

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. Resolution #52-2011 – Honoring Nancy Keck and the Mary Ellen Convalescent Home for their Service to the Community
- B. Resolution #53-2011 – Honoring Bob and Vicki Hero and Hero Electric for their Service to the Community

IV. DEVELOPER ITEMS

- A. Makos/Lenner – 2617 Martins Lane – Conditional Use Hearing Decision & Site Plan Review
- B. Easton Fish & Game Assoc. – 2595 Redington Rd. – Land Development Waiver Request

V. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS

- A. Zoning Hearing Board Variances
 - 1. Stephen Mamay – 2139 Wassergass Rd. – Variance Request of Impervious Surface and Side Yard Setback for an Inground Pool
 - 2. Donald Metzger – Mike Kiefer – 4310 Lower Saucon Road – Appeal of Notice of Violation
- B. Award of PreEmptive Traffic Device Bid
- C. Review of Revised Police Department Ride Along Policy
- D. Northampton County Gaming Revenue and Economic Redevelopment Authority – Update 2011 Local Share Restricted Municipal Gaming Fund Applications
- E. Review of Special Events Policy
- F. Saucon Rail Trail Memorial Benches
- G. Regional Police Study Survey

VI. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

- A. Approval of July 20, 2011 Minutes
- B. Approval of July 2011 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: September 12, 2011
Next EAC Meeting: September 13, 2011
Next Council Meeting: September 7, 2011
Next Planning Commission Meeting: August 18, 2011
Next Zoning Hearing Board Meeting: August 22, 2011

I. OPENING

CALL TO ORDER: The General Business & Developer meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Wednesday, August 17, 2011 at 7:02 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, Ron Horiszny and Priscilla deLeon, Council members; Jack Cahalan, Township Manager; Leslie Huhn, Assistant Township Manager; Dan Miller, Township Engineer; Karen Mallo, Township Planner. Absent: Linc Treadwell, Township Solicitor

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ANY EXECUTIVE SESSION (IF APPLICABLE)

Mr. Kern said Council did meet in Executive Session prior to this meeting to discuss three items. The first was a personnel issue. The second was potential litigation regarding a property at 3868 Route 378; and the third was discussion of potential property acquisition.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Kern said if you are on the agenda, you have Council and staff's undivided attention and we can discuss the agenda items with you thoroughly. At the conclusion of the discussion, we do open it up to the public for public comment for each individual agenda item. If you do speak, we ask that you use one of the microphones and state your name clearly for the record. We transcribe the minutes verbatim, accurately and fully. If you go on our website, you can see that. We want to make sure we get everyone's name in there and what you've said accurately. If you do want to receive future agendas, there's a sign-up sheet in the back where if you put your email address, we'll email them or mail them to you if you don't have an email address. Mr. Cahalan said V.A.2, Metzger-Kiefer, has been taken off the agenda.

III. PRESENTATION/HEARINGS

A. RESOLUTION #52-2011 – HONORING NANCY KECK AND THE MARY ELLEN CONVALESCENT HOME FOR THEIR SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

Mr. Kern said Resolution #52-2011 has been prepared honoring Nancy Keck and the Mary Ellen Convalescent Home for their service to the community. This resolution will be presented to Nancy at the Hellertown – Lower Saucon Community Day on Saturday, August 20, 2011.

**A RESOLUTION HONORING NANCY KECK AND THE MARY ELLEN
CONVALESCENT HOME FOR THEIR SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY**

WHEREAS, the Mary Ellen Convalescent Home, which has been in operation for over 50 years, is one of the oldest family-owned business in the Saucon Valley; and

WHEREAS, the Mary Ellen Convalescent Home, a senior living facility located in the Leithsville area of Lower Saucon Township, was established in 1954 in the home of Harold and Mary Ellen Sauer on Leithsville Road when they began caring for Mrs. Sauer's mother; and

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

WHEREAS, the business expanded with the addition of a nursing home wing in 1980 and staff at the nursing home has grown from the original fifteen (15) members to its current complement of forty (40) skilled professionals who provide nursing care and rehabilitation services to its residents; and

WHEREAS, since 1991, the Mary Ellen Convalescent Home has been run by Mary Ellen Sauer's daughter, Nancy Keck, who has been assisted by her sons, Lynn and Jay Keck, her daughter Nanette Keck, and her daughter-in-law, Debbie Keck in operating the facility; and

WHEREAS, the facility, under Mrs. Keck's supervision, prides itself in providing homelike care with a personal touch and has earned recognition from the State for the service that it provides; and

WHEREAS, Nancy Keck and the Mary Ellen Convalescent Home will be saluted at the 2011 Hellertown – Lower Saucon Community Day for their community service to the Saucon Valley.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Council of Lower Saucon Township, Glenn Kern, President; Thomas Maxfield, Vice President; Priscilla deLeon, Council Member; Sandra Yerger, Council Member; and Ronald Horiszny, Council Member; wishes to commend Nancy Keck and the Mary Ellen Convalescent Home for their service and dedication to the residents of Lower Saucon Township.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of Resolution #52-2011.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

B. RESOLUTION #53-2011 – HONORING BOB AND VICKI HERO AND HERO ELECTRIC FOR THEIR SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

Mr. Kern said Resolution #53-2011 has been prepared honoring Bob and Vicki Hero and Hero Electric for their service to the community. This resolution will be presented to the Hero's at the Hellertown – Lower Saucon Community Day on Saturday, August 20, 2011.

A RESOLUTION HONORING BOB AND VICKI HERO AND HERO ELECTRIC FOR THEIR SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

WHEREAS, Hero Electric, a family owned and operated business, has been in operation in Hellertown Borough for 47 years; and

WHEREAS, the business was originally established in 1952 by Mike and Irene Hero on East 4th Street in the City of Bethlehem where it sold televisions and other appliances; and

WHEREAS, in 1964, the Heros moved the business to space at 520 Main Street in Hellertown that was formerly occupied by Nicholas's Five and Dime Store and offered Zenith television sets, Gibson appliances, as well as parts and service; and

WHEREAS, after settling into their new location, Mike Hero and his sons built a slot car track in the store and held weekly races for local children where they would serve an array of hot sandwiches, hot pretzels, and soda; and

WHEREAS, the current owners, Bob and Vicki Hero, took over the business in 1993 and expanded its product offerings with hobby supplies, focusing primarily on model cars, remote control vehicles, and Power Wheels; and

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

WHEREAS, Bob has served the community as long-time member and officer on the Board of the Hellertown-Lower Saucon Chamber of Commerce and logged attendance at numerous Council meetings in both municipalities over the years where his keen observations and good cheer were always welcomed; and

WHEREAS, Bob and Vicki and Hero Electric will be saluted at the 2011 Hellertown – Lower Saucon Community Day for their community service to the Saucon Valley.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Council of Lower Saucon Township, Glenn Kern, President; Thomas Maxfield, Vice President; Priscilla deLeon, Council Member; Sandra Yerger, Council Member; and Ronald Horiszny, Council Member; wishes to commend Bob and Vicki and Hero Electric for their service and dedication to the residents of Lower Saucon Township.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of Resolution #53-2011.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

IV. DEVELOPER ITEMS

A. MAKOS/LENNER – 2617 MARTINS LANE – CONDITIONAL USE HEARING DECISION & SITE PLAN REVIEW

Mr. Kern said the applicant is seeking to extend an existing access drive toward the rear of the lot and past the edge of the 100' riparian corridor. No piping and/or structures are proposed other than those that currently exist.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR MAKOS DRIVEWAY IN A RIPARIAN BUFFER
2617 MARTIN LANE, TAX MAP PARCEL Q8-11-14B CONDITIONAL USE (CU01-11)
AND SITE PLAN (SP01-11) APPROVAL FOR JULY 20, 2011 LOWER SAUCON
TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING**

The Lower Saucon Township Staff recommends that the Township Council approve the “Makos Site Plan,” as prepared by Mease Engineering, P.C., consisting of one (1) sheet, dated April 13, 2011, last revised June 15, 2011.

Subject, however, to the following conditions:

1. The Project is subject to the approvals of all municipal and governmental agencies having jurisdiction over the project, including but not limited to review and approval by the Northampton County Conservation District and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as applicable. A Note shall be added to the Plan identifying that Army Corps review will be required prior to construction of the driveway.
2. The limit of constructed improvements within the riparian buffer will be limited to the area shown on the Plan. The area of temporary construction disturbance shall be subject to review and may be limited by the Township during the future Grading Plan review(s).
3. All review comments contained in the letter dated May 26, 2011, from Hanover Engineering Associates, Inc. have been addressed.
4. The Applicant shall address, to the satisfaction of the Township, the review comments contained in the letter dated June 7, 2011, from Boucher & James, Inc.

General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011

5. The Applicant shall provide four (4) prints of the approved Plans with original signatures, notarizations, and seals. The Applicant shall also provide two (2) CDs of all Plans in an AutoCAD format (jpeg-ROM).
6. The Applicant shall pay any outstanding escrow balance due to the Township in the review of the Plans and the preparation of legal documents.
7. The Applicant shall satisfy all of Conditions 1 through 6 within one (1) year of the date of the conditional approval unless an extension is granted by the Township Council, or this approval shall be considered withdrawn, null and void.

Mr. Scott Mease from Mease Engineering and Mr. Lenner were present.

Mr. Mease said this is a 6-1/2 acre parcel, an existing parcel, on the north side of Martins Lane. We are here for the conditional use. The property does have some natural resources on it. We had various studies done such as wetland studies, flood plain soils, to identify the natural resources. We provided a table of natural resource calculations. They are looking to put a driveway in the riparian buffer area. Currently, there remains an existing lane that was shown on the 1982 subdivision plan when this lot was created, and basically, we want to use the existing lane for the driveway access. Improvements would be made to that lane to make it comply with the driveway ordinance requirements of the Township. That was the conditional use requirements. The site plan was also reviewed by the two consulting engineers for the Township. They had various comments. We have complied with all of those comments. They have come to a resolution as to what they would like to see if additional things may have to be added to the plan. He believes all of their requirements have been met. That's a general summary.

Mr. Mease said the limit of disturbance line was added to the plan, but when it was plotted out, it didn't show up, so they complied with that and the plan he has here tonight has it on it.

Ms. Mallo said outside of the letters Council has reviewed, they do not have any additional comments. They have received a revised plan from the applicant, but their office has not reviewed it to make sure it meets the requirements of the condition that they suggested. They have no other comments.

Mr. Miller said they don't have any comments.

Mr. Maxfield said with the submission of the new plan and the conditions that you are not sure are filled or not, are you okay with moving ahead to conditional use and that those will be sufficiently fulfilled. Ms. Mallo said from what she just looked at, they did show the limits of disturbance on there. They do meet the coverage requirements. It's only 4% where 20% is allowed. They can work with them. The comments and conditions were that it's no greater than what was shown on the plans originally. If it is greater than that, that would be the only issue. It doesn't appear right now from looking at it that it will be an issue. Their letter will come out to say whether those conditions are met.

Mr. Maxfield said this approval for conditional use does not trigger any real disturbance action on the site. Mr. Miller said right. He said he'd like to revise his previous statement about having no comments to saying that all his comments are in the staff recommendation above.

Mr. Miller's concerns are addressed.

Mr. Rodney Vanscavish, resident, said he resides on Martin Lane. He's adjacent to the property. He came to the Planning Commission a couple of months ago. He brought several concerns up about this parcel of property. He just wanted to bring them to Council attention before you make your final approvals on this. The first concern was about even having a house built on this property

General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011

because of its potential, its environmental sensitive characteristics, and they are really concerned about that. They are concerned about it being adversely impacted based on the characteristics involved with the environment there. At one time, the Vanscavage property was in consideration for a conservation easement – sixteen acres. That’s what brings up the question of this parcel being built on. Unfortunately, with the Vanscavage property, they weren’t able to obtain the conservation easement because of an issue with a subordination which is required with a conservation easement. Their mortgage company would not subordinate nor was any other financial institution able to subordinate because of the economic times. That was brought up about that being preserved. The Township had acknowledged that the sensitivity and environmental issues on their property were pretty good and that’s why they raised questions about this parcel being able to be built on. The Planning Commission explained to them that back in the early 80’s, this parcel was already approved for a building lot and there was nothing that the Township could do to prohibit a house from being constructed on it. With that being said, concerns are for the Township and himself, he feels that how it’s gone about being constructed, how the driveway has gone about being constructed. Moving onto the driveway itself, the conditional approval, the pipes that are currently in place right now was brought up to the Township’s Planning Commission about them being up to standard and the Planning Commission felt that along with the Township Engineer, that there was no need to address those current pipes. In his professional opinion, that once construction begins on that parcel of property and equipment starts to travel over what they are calling a proposed driveway and an existing driveway, that he feels those pipes will fail and someone will be addressing the conditions at that time. The Planning Commission felt it would be more of an adverse impact if they made the existing owner right now or the buyer update those pipes because they felt that’s going to disturb more. What’s going to happen when trucks and traffic start to travel over those pipes and they fail? Then at that point, someone is going to have to address it. It’s going to have to be addressed sooner or later when they fail. It’s better they get addressed now versus later. He’s hoping some consideration can be taken into that and looked into more deeply before any conditional approval is given on either the driveway or the site plan.

Mr. Kern said what kind of pipes are we talking about? Mr. Miller said he believes they are plastic pipes. Mr. Kern said what’s the issue with the pipes? Mr. Miller said they don’t have adequate cover over top of them. They would need to be sized larger. Mr. Kern said what are the pipes used for? Mr. Miller said conveying stormwater. There’s base flow that goes through them. Mr. Mease said the plan does currently show that they are calling for additional cover over the pipes.

Mrs. deLeon said if this gets approved, three years from now, who is going to inspect those pipes to make sure they didn’t fail or would we know by them backing up? What would trigger this? Mr. Maxfield said that’s what was explained to them at Planning Commission meeting. It’s important to note that no action or disturbance is proposed right at this time or sanctioned by this conditional use. When that occurs, that kicks in a whole new set of controls. All those kinds of considerations would have to be looked at with disturbance issues, the grading; all of those things when the actual action is proposed and it has to be addressed. It will be addressed before they even come in for a building permit. Mrs. Yerger said are we just approving the driveway? Mr. Miller said you are approving the concept of the driveway. You are not approving a design of a driveway. Mr. Maxfield said there is an existing driveway there and all we are approving is a theoretical extension of that driveway.

Mrs. Yerger said if you go to the Boucher & James letter dated June 7, 2011, it’s not clear to her, the plans propose to improve and expand the existing lane into a minimal use driveway to take access from Martin Lane. No other improvements are proposed at this time. The plans indicate that the purpose of the application is to “gain approval for a future owner of the property to be able to construct an access to the buildable portion of the property”. Her question is, does this provide an indication that someone can come back to them three years or three months from now and say you have inferred that this is now indicating it’s a buildable lot and that you have to allow a structure to be put there. That’s where she was having problems. Ms. Mallo said that was a quote taken from their application. Basically whether that lot is buildable at this point, we don’t know

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

what they are proposing in terms of what is buildable. They may not be able to put a 4,000 square foot house on that property as it may not allow it with the site capacity calculations. They are not proposing anything at this point. We can't say whether that site is buildable or not. It appears they have impervious surface coverage and there is an area that is not completely taken up by natural resources so that they could build on, but that is no way implying what is buildable on that lot, if anything.

Mr. Maxfield said there are no details on any map showing anything other than the driveway extension. Ms. Mallo said correct and to say that the lot is buildable at this time. Mr. Mease said that's wording he put on the plan and he actually put that on the plan to indicate we are just here for the concept for crossing the riparian, and that's why it says the property is unable to be sold without establishing an access. The sole purpose of this plan is to gain approval for a future owner of the property to construct an access. That's all it says. It doesn't say to be able to build. It does say no development is currently proposed for this property nor by this plan.

Mrs. deLeon said it says the plan is proposed. Mr. Vanscavage said isn't it true in your ordinances you state that the Planning Commission can require a full blown site plan to be developed before any conditional approvals are given? They can go ahead and ask for further information to show an outline of all the information needed as if a house was to be constructed? Ms. Mallo said the Planning Commission has the ability to request it; however, the Planning Commission doesn't have the ability to require the applicant to do that. The Council has that power to do that. Mr. Vanscavage said the Council has the power? Ms. Mallo said correct. If the Council wanted additional information, that is able to be added as a condition. However, at this point, they don't have a footprint and don't know what the building footprint would look like.

Mr. Maxfield said we have to remember that it's conditional use which means it is a permitted use. What they are proposing is permitted, but we have the ability to put conditions on it. He'd ask Council to trust the Planning Commission and understand that they felt that everything they needed to know would be taken care of by the trigger of action on the property. He can safely say that's how everyone on the Planning Commission felt.

Mr. Vanscavage said you discussed the driveway. The driveway that is there, he doesn't know how you would call it a driveway. It's an area or pathway that is cut by a lawnmower. He posed a question about whether a driveway permit was ever issued on this parcel of property; and if so, if a driveway was permitted, there are probably conditions in the driveway permit that have to be exercised in order for the permit to be valid. If they aren't exercised, that driveway permit would expire over a period of time. We're talking about a parcel of property that was approved back in the 80's. Does anyone know of an existing driveway permit issued on this parcel because that leads to his next question. Do we know if this current existing location we are calling the driveway is the best suited location for the driveway on that parcel of property to protect all of the environmentally sensitive things so it's not adversely affected? We don't know that. In order to find out, why wouldn't we ask that an impact study be done and as part of the impact study, why wouldn't we be asking if a PMDI be done. A PMDI is basically to find out if there are any environmentally sensitive vegetation or wildlife on that parcel of property. Basically an impact study would be okay, here's alternative A, alternative B, alternative C for the Township to take a look at and find out if the driveway that is on that plan, is that the well suited driveway for the parcel of property. The Council could do their due diligence and ask for something like that.

Mrs. deLeon said this hearing was advertised for last month and we closed the hearing and our solicitor isn't here and we're kind of in a dilemma here. Mr. Vanscavish said approvals haven't been given at this point.

Mr. Kern asked Mr. Maxfield if the site of the driveway discussed at the Planning Commission meeting is it the best location possible? Mr. Maxfield said no, but he thinks it was recognized that there's a body of water at the front part of the property and this is about the only place you could

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

pull into the property and get past the body of water. There are a couple of pipes over flow areas, but it's pretty much from the road a straight shot back to the only buildable area on the site. It may be a small buildable area. He's guessing it started out as an access for a farmer and with the environmental restrictions of the property, he's thinking that farmer had enough sense to take the best route into it. Looking at it from a planning perspective, it's probably the smartest way to go. Mr. Miller said you are correct.

Mrs. deLeon said the other issues Mr. Vanscavish brought up, were they required as part of this conditional use? Should they have been done? Mr. Maxfield said his understanding was that all of that will be looked at when the action is proposed. Before you do anything, stoning, machinery on the property, the studies will start. Mr. Miller said correct. All the normal conditions were put on this and then because of the concerns Mr. Vanscavish made, we made sure the Army Corps of Engineers was kept in the loop.

Mr. Kern said let's go through the conditions. Mr. Miller said approval of the plan is subject to the following conditions as listed above. Comment nos. 1 to nos. 7 conditions were read by Mr. Miller. Mr. Kern said if this gets approved, as with the grading ordinance, the grading ordinance is pretty strict and standards kick in effect that have to be adhered to. Mr. Vanscavish said as far as going to the issue of the pipes, if they were revisited, you'd have to have the Army Corps involved in that and get the proper sizing and hydraulic studies done? Mr. Mease said with the Army Corps, they are going to get involved with are we having disturbance to wetlands, things like that. That's what they are going to be focused on. The question he has is what is the concern of the failure of the pipes? He's seen the pipes and they are in very good condition. They've been utilized and tractors have passed over them to get to the field in the back, the cover is not what it should be, but that's one of the things they are showing on the plan that they would put more cover and they can put that cover on without adversely affecting any resources that they had studied by DeVal Soil Consultants. DeVal made visits and delineated the various natural resources they showed on the plans. They did have studies done. It's not like this is just a plan they put together and took off of aerial imagery. This is the location where the lane was shown in 1982 and they are putting a future driveway in that same location to eliminate impact on other resources. Mr. Vanscavish said when you are sizing pipes, you need to have proper calculations. Have these calculations been done to see if they meet the proper storm event of today's standards. Mr. Mease said that was one of the things that was discussed when you were at the Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Miller played a key role in this in the fact that if you take a pipe that's there now and you enlarge it, then you have to take a look at what is the impact.

Mr. Kern said you understand that if major issues come up later on they will be addressed. It's not like a green light to go crazy and build a house there no matter what. There are checks and balances in place where if an issue arises, it will be known and it will be handled. Mr. Vanscavage said he understands that the checks and balances is a process, but at this early stage, you can head off a lot of these issues up front and have them addressed to put whoever the buyer is at ease. Unfortunately, people buy properties and don't understand anything about the property. That's why he brings these concerns to the table now so everybody can address them at this level and the current owner can look into them, address them, and make sure everybody is done in the proper manner at this point in time instead of letting some poor property purchaser buy the property, doesn't understand the issues, and then gets stuck with something. In summary, he wanted to bring all these concerns to the table now and hopefully you take these into consideration before moving on to any type of approval.

Mrs. deLeon said if we vote on this tonight, does it get recorded at the Courthouse? If someone was buying this, their mortgage company could do research, and find it somewhere? Mr. Miller said no, but the potential buyers that are negotiating with the current owners were at the Planning Commission and we've even had discussions with them directly before and after those meetings expressing to them the significant constraints that Lower Saucon puts on these properties even though other Township's might not do so they should be aware of that. They are fully cognizant.

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

Mr. Maxfield said publicly we said this will not be an easy property developed and he believes it will be a expensive property developed. That is something if anybody goes back and looks at the record, they will see we are recognizing what kind of property this is. Mr. Kern said they can also see Mr. Vanscavish's comments in the minutes.

Mr. Allan Johnson, resident, said he lives on Martins Lane. He heard the Hanover Engineering and Mr. Lenner's engineer tonight refer to the flow through those pipes under the driveway as storm water flow. He believes it's a stream that flows through those pipes and the headwaters of the stream are in that area where the springs are and the pond is. He just wanted to put this in the record so you could think about it.

Mr. Maxfield said you referred to it as flow, but he thinks Mr. Miller meant stream. Mr. Miller said he referred to it as base flow. It's a certain type of stream flow. It's the non-storm base of the stream flow and he also called it storm flow, it's both. It's the trickle ongoing as well as the storm flow. Mr. Maxfield said it's on the plan as stream. Mr. Miller said that's correct. It's a water course.

Mr. Kern said everyone has heard the staff recommendation for July 20th, are there any additional comments? No one had any comments.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to grant the conditional use for this applicant, per the staff recommendation.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if anyone had any questions or comments? Mrs. deLeon said she hears the comments from the neighbors and she doesn't want to do anything that is going to affect the neighbors, but at this part of the process, this is what it is if she's understanding it correctly. For the next step, the concerns will be addressed. Council doesn't see the grading, but if there are issues they will hear about it. She's hoping administration will let them know and the property owner has access to the information. It's like you hear the concerns, but at this stage, this is what we have to do. Mr. Maxfield said it's a permitted use. Mr. Kern said that's the issue. If it wasn't a permitted use, it would be clear.

ROLL CALL: 5-0

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for approve of the site plan, per the same conditions.

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

B. EASTON FISH & GAME ASSOCIATION – 2595 REDINGTON ROAD – LAND DEVELOPMENT WAIVER REQUEST

Mr. Kern said the applicant is seeking a waiver of the Land Development process so they may proceed with constructing a new building on their property.

Present - Mr. Bryan Ritter, Jena Engineering Corp; Attorney Steve Mills; Eric Nagle, Board member of Easton Fish & Game; Matt Maiella, President of Easton Fish & Game. Mr. Ritter said Easton Fish & Game is a facility that currently exists in the Township along Redington Road down near the river. It's where their range is currently at. They have another facility in Williams Township along Industrial Drive where their clubhouse is. They'd like to move their clubhouse to the facility. That way everything is there. They are proposing to construct a building as the introductory letter indicates. It's a 40'x80' building where they would do their monthly meetings and also do their instruction there. There would be people going there for their hunting license instruction; and police departments would practice and do their testing there. What would be done at the site would is basically construction of the building. The park and everything else is there. It's adequate. It would be the building to do the instruction. Obviously, when you look the

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

subdivision land development ordinance, it's quite involved. They are looking at approximately 36 acres. If you ran it as a true subdivision land development, there would be a lot of things that would need to be done. We're only looking at disturbing the 40'x80' print of the building and that would be the extent of the disturbance. The question comes, in what they have sought, relief from the subdivision land division ordinance, recognizing the fact that we still have some aspects of the zoning ordinance that kick into place like some of the studies – the coarse geology, the slope analogy, site utilization analysis, etc. They are seeking do we need to do everything for this particular development. It's already a developed property. They just want to put a new building on it.

Mr. Miller said they had three main things that need to be done. They don't necessarily have to be in the confines of land development. They are outlined in their August 1, 2011 letter. Mr. Ritter said they are familiar with both review letters. Council needs to respond accordingly in agreement with the recommendations of their staff to move forward. When he was looking through Boucher & James requirements and looking at the inventory, would that just be for the disturbed area or the 36 acres - the general area where they identify where the ranges are at? Ms. Mallo said yes. In terms of providing where the environmentally sensitive areas are, that's all published out. Probably the aerial photography that was requested is basically to see where those areas of disturbance are, but yes, we are talking about the area you are proposing to develop and any area that would be disturbed by construction methods, stockpiles, etc. – any limits of disturbance for this project.

Mr. Ritter said the only other thing he had was going through the process of doing the compilations for slope disturbances. Obviously, the portion of property they are looking at is flat. He's not going to go in and disturb any of the steep slopes or anything like that. Do they have to go through full compilation process? Ms. Mallo said she'll turn that over to Council in that Boucher & James would recommend it; however, Council may feel that is excessive as there are 36 acres. The site calculations are what you are going to base on in the future too. If they come in with a huge parking lot and pavilion five years from now, it could be incremental over the life of the project to see those disturbances. It's 36 acres so they would recommend the site capacity calculations be done if there is some limit to where your disturbance already is in areas you don't even have development on, that would be fairly easy to work around. Mr. Ritter said most of it is the upland area. There's an area where the old quarry was. That's literally the only portion of the facility they currently operate. They aren't going to be on that part.

Mr. Maxfield said this is made up of multiple parcels? Mr. Ritter said correct. There are three parcels that make up the tract of property. Mr. Maxfield said if we were going to limit any steep slope analysis, are they any parcels that would be less than 36 acres or are the parcels still large? Mr. Ritter said the parcel we are talking about would be identified on the plan as tract no. 1. If we limit it to that area, and everyone is in agreement to that, that's reasonable. Mr. Maxfield said the building is in the corner? It's so small, he can't see it on the plan. Mr. Ritter showed Council where tract no. 1 was, the railroad tracks off of Redington Road, and showed where the area was they were looking at. That's where the core area is with the high walls. The rest of it is trees and woods and they aren't doing anything in that particular area.

Mr. Maxfield said would the planner be happy with a steep slope analysis that would be limited to tract no. 1? Ms. Mallo said her concern is, on the plan, she doesn't know where the access points are coming in. Is the access coming in on tract no. 2? Mr. Ritter said looking at the large plan, look at Redington Road East, which is to the west side of the property along the Norfolk Railroad, along the river, you come to the end and it says "Private Drive". That is an existing drive that currently goes into that property. You will see that with the aerial photo. That's the existing access into it. There's a parking area in there. The shooting range is there. For the benefit of the Planner and the Council, in the future, when we do make the submission he can take some pictures so things can be seen. It's 3.7 acres. When you look at the 230 contour, where that goes behind where the new building is, it's actually parcel 2, and it's the beginning of the high wall of the

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

quarry. Ms. Mallo said that's probably going to be sufficient. She hadn't seen the plans. She had not seen where the access points were. They are basic things they would just like to see on the plans. If you want to limit the environmental disturbance to tract no. 1 where they've already shown, that should be fine.

Mr. Maxfield said as far as the information the Township will not be getting, they were to follow your recommendations and there is nothing major you would be looking for. Mr. Miller said as far as permission for doing what they are doing, with the exception of Hanover's comment about the limits of the parking, and anything that is in the nature of the buildings that are outside of that area, if it's limited entirely to the zoning calculations, it's everything they need. Just make sure if you are doing that one parcel you may or may not have the site capacity from that one parcel to generate the development you are doing. If you do, then everything is well and good and proceed in that manner. Mr. Ritter said they will be in contact with both of the staff members as well as the Zoning Officer when they are developing this. If they expand out of tract no.1, they will identify the limits of that expansion in order to justify the developments being proposed.

Mr. Maxfield asked Ms. Mallo if there was anything they would be missing? Ms. Mallo said the environmental encroachments are the biggest concern when you have a property that is large and has environmentally sensitive areas on it. If the limits of the disturbance are limited to just that one parcel and there's a commitment on behalf of the applicant and we are satisfied when we see some submission of a plan to not encroach upon those environmentally sensitive areas, then the waiver for subdivision and land development plan is fine.

Mr. Kern asked if there were any questions from anyone in the audience? No one commented.

Mr. Ritter said during the process and when they submit the plans to the professionals for the review, if they feel some sense of uncomfortableness or some clarification is necessary to come back here, they will be happy to do so. They are trying to keep it simple for what they want to do.

Mr. Garges, Zoning Officer, said for clarity sake, ultimately we are going to have to review it as a staff, so his recommendation for a motion would be for a waiver of the land development subject to the applicant submitting a grading plan, which would be required anyway. The grading plan would show all the natural features and everything that is required by zoning – the parking calculations, any stormwater management that may be required depending on what the storm water or grading ordinance says. From that standpoint, the only thing that changes, they are still doing what they want, but they don't go through the formal process of all the formal reviews and the appearances before the boards. The zoning, grading and stormwater review would be covered in-house by the consultants. Mr. Ritter said they are fine with that.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of waiver requests based on the description stated above by our Zoning Officer, Chris Garges.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny
- ROLL CALL:** Mr. Kern asked if anyone had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
5-0

V. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS

A. ZONING HEARING BOARD VARIANCES

1. STEPHEN MAMAY – 2139 WASSERGASS ROAD – VARIANCE REQUEST OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AND SIDE YARD SETBACK FOR AN INGROUND POOL

Mr. Kern said the applicant is requesting a variance of the impervious coverage and setback regulations to construct a pool.

Present – Stephen Mamay.

Mr. Mamay said he's here to find out what can be done about this. Mr. Garges said the applicant is proposing to put in an in ground swimming pool at 2139 Wassergass Road. He's requesting three variances from three sections of the zoning ordinance. The property is located in the R40 zoning district which is 40,000 square feet or nearly an acre minimum zoning. The lot itself is 16,000 square feet which is less than half of what would be required as a minimum lot size. The applicant is already dealing with some constraints on the lot. This is an older dwelling. It's not new construction. When you are dealing with half of the lot that the zoning standards set forth, it's harder to meet some of the requirements, so he's requesting a setback variance, 30' side setback, and his lot is roughly 80', so it only gives him 20' in the middle to do anything with anyway. He's requesting relief from the coverage which is approximately 3% of relief that boils down to about 485 square feet total. The 3% number of even a smaller lot is not that much when you look at the actual square footage amount. It is still almost 500 square feet. The third section that the applicant is requesting relief from would be the carbonate geology study which is required in zoning for any excavation that's greater than 3' in depth. It goes below the frost line.

Mr. Mamay said there were only two variances – the carbonate geology, he spoke to Dru Germanoski today and talked about a few things. His letter to the Zoning Officer stated that if in fact the first two items could be approved for a variance, he would be willing to hire a geologist for this particular issue. One of his biggest concerns was when he first came to the Township, he was never given any kind of instructions. All he was given was a sheet that said go to see this individual or this individual – Keystone Consulting or Base Engineering. Nothing else was said. He went over to Keystone and took the plans over and they told him what he had to do. He paid them the money and in the interim, he had already paid the pool builder \$10,000.00 for the materials. The first time he went to Keystone, they just told him what he had to do. He drew the plan up. Then they called him about six days later and said the plans were there and this is what he had to do. They gave him two sets of plans – one for the job site and one for the Township, with clear instructions on what he had to do to conform to their issues. At that point, he thought since no one said anything else, this is what he has to do. He went to the Township that same day, dropped off the other copy to the Township and he paid the fee for the permit. Nothing was said at that time about anything either. Two days later, the check was cashed for the permit, and he assumed at that time, that everything is good. He has what he has to conform to from Keystone Engineering, nothing was said to him from the other part, so he assumed that this is all he had to do. He was willing to do everything and he even went out and bought door alarms, ordered fencing, ordered wiring. The very next day he went over and he paid American Pool \$10,000.00. It was a mistake on his part as over the weekend he got a letter from the Zoning Officer saying that he had to comply with the impervious coverage, the setback, and the carbonate geology. He had never heard of any of these. Nobody had ever said anything to him about any of these issues. On a side note, he went to a neighboring municipality and the Zoning Officer gave him a big packet telling him this is what had to be done. He spent a half an hour talking about certain issues and what had to be done. He thought that was a good way it should be done and questioned why he wasn't given the same treatment at Lower Saucon. On Monday, the 25th, American Pool cashed their check, and on the 27th, materials were delivered to his house, and they are still setting there. On the 29th, he got the LS rejection notice. He called his pool guy and he said that he was ready to come down and start. Mr. Mamay said he couldn't start and do anything as he has some issues with Lower Saucon Township. He asked for Chris Garges telephone number and spoke to Mr. Garges and he called him back and told Mr. Mamay what he had to do. The only thing that was upsetting to him was he wasn't given any ground rules to begin with.

General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011

Mr. Kern said how can we improve that process? Is that an issue that needs to be addressed? Mr. Garges said typically it is not an issue. If somebody comes in and says he wants a permit application and doesn't ask anymore, they are handed the permit application and told how to do it. He sits down with people on a daily basis who want to put a pool in, but that was never asked, so we don't know. Typically, it's not an issue at all. It all depends how the question is asked.

Mr. Maxfield said if the recommendation was made to go to an engineering firm of some kind, and he's looking at the drawing, and it doesn't look like the engineer produced the actual drawing that we have, but the engineering firm who works in our neighborhood should be very familiar with the fact that there are ordinances associated with each municipality and probably should have identified those ordinance problems by looking at your drawing. Mr. Garges said not necessarily. The people that have these are building code officials that have certifications to review and inspect plans for building code issues only. They don't know anything about zoning. We are required to comply with the UCC as a municipality. The building inspector takes care of all the building issues with their approval. We take care of the zoning issues. They deal with so many different municipalities you couldn't even ask them to do that. It would just spin their heads. Mr. Maxfield said normally an applicant would hire an engineer to draw the plan up, that's when it would be identified. The problem here is we're missing a step.

Mrs. Yerger said this isn't the first time we've had this kind of issue. What happens is they go and contract with a landscaper or a pool person, some kind of construction person who does not take the time to figure out what municipality they are working with, the rules and the guidelines of what that municipality has. These people are in the construction business. That pool is going in the ground. They know there have to be guidelines no matter what municipality they are going to. She views it as the responsibility as your pool guy in this case or anybody who would be a contractor to go to the municipality and make sure that his construction is in compliance with Township rules. Mr. Garges said that happens very frequently. There are a number of pool companies that call Mr. Garges. Mrs. Yerger said she remembers a landscaper who worked in this Township and didn't bother to check. They are constructing something. They are building something. If he were building a house, they should know to go to Base Engineering. They should know the rules and regulations or at least check to make sure and your guy didn't.

Mr. Mamay said if he had been given the instructions and he knew he had to deal with the impervious coverage or the setback or the carbonate geology, he probably would have forgotten about it, but he has a signed contract with the pool people that he can't get his money back for any reason. Mrs. Yerger said his pool people were the ones responsible to make sure that the pool you are building is in compliance with the Township codes. Mr. Mamay said when the pool guy came out to his place, and he looked around, Mr. Mamay said to him, as far as the disturbance from the fence, the pool guy said he's seen this already up to the fence. This is what he told Mr. Mamay. He's just going by what the pool guy said. There's a fellow that lives up around the corner on Wilhelm Drive and he's right up against the fence. Mr. Garges said he got a variance. Mr. Mamay said he spoke to the guy and the guy did tell him he had to get a variance, so he figured maybe he'll come in here and see if he can get a variance. As far as the impervious coverage of the ground, the way he figured it out, he was about 2.7% over. To him, he doesn't really view that as a big issue since he lives right across the street from 50 acres of the country club. He doesn't see how that figures in, but he's willing to do what he has to do. It was also suggested to him that he dig up his driveway to make it pervious. He just put the driveway in last year, so he's losing another \$1,000.00 plus the cost of somebody to dig it all up. It seems he wasn't given a fair shake from the beginning. That's just the way he's viewing it. He's willing to comply with whatever you say. He doesn't want to lose his money.

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

Mr. Kern said he doesn't have an issue with the side yard setback at all. To him, that's easily a waiver. The impervious a little more so. He's not familiar with the site. It's a very much of an issue to go over. It might not be an issue where you are situated. He would need some guidance from the Zoning Officer or someone who is familiar with the site. If Council grants a variance to those two issues, that's fine. The one he does have an issue with is if he starts digging a hole in the ground and he has some type of geology problem. Mr. Mamay said he went on line and tried to educate himself as he never heard of a carbonate geology study. It says 50% or Northampton County is supposed to be in this area. He thought if that's a big issue and if this came from Council's environmental protection standards where they do not assume liability, why don't they at least let the people know they are living in an area where there are sinkholes so they can get some kind of insurance. Mr. Miller said he has carbonate geology under his house, and there are firms that do have sinkhole insurance.

Mrs. deLeon said if you have a sinkhole in your yard, you need to report it. When they were doing the zoning ordinance years ago, they are the second highest incidences for sinkholes in PA. People don't realize that, but there used to be a record somewhere. Mrs. Yerger said we've had some developments where they had to remediate sinkholes. Mr. Mamay said if the first two issues would be granted, he spoke to Mr. Germanoski today and told him if Council shoots it down, his only recourse is to get a lawyer to try to get his money back. The contract says for no reason can he get his money back, so he's out \$10,000.00 for them and \$12,000.00 he has to pay back to the bank. He's 68 years old; he can't take a hit of \$25,000.00, especially since he didn't know from the beginning. If he would have known about it from the beginning, he would have thought about it twice and said maybe he should have bought his wife a car as opposed to the pool.

Mr. Maxfield said he doesn't think Mr. Mamay is going to get out of the carbonate study because the effects of that can be disastrous to you and your neighbors. Mr. Mamay said he understands that. Mr. Maxfield said you could open up a large cavern underneath your pool with a pool leak. All that really needs to be done. He agrees with Mr. Kern. The setback is really reasonable. The impervious is a problem. You are very close to the Silver Creek. Silver Creek has a history of flooding. Hellertown will tell you that. Those are the kinds of things we need to keep an eye on. He saw in some of the literature he gave to Council, the pool is set. Can the size of the pool change? Mr. Mamay said he has a signed contract for that specific pool. If he has to dig up his driveway, he'll just have to do it. It's better than losing \$25,000.00. He has to do something. Mr. Maxfield said is there decking associated with the pool? Mr. Mamay said yes, 3' all the way around. Mr. Maxfield said could you reduce that to get your percentage down? Mr. Mamay said the easiest way to do it, and it was a suggestion given to him by the Zoning Officer was to dig up his driveway. If he has to, he will, but it will look like heck. He is going to have to dig 40' from the road up, 40'x12'. It's about 27% as opposed to 25%. It's 2.7% over, and to him, it seems minimal. Mr. Horiszny said could you move the pool over? Mr. Mamay said no, as that's solid concrete, about 8" thick. It would be easier to dig up the driveway. Mr. Horiszny said it would save some deck space and get you closer to the impervious. If the spa deck and the pool deck were the same deck, or part of. Mr. Mamay said that would cost a lot of extra money. The best thing would be to have someone dig up his driveway and take it away. He just had his driveway put in last year, that's what's upsetting to him. The driveway is 12' wide and a 2' grass strip going over. He'd have to dig up about 41' x 12'. Ms. Mallo said you have to access your site. You can't not have a driveway. Mr. Garges said he doesn't know how long his driveway is. Mr. Mamay said it's about 145'. Mr. Garges said if you took a foot off of the width of the driveway, you're down to a little over 300 square feet over. Mr. Garges said then you still have access. Mr. Mamay said she could do that also. Mr. Maxfield said they don't want him to lose his driveway, but reducing it to a smaller size and take a foot off and we got it down. Mr. Mamay said he could do that. Mr. Garges said if you would be able to come up with 150 or 180 square

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

feet, which would be the most convenient to him, he wouldn't have to lose his entire driveway. Mr. Maxfield said it seems kind of piddly to take a foot off, but what we're operating with all these years is everybody's impervious gets added together and pretty soon you have a whole area what's above what it should be. That's what causes stormwater problems and that's what we're trying to avoid.

Mr. Mamay said it seems to him that if you increase the perviousness of the ground, you are actually increasing the amount of water that goes into the ground which may be causing the bathroom effect of the scarification. Mr. Maxfield said that's what your carbonate study would reveal. Problems occur when you have things like fracture zones where there are small sinkholes started and the carbonate study would reveal that. Normally on coarse underlain soils, if you spread that water out as long as you're not concentrating it, it will absorb it with no problem. That's a general statement.

Mr. Mamay said he spoke to another geologist and he mentioned a couple of these things and the gentleman said there's a couple of ways of getting around those things. He says what you can do as far as channeling your water into the ground as opposed to your impervious areas, and he told him, he's done that. On his garage, he channeled the water instead of going down his driveway, he added a channel out the back and out the side and into the ground. The same thing with all his existing spouting, it goes into the ground. He doesn't have any spouting that goes into the driveway.

Mr. Maxfield said you need to have a mechanism in the ground that allows to seep it out slowly or spreads it out. Concentrating water is one of the no-nos. Mr. Mamay said he spoke to Dru Germanoski today and he told him if Mr. Mamay needs him, to give him a call.

Mr. Kern said his earlier question was cumulative effect. He doesn't know if it would be significant here. Mr. Maxfield said other than when the golf course has flooded – no. Right downstream of the golf course is where the flood took out bridges. The flow down through there is bad. Mr. Kern said it's not like a Toll Bros. Development where a cumulative effect is going to be significant.

Mrs. deLeon said were you here in 2004 when Hurricane Ivan flooded everything? Mr. Mamay said yes, he lived here. Mr. Maxfield said that's what they are trying to avoid. Mr. Mamay said that stream is a couple of hundred yards from Wassergass Road and passes underneath Wassergass Road and travels wherever it goes to. Mr. Maxfield said all that road runoff ends up in the creek. Mr. Mamay said a lot of the run off goes across the road and goes into the grassy area of the golf course. Most of his goes across the road into the grassy area.

Mr. Kern said you are here tonight as you are going to the Zoning Hearing Board? Mr. Mamay said yes, on Monday. Mr. Kern said we can support, oppose, or take no action. They don't have to take anything we say. They are the power. It's a recommendation from us. He would recommend Council take no action. Mr. Horiszny said we should have him narrow the driveway, but if the geology study indicates he can't put a pool there, he's going to be out all that money anyway no matter what we do. Mr. Mamay said he understands, but he has to do something as he wasn't given the ground rules anyway. Mr. Maxfield said this isn't a guess, but it's possible if you had a carbonate geology study, it would say you could not put a pool in your yard, at all. That's probably one of the more important things we are talking about and why he doesn't want you to avoid that anyway. Mr. Mamay said when he was informed of the three issues, no. 1 the imperviousness, no.2 the setback and no. 3 the carbonate geology. He took that as preference, 1, 2, and 3. He thought the carbonate geology would be the most important because of the sinkholes. Mr. Maxfield said priority wise would be the carbonate geology. If there's a fracture running

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

though your yard, it could prohibit you from doing anything. That is something he wants to see Mr. Mamay do for himself. The other things, Mr. Kern is right.

Mr. Horiszny said we could oppose it unless he has his driveway narrowed and has a carbonate geology study done. Then the ZHB can make their decision. Mr. Garges said we can take no action for item 1 and 2, the coverage and the setback, and we would oppose the relief to the carbonate geology section. Mr. Maxfield said will it come out at the ZHB that the driveway reduction is a recommendation. Mr. Garges said Council can write a letter to the ZHB. Mr. Maxfield said he'd be happy with that. If you lay it out in percentages, it's about 3%.

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved that Council oppose relief from the carbonate geology study and suggest that the driveway be narrowed either one or two feet and that we do not oppose the setback.

Mr. Garges asked if Mr. Horiszny wanted to put a number to that, like 150 square feet reduction so Mr. Mamay has the ability to move that around somewhere and Mr. Garges can go out and inspect the area that was removed. That may be a little more concise. Mr. Horiszny said he said one or two feet, then you are taking off 290 feet. Mr. Garges said whatever number you choose. Mr. Maxfield agreed that that may be a good way to proceed. Mr. Garges said Council could make a motion that stated that they take no action on No. 1, the setback request; that they oppose No. 2, the impervious coverage request, unless the applicant agrees to remove 150 square feet of impervious coverage elsewhere on the parcel by reducing the size of the proposed pool/decking; and the Council opposes any relief to the Carbonate Geology regulations.

SECOND BY:

ROLL CALL:

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny amended his motion to what Mr. Garges stated above.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

ROLL CALL: 5-0

**2. DONALD METZGER – MIKE KIEFER – 4310 LOWER SAUCON ROAD –
APPEAL OF NOTICE OF VIOLATION**

This item has been tabled.

B. AWARD OF PREEMPTIVE TRAFFIC DEVICES BID

Mr. Kern said a bid opening was held on August 11, 2011 for Pre-Emptive Traffic Control Devices. The Township Manager will review the bid results with Council.

Mr. Cahalan informed Council that:

- \$128,000 in funding was received from the County Gaming Authority to install pre-emptive devices on traffic signals and in emergency vehicles in Lower Saucon and Hellertown.
- This has been a time consuming process as we had to involve our traffic engineers and PennDOT and we also learned in the process that the controllers at the traffic lights had to be upgraded in order to install the pre-emptive devices.
- Ids were opened on August 11, 2011
- We received bids from four (4) companies
- The documents were reviewed by our traffic engineer and were found to be in order
- Wyoming Electric & Signal from Wyoming Pa, in Luzerne County submitted the low bid at \$104,630

We would ask that Council approve and award the bid to Wyoming Electric & Signal contingent on this bid being approved by the Hellertown Borough Council at their meeting of September 6, 2011

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for approval of the award of preemptive traffic devices bid to Wyoming Electric & Signal contingent upon the bid being approved by the Hellertown Borough Council.
SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
ROLL CALL: Mr. Kern asked if anyone had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
5-0

C. REVIEW OF REVISED POLICE DEPARTMENT RIDE ALONG POLICY

Mr. Kern said the Ride Along Policy utilized by the Police Department has been reviewed by the Solicitor and he has provided some recommendations for revisions for Council's review. Chief Lesser has reviewed and is in agreement with the suggested revisions.

Mr. Cahalan said that you will recall that this policy came up at a previous meeting and we indicated that we would have the Solicitor look at it and make some recommendations for updates and revisions.

Mr. Cahalan said #4 and #5 have been revised in this policy requiring that the participants remain in the car at all times and that they not participate in any way in any conversations or incidents. In addition the policy has been updated to prohibit participants from using any video or recording devices, cell phones, etc. during the ride along.

Mr. Kern said on the age limit he'd go for 16. Mr. Maxfield said he was going to suggest 21. Mr. Kern said it's really to get young kids in. Mr. Cahalan said you could get a college student. Mr. Kern said mostly high school kids who do the ride-alongs. Mr. Maxfield said that's fine. On No. 5, he thinks that's really good. He wouldn't want the ride-along to be in a conversation with the public. For instance, if the person was required to sit in the car in the front seat, and they arrest someone and put them in the back seat, you really don't want to encourage any sort of conversation going on with the ride-along. It may be initiated by the arrested person. Can we get that in somewhere? Mr. Cahalan said he thinks that would cover that. You are saying a member of the public isn't the person getting arrested or detained? Mr. Maxfield said the way it's stated, it basically says you can't get involved in a conversation that was occurring already between your officer and a member of the public. Even if you are just standing around talking and you are addressed by a member of the public and you are a ride-along, you really should at that point, say you can't speak and shouldn't give advice or any opinions given. There shouldn't really be an involvement, and especially if you are going to lower the age to 16 or 18. Mr. Cahalan said that would take another revision. He will bring it back. The Solicitor isn't here this evening, so Mr. Cahalan doesn't want to change anything until he would look at it. The rest of Council agreed with Mr. Maxfield's suggestion.

Mr. Horiszny said you might want to ask or consider that they don't transport prisoners in a car that has a ride-along person in it. Usually if they arrest someone, they are going to have a back-up car anyway and it may be better to keep the ride-along person away from the perpetrator. Mr. Cahalan said he thinks that is done, but not reflected in here.

D. NORTHAMPTON COUNTY GAMING REVENUE AND ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY – UPDATE 2011 LOCAL SHARE RESTRICTED MUNICIPAL GAMING FUND APPLICATIONS

Mr. Kern said Councilwoman Priscilla deLeon, Lower Saucon Township's representative on the NCGR&ERA, would like to report on the 2011 Local Share Restricted Municipal Gaming Fund applications.

Mrs. deLeon said applications were due by August 1, 2011. The Gaming Authority received twenty-eight applications. Three were rejected as they lacked supporting documentation and other

documents. That brings them down to twenty-five. The Township and Hellertown will be presenting their applications on Monday, August 22nd. The meeting is at 5:30 PM. The twenty-five grants that were received total \$3,254,268.13. We're guesstimating that the revenue for this round of restrictive funds will probably be around \$1.7 million, so they are not going to have enough money to cover all. They will come and present their applications. The next date will September 19th where more will come to present their applications.

E. REVIEW OF SPECIAL EVENTS POLICY

Mr. Kern said the Manager will review a draft Special Events Policy. The policy has been reviewed by the Park & Recreation Board and is ready for Council's review and adoption.

Mr. Cahalan said this has been out in draft form for over a year. The Park and Recreation Board has reviewed it and they have actually used it in draft form for several special events that have been requested on the Township parks. They had the cyclo-cross event here at Town Hall Park which followed this policy. They had the Civil War Encampment at the Heller Homestead, and they recently had a Lacrosse day and a soccer tournament coming up on Labor Day. The policy has worked very well for these special events requests. There are a couple of changes that need to be made to the policy. Under "Fees & Costs", they have added to the policy a fee schedule. There's a blank under this section that says "non-refundable application fee" and that should read \$25.00 must be included with the application at the time of submission. Under "Security Bond and Damage Deposit", under the first bullet, the security deposit should read \$250.00 instead of the \$500.00 that's listed there. Under "Events on Historical Properties", we have given that information out to both historic organizations that lease the Township properties – the Lower Saucon Township Historical Society and the Saucon Valley Conservancy. They are reviewing that. That's not here for your review, so we would put "under development" in that section of the policy. Mrs. deLeon asked if Mr. Cahalan could send that to her. Mr. Cahalan said under "Food Concessions", it indicates there aren't any local or state requirements for food concessions, so we would put "No food safety requirements" under that section.

Mr. Horiszny said on page 1, the second bullet under "Application Procedure", the number of days 60", the number of days isn't in there. In the setup on the next page, under the first bullet, it says "setup assemble". It should either have a slash in there or say "setup or assemble".

Mr. Cahalan said under "Crowd Control & Security", there's a correction, it says "Crown" and should be "Crowd".

Mr. Horiszny said the second bullet, page 5 & 6, "Business Use" it says "location on" and it should be "location of" twice in that section.

Mr. Cahalan said the only thing he'd add is under "Release Document" that is "Under Development", as that isn't prepared yet. That's something the Solicitor has to look at.

Mr. Cahalan said attached to this would be the Special Event application. That's been easily filled out by at least five or six applicants without any difficulty. The next attachment would be the Special Event Fee Schedule. That has a series of fees, which are as follows:

- Special Event Application Fee (not waived) - \$25.00
- Security Fee is a security deposit - \$250.00 per event
- Standard Event fee for the athletic fields - \$100.00 per field per day. This policy does not apply to the field scheduling policy we are using for the local groups in the Saucon Valley area. They pay a registration fee, but don't pay a field use fee. This is primarily for outside groups who are requesting use of the fields. The local groups have priority on the use of the fields. This would be only for an event for a park field when one of the local groups is not using it. We don't have a fee, for example, if the Civil War Encampment wants to use the Heller

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

Homestead Park area unless you want to. Mrs. deLeon said technically it's an event with the Heller Homestead.

- If there's any damage to the facilities or the fields the costs that are incurred, we would bill those fully to the applicant by the Township.
- If there is any police support or assistance that's needed, we would bill them under the current pay rate.
- If there's any cost for additional port-a-johns, that cost would be billed to the applicant. That should also be for any garbage disposal. If there's trash above and beyond that's in the dumpster, we would bill them for that.

This is ready for final approval. If we come up with anything that needs to be changed, they would bring it back to Council for approval of that revision. He thinks this is in good shape for Council's approval.

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for approval to the Special Events Policy, with noted changes.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

F. SAUCON RAIL TRAIL MEMORIAL BENCHES

Mr. Kern said the Manager will review with Council a program whereby individuals or groups can purchase memorial benches along the Saucon Rail Trail.

Mr. Cahalan said there's been discussion at the Saucon Rail Trail Advisory Committee about having a program whereby individuals or organizations can buy a bench in memory of a member or family member and put it out on the rail trail with an appropriate plaque. He hasn't received a request yet, but he understands there's been discussion on some of the Facebook pages and people have been asking how they go about doing this. He thinks one of the members from the Lower Saucon Authority mentioned he might be interested. They put together a draft program and it should be in your packet. It has a sheet that shows the bench they are suggesting be purchased and placed out on the rail trail. This is a bench that is sold by a company in Coopersburg who does memorial products. This is a very good looking bench. There's a colored photograph in your packet of a bench that is in Living Memorial Park in Coopersburg. You can see where the engraved plaque would go on the bench. He had the Public Works Director go and look at these benches and check them out for suitability and durability and he said it's a very well made and durable bench. It weighs 210 lbs. It's going to be anchored down in the ground. It's from a local dealership, where if people buy it from them, they will make up the plaque and mount it on the bench and take the bench out to the rail trail to the selected location and install it there for us. The cost of the bench is \$995.00. That includes assembly, engraving and installation at the location on the Saucon Rail Trail. The idea is if there was an individual or organization, and he put down no commercial sponsorships, although there have been commercial sponsorships for the markers on the trail, he wanted to keep this for individuals or organizations that would utilize this. They started off with seven locations along Lower Saucon's section of the trail. The locations are remote from any residences so there isn't any potential disturbance from people who may be sitting and talking on the bench. He has a draft policy that says "We will select the bench location. It will be limited to individuals and local Saucon Valley organizations. No commercial sponsorships will be accepted. Individuals and organizations who are interested in purchasing the bench will make the payment directly to Internal Products who will assemble it, prepare the plaque and install it at the location chosen on the rail trail and no cost will be incurred by the Township". He really doubts there is going to be any damage, but if someone would damage it and it's beyond repair or it's stolen from the rail trail, the Township is not responsible for its repair or replacement. There's a color sheet for the benches and seventeen different color choices. They are leaving the individuals pick the specified bench color unless Council wants to specify a color. Mr. Maxfield said remember when we were talking about the color coding of the sections of the trail for emergencies.

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

Maybe we can do that for the benches also. Mr. Cahalan said that's a good idea except we are orange. Mr. Maxfield said the coding and the framework; maybe the benches could be consistent. Mr. Cahalan said he'd have to check on that. Mrs. Yerger said we have some pretty sections along the trail. You don't want green or red. Mr. Maxfield said the bronze and slate blue is nice. Council agreed on green for the benches.

Mr. Horiszny said when someone runs into one of these benches, do we have insurance to cover them? Mr. Cahalan said we have insurance on any of our park areas. The question is are we responsible?

Mr. Cahalan said is he hearing green for the color? Council said dark green. Mr. Cahalan said that would be it and the policy if it's okay with Council, they would start this and they will put the word out. He believes Hellertown is going to follow suit with the same type of bench. Mr. Maxfield said maybe we could ask them to do a different color so at least we know when people are in Hellertown or Lower Saucon if there is an emergency.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of the dark green memorial benches along the seven locations on the Saucon Rail Trail and adoption of the policy.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if anyone had any questions or comments? Dan Paschke, Fountain Hill, said he's usually here for Representative Simmons. He's an avid runner and loves to run on the trail. He understands you are going to make the benches one color, but then have another color for color coordination. Mr. Cahalan said there are going to be color coded mile markers along the trail. Mr. Paschke said if each Township has a different bench color and they can't see a mile marker, and you pick green; then what if Coopersburg picks green and the person just says green. Mr. Cahalan said they are going to coordinate that. They have been working with 9-1-1 and there will be an individual color. So far, only Hellertown and Lower Saucon have gotten into the markers and the color coding. They've talked to Upper Saucon and they are okay with it, but they are under another 9-1-1 system as they are in Lehigh County. If you are on the trail and you see orange, you know you are in Lower Saucon. Mr. Kern said the orange is a post. Mr. Cahalan said everyone will have different colors.

ROLL CALL: 5-0

G. REGIONAL POLICE STUDY SURVEY

Mr. Kern said the Township has received notification from Ron Stern with DCED that we have been found eligible for technical assistance for a Regional Policy Study.

Mr. Cahalan said the letter is in your packet. It enclosed the law enforcement survey that they are busy completing. Hellertown also received one. They will submit it to DCED. Following that, they will await word from them that they have assigned Peer Consultants to work with the Borough and the Township on a regional policy study and as before, they will set off a kick-off meeting with the elected officials and the Chiefs to discuss where it's going.

Mr. Horiszny said under G., it says policy instead of police. Mr. Cahalan said they will correct that.

Mrs. deLeon said she knows this was half-finished last time. Does anyone remember what happens when they come up with a recommendation? Mr. Cahalan said they actually put together a budget showing what a consolidated police department would look like as compared to what it is now. Then that's the extent of it. He's not sure if there's a recommendation or not. Mrs. deLeon said the fire and the police are kind of the same thing with the merger concept. Would they report to a committee? Mr. Cahalan said you could set it up to have a commission or authority that would oversee the operation of the regional police department. That's done in other regional police organizations. There's a commission and representatives are appointed by the Council's to serve

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

on that commission. Then they would prepare an annual budget and let the municipalities know what their appropriation is for that coming year. Mrs. deLeon said that would be a choice? It's not that ultimately a commission has to be set up. Mr. Cahalan said it's up to the elected officials on how they want it set up. Mrs. deLeon said we are the elected body. She would be bothered by that concept. Ultimately, they should come back to the Council. Mr. Cahalan said each of the studies, like the recreation study, will come back with recommendations and one of the recommendations may be to create a recreation commission or authority and that's Council's decision and Hellertown's decision. The other one with the fire company merger, there may be a similar recommendation and that's up to Council how you want to operate it. No action is required on this item.

VI. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

A. APPROVAL OF JULY 20, 2011 MINUTES

Mr. Kern said the minutes of the July 20, 2011 Council meeting have been prepared and are ready for Council's review and approval. He asked if anyone had any changes or corrections?

Mr. Horiszny said on page 3, line 22 it should be "planned" driveway. Page 11, line 38, it should be "impervious", not pervious. Page 22, line 9, the motion should be "4-1", not 4-0. Page 23, line 55, where it says "Could Not Hear", his report was that "Lower Saucon Authority has completed the Walter Street main water replacement and sold the used front-end loader on the public sale website for a very favorable amount".

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of the July 20, 2011 minutes, with corrections.

SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger

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

ROLL CALL: 4-1 (Mr. Horiszny – No)

B. APPROVAL OF JULY 2011 FINANCIAL REPORTS

Mr. Kern said the July 2011 financial reports have been prepared and are ready for Council's review and approval.

Mr. Horiszny said check no. 65800 for \$11,137.82 to Hoyt Cinema, what is that for? Mr. Cahalan said it's a tax refund. They won the appeal. That was our amount. The school district had to refund them a larger amount than that. Mr. Horiszny said with them out of business, do we still get tax money from the owner of that property? Mr. Cahalan said yes. Mr. Horiszny said is it going to be a lot less? Mr. Cahalan said it's based on what the new assessment will be. Mr. Kern said it's on earned income.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval for the July 2011 Financial reports.

SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

VII. COUNCIL AND STAFF REPORTS

A. TOWNSHIP MANAGER

➤ Mr. Cahalan we held off, as we've been doing the last couple of years, on any essential items until we got to the end of the year. One of the things we've been trying to nurse along is the road sweeper that Public Works has. It's a 1999 sweeper. They've been using it for over ten years. It's currently out of service. It needs repairs that cost about

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

\$15,000.00. This has been on Roger's replacement schedule for several years. We applied for a Gaming Authority grant to replace it last year, but we were unsuccessful. The sweeper we have now that's not operating is primarily used to sweep the roads and clean out catch basins. It cannot pick up leaves. It can pick up leaves, but the way it's constructed, it will clog it up. He asked Roger to look into was a vehicle which would do the road sweeping, vacuum and clean catch basins, which we use with Hellertown Borough, and the third would be to do curbside leaf pickups. DEP has been after us to institute a program to pick up leaves at curbside. That would put us into compliance with the Act 101 compliance. Roger came up with a model. It's an Elgin model that would do all three of those things. The cost is \$240,000.00. We do have money for this vehicle in the Capital account. The current vehicle we can sell to another municipality for about \$20,000.00 without doing the repair that's needed on it. With this vehicle, we'd be able to continue the road sweeping, which is needed. If you've been driving around, they are doing the chip and seal project and we do need the sweeper to clean up those stones after that is completed. We'd be able to start a modest curbside pickup program, by modest, he means that it would have to be done by appointment, but we could go to the built-up areas and if people put the leaves out at the curb, we'd be able to go along with the vehicle and vacuum them up and take them to the compost center. That would put us on the road towards compliance with DEP. He's recommending approval to purchase this vehicle from the Capital account. The money is budgeted sufficiently in the 2011 Capital account and with it, we'd be able to continue with our required work and continue to assist Hellertown. Mrs. deLeon said what else is keeping us from compliance with DEP? Mr. Cahalan said we need do the leaf and yard waste pickups at least twice a year and the big thing is the burn ban. Mrs. deLeon said how much money are we losing from reimbursement? Mr. Cahalan said we were getting about \$22,000.00 a year in the performance grant less the \$4,000.00 we were paying to Mr. Hough for gathering the data. We were getting about \$18,000.00 which was going into the Compost Center account. That has stopped as we are no longer in compliance. This will put us on the road toward that. It would take a bigger commitment which is something we can look at down the road. This vehicle would allow us to start that. It can also be used for normal duties that Public Works has. Mr. Maxfield said the leaves that you pick up are being deposited at the Compost Center. They will just be stacked there and not chopped up? Mr. Cahalan said at the Compost Center, all of that gets ground up on an annual basis and that turns into the mulch that people pick up. Mrs. deLeon said they go around with street cleaners and clean up cinders after winter, how do you segregate the leaves from the stones? Mr. Cahalan said you would be doing two separate operations. They do road sweeping, then they'd convert it and go out with the vacuum and pick up the leaves. Mrs. deLeon said if she'd put leaves at her curb, there would be stones. Mr. Cahalan said it wouldn't pick up the stones. If you raked or blew your leaves to a pile on a road, the vacuum is strong enough to pick up a bowling ball in a catch basin. Mrs. deLeon said her leaves go in the woods. Mr. Cahalan said there's a lot of people in the Township who will choose that. There are other people who burn them. There are areas if we had this service, the people would use it and we could do it by appointment. Mrs. deLeon said wouldn't it make more sense than by appointment just to set up certain streets on certain dates. Mr. Cahalan said they could do that also. They will come back and discuss that with Council. This vehicle would allow them to begin doing that. Mrs. deLeon said with all the streets and properties, we're taking our Public Works away from doing their thing and we have over 10,000 people, and that's so many properties. If we could only do a small portion a year, how is that fair to the people you are not going to collect leaves from? Mr. Cahalan said he doesn't think there are sections in the Township where people are going to be able to rake or blow their leaves to the curb. They did give a report to Council where there are several ways, such as by appointment, by road schedule, that type of thing, where they can do portions of the Township, but not all of it. We can look at that and see how that works. He doesn't want to overtax the Public Works Department with the leaf pickup program. Mrs. Yerger said is there a way to determine the time commitment? Mr. Cahalan said yes, they wouldn't start

General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011

anything until they figured that out and had certain areas in mind. If it starts out and is restricted to certain areas, and then other areas are asking for the service, it's something they would have to look at. Right now they believe it would be on a small scale. Mr. Maxfield said we have private roads in the Township and undedicated roads. We'd probably get some complaints from those areas. There's a tradition in the country of taking your yard waste and dumping it across the road. He'd rather see this than that. Mrs. Yerger said that wouldn't be an area where they would show up anyway. Where do we draw the line? Mr. Cahalan said it's going to be voluntary. They are not mandating it. If you are going to mandate it, you have to go the whole nine yards and you have to ban the burning of anything that can be taken to the Compost Center. If you are going to a Township program like that, we'd need more equipment and more manpower, and you'd have to have some ordinances adopted that prohibit some of these practices. Ms. Huhn said you can look at it many different ways if you want to investigate in picking up and starting this. You may only want to do it in developments that have curbs. You may not want the street sweeper on roads where the speed limit is 45 MPH and people are trying to pass him because he's picking up leaves. You may not want the leaves put out on those roads. Ms. Mallo said you don't need it on subdivisions that were built on farms as they have brand new trees that didn't even start dropping leaves. Mr. Cahalan said there are several different ways you can approach this. He's saying this is a vehicle which would allow them to start it off on a small scale, but we're not saying we're going to do it Township-wide. Mr. Kern asked if there was a rush to get this truck? Mr. Cahalan said the current sweeper either has to be repaired or we'll fall behind. Mr. Kern said he'd like to have some issues to discuss in your office before we move on. Mrs. deLeon said why wouldn't you ask them here? Mr. Kern said he would, except he's still formulating what all those ideas are. One is the cost of the vehicle and one is doing what's not required. There are a whole lot of things. Is that worth just getting the old truck repaired? Mrs. deLeon said she'd like to hear the answers. Mr. Cahalan said we could repair the vehicle and spend \$15,000.00, but you'd still have a very old vehicle susceptible to breakdowns. That's just to sweep roads and clean out catch basins. Mrs. Yerger said what would be the cost of what you have now? Mr. Cahalan said there's vehicles some municipalities just use for leaf pickup. You could pull something behind on a truck, but you'd need several staff to operate it. This can be operated in the cab and just drive along the road without getting out of the cab. It's a one man operation. Some of the others, it takes the driver and two people in the back. It's cheap equipment-wise, but manpower it's expensive. He was trying to get a vehicle adaptable for several things. If Roger went out to replace the vehicle that's out there, it's the same price and all you get is road sweeping and catch basin vacuuming. This is getting a third job done with the same vehicle as it is literally the same price. Mr. Horiszny asked how long the repairs would take? Mr. Cahalan said he's sure the company Grand Turk could fix it within 30 to 60 days. Mr. Horiszny said could we rent equipment if we absolutely have to have it? Mr. Cahalan said he'd have to check on that. Mr. Horiszny said what would delivery time be on a new vehicle? Mr. Cahalan said he would have to find that out also. Mr. Kern said because of the capital expenditure on this, he needs time to think about it. If he'd be asked to vote right now, he'd vote no. He needs to think about it. Mrs. deLeon said why can't Mr. Cahalan prepare that as a report for us and compare it and put all the information together and we have a document. Mr. Cahalan said he can do that and he'll get it out to them before the next meeting.

- Mr. Cahalan said the Girl Scout volunteer, Mary Elizabeth Anthony, completed her Gold Award project on the Native Plant Garden and the recommendation from the EAC is that she be reimbursed for materials that she purchased for the project. There's a fountain out there with a pump, solar pump to run the fountain, two pedestal signs, Plexiglas and lamination which cost \$385.64 for those materials.

General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for approval to reimburse Mary Elizabeth Anthony for \$385.64 for her materials she bought for the Native Plant Garden.
SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
ROLL CALL: 6-0

- Mr. Cahalan said Community Day is Saturday, August 20, 2011 from 10 AM to 8 PM at Dimmick Park. The resolutions will be presented to the two businesses at noon time.

B. COUNCIL

Mr. Maxfield

- He said someone alerted to him what they thought PennDOT was spraying on Lower Saucon Road and Easton Road. He went out there and they are indeed spraying close to water which they say they don't do. He thinks that was near the bridge. Near the Harris property where the wetland is, the stream runs down through the corner there. They've been spraying that. He'd like to direct the staff to send a letter to PennDOT and remind them of their own policies so they do the right thing.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for approval for staff to send a letter to PennDOT as stated above.
SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger
ROLL CALL: 5-0

Mrs. Yerger

- She has a request if we could do a resolution for Mary Elizabeth Anthony recognizing her work she has done on the Native Plant Garden.

Mr. Horiszny

- He said yesterday he did a conservation easement monitoring with Wildlands Conservancy people, Carl Martin and Adam Keller on the Bracalante-Dwyer-Noble property as they heard about ATV tracks there. It appears as those tracks are just used for hunting and for inspecting the property and not for recreational riding. Overall, the assessment was it's being monitored as it should be and the conservation easement is in good affect.
- He said Lower Saucon Authority is reviewing their Mission Vision and Five Year Plan and they will have more information on that in the near future.
- He said they had a request from Toll Bros. for dedication of the sewers and piping in the Meadows Subdivision and preliminary testing indicates there's going to have to be fairly significant amount of work done before Lower Saucon Authority will accept the situation the way it is.

Mr. Kern – No report

Mrs. deLeon

- She said she was talking to several residents and the concern was coming into Steel City on Riverside Drive, there is a lot of growth coming into the road. She'd like to have staff contact PennDOT regarding the trimming on Riverside Drive. Mr. Maxfield said they will just spray it, they won't trim it.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved to have staff contact PennDOT as stated above.
SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger
ROLL CALL: 5-0

- She said on Monday, August 15th, they had an Artist Reception at the Homestead for Louise and Bill Cosgrove. It was well attended and a nice event.
- She said September 10th, the Saucon Valley Conservancy is holding their 5th Annual Barn Tour. There's rack cards in the back.

**General Business & Developer Meeting
August 17, 2011**

- She said they finally got to schedule the slate roof workshop. That's going to be held on September 17th from 9 AM to 3 PM; rain date is September 24th.
- She said they had the Saucon Valley Partnership last Wednesday and there was no quorum. They just talked about lots of different things. Ed Inghrim said he saw County workers working on Meadows Road Bridge. If you recall several meetings ago, they had the County representative, Tom Koehler, report on the bridges of Northampton County. They asked the County to contact Mr. deGruchy for the lime water method of repairing old bridges, and she guesses they haven't done that yet. They asked if they could try to get in touch with him and fix it. Fixing it with Portland Cement is not fixing the bridge. They are wasting tax money.
- She said on August 16th, she attended the funeral service for Officer Robert Lasso. It's a terrible tragedy.

D. SOLICITOR – Absent

E. ENGINEER – No report

F. PLANNER – No report

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for adjournment. The time was 9:45 PM.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

Submitted by:

Jack Cahalan
Township Manager

Glenn C. Kern
President of Council