangular, so now she wants it square. It's going to be 5' back or 20' from the door to her property line. Mr. Horiszny said what is the area of the patio or the deck? Ms. Trambadia said she doesn't know how many square feet the patio is. Attorney Treadwell said in Chris Garges memo, it just says what the

**General Business & Developer Meeting
July 21, 2010**

total impervious was prior to the patio. It doesn't say how big the patio is. Mr. Maxfield said do you know the approximate size of it? Ms. Trambadia said it's about 28' from her kitchen door and it will be a big square.

Council took no action.

B. FREDERICK STREET TRUCK RESTRICTION AND TRAFFIC STUDY

Mr. Kern said the Township Engineer has completed an Engineering and Traffic Study on Frederick Street and is recommending that trucks be prohibited from this section of the roadway with the exception of trucks making local deliveries.

Mr. Miller said they've received a report that on several occasions trucks have been directed by their GPS to go up Fredrick Street and turn onto 378. Anyone who has been on Fredrick Street, it's a very, very steep hill. If the truck can get up there, then it bottoms out when it gets to the top. It's their recommendation that truck traffic be prohibited. They are not really sure where the boundary is in Fountain Hill so the approval for the truck restriction should be conditional on Fountain Hill giving their blessing for whatever portion is in Fountain Hill. There may need to be action taken by Fountain Hill if they need to put signage up. If the entirety of the segment of road is in our Township, then it's a non-issue, but it may be contingent on Fountain Hill taking action. If Council thinks it's a good thing to do, then act on it this evening, and then whether or not Fountain Hill has to be involved, they will work on it.

Mr. Horiszny said does it need an ordinance? Attorney Treadwell said we're not sure if there will be signs in the Township, but if you want to make a motion to prepare the ordinance and discuss it with Fountain Hill, that will be fine. They will then take the next step and appropriate action.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved to take the appropriate action on restricting truck traffic on Fredrick Street.
SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if there were any comments or questions? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 5-0

C. HELLER HOUSE – NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CONFIRMATION OF PLACEMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

Mr. Kern said on June 28, 2010 the National Park Service confirmed the placement of the Michael & Margaret Heller House (the Heller Homestead) located at 1890-1892 Friedensville Rd. to the National Register of Historic Places.

Mrs. deLeon said she wants to thank the Township. Without their support in paying the consultants, they probably wouldn't have been able to do this. This was a goal achieved through your public support. They sincerely appreciate that. They are going to do their best at the Conservancy to protect the site and improve it. She'd like to invite the public and the Council to a celebration reception which is being held in conjunction with the Frances Roseman Artist Reception scheduled for Monday, August 16, 2010 from 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM. At 7:30 PM, they are going to have remarks and she'd like to invite Mr. Kern and Mrs. Yerger, as Historian, to come and say a few words. Bob Freeman and Lisa Boscola are also coming. The public is invited, so come out and help them celebrate.

D. RESOLUTION #56-2010 – AUTHORIZE SUBMISSION OF LOCAL SHARE MUNICIPAL GRANT APPLICATIONS

Mr. Kern said Resolution #56-2010 has been prepared authorizing the submission of 2010 Local Share Municipal Grant applications to the Northampton County Gaming Revenue and Economic

Redevelopment Authority (NCGRERA) for funding for projects both in Lower Saucon Township and for joint projects with Hellertown Borough.

**RESOLUTION #56-2010
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMISSION OF A LOCAL SHARE MUNICIPAL
GRANT APPLICATION TO THE NORTHAMPTON COUNTY GAMING REVENUE &
ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Pennsylvania Race Horse and Development and Gaming Act (Act 2004-71), as amended, local governments receive a “Local Share” of gross terminal slot revenues of certain licensed gaming facilities to support and enhance community and economic well-being and mitigate the impact of gaming and related activities; and

WHEREAS, Northampton County, as the host county to a licensed gaming facility receives gross terminal slot revenues which must be distributed as follows: 20% to the host city; 30% to the host county and 50% to the host county for the purpose of making municipal grants within the county, with priority given to municipalities contiguous to the host city; and

WHEREAS, Northampton County established the Northampton County Gaming & Economic Redevelopment Authority to administer these competitive municipal grants based upon impacts associated with licensed gaming facility operations; and

WHEREAS, Lower Saucon Township is a contiguous municipality to the City of Bethlehem which is the host city of a licensed gaming facility; and

WHEREAS, Lower Saucon Township has prepared a Local Share Municipal Grant Application for submission to the Northampton County Gaming & Economic Redevelopment Authority for projects that fall under the eligible uses of these funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

1. That the Council of Lower Saucon Township hereby approves the submission of Local Share Municipal Grant Applications for Lower Saucon Township projects and Hellertown Borough/Lower Saucon Township projects to the Northampton County Gaming & Economic Redevelopment Authority for funding for fire, police, EMS and road projects.
2. That the President of the Lower Saucon Township Council is hereby authorized to execute the grant applications and transmit the application to the Northampton County Gaming & Economic Redevelopment Authority.
3. That grant funds, if awarded, will be utilized in accordance with the provisions established by the Northampton County Gaming & Economic Redevelopment Authority.

Ms. Huhn said this resolution will authorize the Council President to execute the grant applications on behalf of the Township and for the submission of the applications to the Northampton County Gaming Revenue and Economic Redevelopment Authority.

Mrs. deLeon said she'd like to know if she still gets to vote on this? Attorney Treadwell said you can vote on the submission.

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for approval of Resolution #56-2010.

SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger

Mr. Kern asked if there were any comments or questions? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 5-0

**General Business & Developer Meeting
July 21, 2010**

Mrs. deLeon said it refers to the Fire Companies as Saucon Valley, should we do that yet? Ms. Huhn said they are going to add "proposed".

E. RESOLUTION #57-2010 – AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF DUI GRANT DOCUMENTS

Mr. Kern said Resolution #57-2010 has been prepared approving the authorization of the Council President to execute the DUI Grant applications on behalf of the Lower Saucon Township Police Department.

Ms. Huhn said this is an annual renewal of an application for the DUI funds. This is a joint effort between Lower Saucon, Hellertown Borough and Freemansburg Borough.

MOTION BY: Mrs. Yerger moved for approval of Resolution #57-2010.
SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
Mr. Kern asked if there were any comments or questions? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 5-0

F. AWARD OF PERVIOUS CONCRETE BID

Mr. Kern said a bid opening was held on July 15, 2010 and the Assistant Manager will provide Council with the results and recommendation of bid award for the pervious paving material for Kingston Park.

Ms. Huhn said we received one bid for the pervious concrete from Berks Products, Inc. of Wyomissing, PA in the amount of \$80.00 per cubic yard for a total of \$16,000.00. The bid has been reviewed and Berks has submitted all the required bid documents. They recommend that Council approve the Berks bid. Mr. Kern asked if Roger looked at it and it's okay? Ms. Huhn said yes. Mr. Horiszny said how did this compare to the last time? Ms. Huhn said it's no more than \$5.00 per cubic yard.

MOTION BY: Mrs. Yerger moved for award of the pervious concrete bid to Berks Products, Inc.
SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if there were any comments or questions? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 5-0

G. AWARD OF POLK VALLEY PARK PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE ROAD

Mr. Kern said a bid opening was held on July 15, 2010 and the Assistant Manager will provide Council with the results and recommendation of bid award for the pedestrian bridge located at Polk Valley Park.

Ms. Huhn said for the bridge they received two bids. One was from Descoco Design and Construction from Fleetwood, PA. They submitted a base bid in the amount of \$50,495.00. Nemaris Construction from Bath, PA was the other bid. Their base bid was in the amount of \$139,083.00. The Solicitor has reviewed the bids and all required bid documents appear to be in order and they are recommending that Council approve the low bid to Descoco Design.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for approval to award the bid to Descoco in the amount of \$50,495.00.
SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger
Mr. Kern asked if there were any comments or questions? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 5-0

VI. MISCELLAENEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

A. APPROVAL OF JULY 7, 2010 MINUTES

Mr. Kern said the minutes of the July 7, 2010 Council meeting have been prepared and are ready for Council's review and approval.

MOTION BY: Mrs. Yerger moved for approval of the July 7, 2010 minutes.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

Mr. Kern asked if there were any comments or questions? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 3-1 (Mrs. deLeon – Abstained; Mr. Horiszny – No)

B. APPROVAL OF JUNE 2010 FINANCIAL REPORTS

Mr. Kern said the June 2010 Financial Reports have been prepared and are ready for Council's review and approval.

MOTION BY: Mrs. Yerger moved for approval of the June 2010 Financial Reports.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny

Mr. Kern asked if there were any comments or questions? No one raised their hand.

ROLL CALL: 5-0

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS

- Stephanie Brown, Meadows Road, said when we talk about trucks making local deliveries in this Township, who defines what a local delivery is? She keeps hearing that Meadows Road is allowed local deliveries. She has a problem with the understanding of how it's supposed to work. She doesn't consider a local delivery to Giant, a local delivery. Is there anybody who can answer that question? Mr. Kern said that would be a truck that's delivering something to a local person in the area on that street. Attorney Treadwell said that language comes from the PA State Vehicle Code and there's a definition in there of local delivery. He's not 100% sure, but he thinks there is. He doesn't know what it says, but they can surely find it. Ms. Brown said the Township is working on looking to see if they can restrict trucks on Meadows Road. She got an email from the Township Manager when she was questioning this saying that Meadows Road was pretty much restricted already. That's why Toll Bros. has the bond on the road. If you come off of Friedensville Road and turn right onto Meadows Road, you have that ten ton weight limit on the road itself. It is restricted to local deliveries, but local deliveries to go Giant aren't local deliveries. It would be understandable if that was the only road to the Giant, but there are other roads to Giant. She's wondering where we are in terms of getting Meadows Road restricted, but apparently, it's already restricted, but it's not posted. Attorney Treadwell said the question that came up was that the weight limit restriction provides more severe penalties than the "No Truck" restriction would. What we are looking at is what is the best way to try and prevent trucks from going on that road whether it's to adopt a new "No Truck" restriction or the weight limit restriction. There was a truck that got stopped and the fine was like \$15,000.00. The local delivery question, he's almost positive it's defined in the PA Vehicle Code. If he finds it, he'll email it to her. Ms. Brown said she left that meeting with the confusion that you didn't think that the bridge could be weight restricted and the road be road restricted. Is that inaccurate? Attorney Treadwell said he doesn't think he said that. The question he brought up was if you are not going to have any trucks on the road, then you can enforce a weight restriction on the road, not the bridge. The bridge is still the bridge. That was the question, which one of those restrictions carries more teeth, and would be more helpful in preventing trucks from actually using that road. Ms. Brown said the U.S. Food Service truck got stuck between the bridge and 412 and couldn't go anywhere so it backed out onto 412. She had no cell phone and rushed home to call the police, but by that time the truck was already gone. She considers that to be a dangerous situation. She has no idea what happened. What is frustrating her is the fact that there's this huge truck that goes down to the Meadows,

**General Business & Developer Meeting
July 21, 2010**

which is considered a local delivery but this truck is actually over the old weight limit for the bridge. Apparently, it's over the weight limit for the road, which she never knew the road had a weight limit. Because it's considered a local delivery, it's a big truck to be on Meadow's Road, in an R-20, high density area. She talked to some of her neighbors and there have been all kinds of problems with trucks on Meadows Road and it's just not getting any better. The past couple days concrete trucks have been coming to Toll Bros. and they just speed down the road. She called the Police and nothing gets done. It's been five years. One of the other frustrating things is that there are all these lines painted on Meadows Road, but she hasn't seen a cop put a speed trap on Meadows Road for months. What can she do to make this road safe? She doesn't know what to do anymore. She's frustrated that the weight limit went down on the bridge and it took the Township almost five days to put it on the Township website. That was something very important that needed to get out to residents and it didn't. The Township knew Friday and there wasn't anything put on the Township website until Tuesday or Wednesday. She's asking what to do. Mrs. deLeon said wasn't that over a holiday weekend? Ms. Brown said the County was out at 8:30 AM on Friday changing the signs on Meadows Road. The Township was well aware of it as she got an email from the Township Manager about it, so they knew. Mr. Kern said the physical signs took priority. Ms. Brown said people ignore them as no one can tell that the signs were changed. She's getting very frustrated with Meadows Road.

- Ms. Brown said she wants to know what the Township is going to do about the meeting with the County on the bridge. Ms. Huhn said she called the County today and they are waiting to hear from them. The County is waiting to hear from their engineer. They are going to provide us with some more dates. Ms. Brown said has anybody actually found out why they lowered the weight limit as she's not convinced it's necessarily a good thing. Are you going to wait until the meeting to find out? Ms. Huhn said she thought they lowered it to further protect the bridge.
- Ms. Brown said her biggest concern on Meadows Road, as she walks it and has been driving on it a lot lately, is the police speeding down the road when they aren't going anywhere on a call and not stopping at the stop signs at the bridge. She's noticed this a couple of times in the last few weeks. It's up to the police to set a good example especially with having a Rail Trail going through there soon. She can't understand why the police keep speeding down the road. If they are going to a call, that's understandable with lights or sirens on, but just in general, they need to watch their speed on that road. It's disgusting. She can stand out on that road and watch them speed down the road. When they see her, they slow down, but it's really a big issue anymore. She's upset about it. Mr. Maxfield said with all due respect, we don't know what the police are doing. They don't go on every call with lights and sirens on, so we should just let them do their business. Ms. Brown said unfortunately, it's routine patrol, and something needs to be done about it. Mr. Maxfield said he is going to say publicly that you don't know that for sure and it's kind of hard to slam the police on something like that. Ms. Brown said when you've lived on Meadows Road for 37 years, you can tell me that; and when you take an interest in what's going on at Meadows Road, as a Councilman, you can tell me that.
- Ms. Brown said one of the things that she's really upset about is that on July 4th every year the illegal fireworks displays in the Township are getting bigger and bigger and worse. Some of the worst offenders are in the development behind her. The fact that we have fireworks that go on for 20 and 30 minutes in private residences, the police don't respond to them, so it's pretty sad and scary when you live in the R20 zoning district. She drove through the development, back on Viola, and there must have been 50 to 100 people out watching the display. Apparently, it was planned and people were invited to it. It's very disgusting to know that with the high density zoning area, and it was so dry, that these fireworks were going off and the police didn't respond. The one has been going on for the last five years and it's coming from the Arden Lane area. She doesn't know what the Township can do. It's one thing to shoot off a couple of fireworks and everyone does it, but when you have 20 and 30 minutes displays going on, that's a problem. She's wondering what the Township can do. Mr. Kern said he doesn't know. Attorney Treadwell said he would have to guess that we have some type of regulation and the police have some type of enforcement issue. Again, it's a police enforcement issue and we don't direct the police department what to do. They enforce the laws we have on the books. Mr. Kern said there would have to be a complaint first.

**General Business & Developer Meeting
July 21, 2010**

Ms. Brown said she did complain. Mr. Kern said they will respond based on the ordinances. Ms. Brown said these are almost like professional fireworks displays. It's scary and she doesn't understand it. People complain you burn, but that's even more dangerous.

- Mrs. deLeon said going back to the Meadows Road bridge, she's the one that wanted to meet with the County back in January and we've been throwing dates back and forth. The last round of dates neither Jack nor Jim was not available. She said from now until mid-September, she can't attend any meeting at the County. If anyone wants to go in her place, please do. She doesn't want to hold the meeting up. We're all representing the same thing, so it doesn't really matter who goes. She just wants everyone to know the prime people would be Jack and Jim, and Stephanie is invited. Keri from the Watershed Association wants to go. They would be our key people. She apologizes, but can't go with the other commitments she has.

VIII. COUNCIL AND STAFF REPORTS

A. ASSISTANT TOWNSHIP MANAGER – No report

B. COUNCIL

Mr. Maxfield – No report

Mrs. Yerger – No report

Mr. Horiszny

- He said he attended the LSA meeting last night and the main replacements have gone well. They are on schedule for most things. There have been some low pressure incidences because of the drought that go throughout the Bethlehem water system, so it's not our fault.

Mr. Kern – No report

Mrs. deLeon

- She said she attended the Lutz-Franklin potluck picnic last Wednesday and it was very nice. She was glad she got to go.
- She said last week we got a phone call from Mrs. Reed, who is a resident of Williams Township and she was appointed to their newly appointed Landfill Committee. Mrs. Reed understands through Bill Tomayko, that the Township has a Landfill Committee. She called Jack or Leslie and they referred her to Mrs. deLeon. Mrs. deLeon told the Landfill Committee that Mrs. Reed was coming to the meeting. Mrs. Reed was so thrilled to go to the meeting. She said it was very interesting and said we did a good job working with the landfill and reviewing things. When Mrs. deLeon first started here, she felt that the landfill books should not sit on a bookshelf and get dust accumulated on them. They should be reviewed by consultants so we don't let people drink polluted water and other things like that. They feel the same and are starting this Landfill Committee now.

D. SOLICITOR

- Attorney Treadwell said there will be an Executive Meeting after this meeting on the Dravec property acquisition.

E. ENGINEER – No report

F. PLANNER – No report

Council recessed for a brief Executive Session. The time was 7:56 PM. Council reconvened. The time was 8:03 PM.
--

**General Business & Developer Meeting
July 21, 2010**

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to update the Dravec appraisal with an amount not to exceed \$1,000.00.
SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger
ROLL CALL: 5-0

IX. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for adjournment. The time was 8:04 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