

I. OPENING

CALL TO ORDER: The General Business & Developer meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Wednesday, December 6, 2006, 7:24 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. Glenn Kern, Council President, presiding.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ANY EXECUTIVE SESSION (IF APPLICABLE)

Mr. Kern said Council did meet in Executive Session prior to tonight's meeting for some performance reviews, litigation issue and personnel issues.

PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Kern said for citizen agenda items – Council operates under Robert's Rules. What that means is during agenda items, Council will talk amongst themselves and amongst staff and the interested parties. At the conclusion of that, we open it up to the public for public comment. There is an opportunity for non-agenda items at the end of the meeting to discuss whatever your business might be. We do have a microphone and there are microphones up at the table. There is a sign-in sheet in the back of the room. Please print your name and address and email address. It is very helpful in transcribing the minutes. For those who want to receive emailed agendas, please give your email address to Diane, Leslie, or Jack or call the Township office. Please state your name and address. If you can't hear, please let us know. Mr. Kern asked if anything was taken off the agenda this evening? Mr. Cahalan said item IV E was taken off.

II. PRESENTATIONS/HEARINGS

None

III. DEVELOPER ITEMS

A. ZONING HEARING BOARD

1. T-MOBILE NORTHEAST – 1462 E. UNIVERSITY AVENUE – REQUEST VARIANCE FROM SETBACKS TO CONSTRUCT 72' COMMUNICATION POLE AND EQUIPMENT CABINETS

Mr. Kern said the applicant is proposing to install a 72' communications tower on a wooden pole and is seeking several variances.

Present – Attorney Erich J. Schock. Attorney Schock said a few months ago, the proposal is now located on a different property as there were issues with height, the location, etc. They attempted to heed Council's advice in finding a site. They are still constrained by the fact that the areas where there is land which would perfectly meet their needs, are not in the

area that they can place this facility to serve the gap that they have. They've come back with a shorter pole, which is wooden and will resemble a telephone or PPL structure and is at a height of 72'. There are wooden poles in the neighborhood which are 35' to 45' and trees which are 70' to 80' feet. Height wise, they are doing what they can to blend in. They need zoning relief, primarily the setback. The parcel they found is only 36' wide. They could not meet the setbacks. They need setback variance for the cabinets also, but probably less of a concern than the larger setback deviation they need for the structure itself. They will revise the plan to comply with the parking spaces, etc, and will put on those items or clarify with notes on the plan. The only thing they will have to investigate is the question of the impervious coverage in the woodlands. They came in to Council to get feedback like last time they were here.

Mr. Chris Milotich, an independent consultant with T-Mobile was present. He said they were before the Council for a different site. A request of the Council at that time was they should look for something shorter, wooden, and better designed to fit in with the wooded nature of this area. He found a parcel that does have tall existing trees, PPL lines running up and down the street, and they designed a pole that was significantly shorter and much better placed. The nature of the parcel is on the narrow side and does not meet the setbacks. There are no other parcels that would meet their criteria that are leaseable in this area. The City of Bethlehem told them they would not be interested in leasing to them anything around their star. They are in the R40 zone with the site they described.

Mr. Birdsall asked if this parcel was owned by one of the adjoining parcel owners? Mr. Milotich said yes, the parcel is owned by the same landowner that is directly east of this. The parcel he has the house on is actually much bigger than the parcel in question and has a residence on it. Mr. Birdsall said why would it be shown as a separate parcel of land then? Mr. Milotich said it is two separate tax parcels. Mr. Birdsall said the flag stone walkway, is that a new flag stone walkway to get service to your tower? Mr. Milotich said there is a barn that the adjacent parcel has. There is an existing flag walkway that goes to the side of the barn and they are proposing to extend it slightly to reach to the adjacent parcel and reach their compound. Mr. Birdsall said the gate before the compound would be off of that flagstone walk? Mr. Milotich said that is correct. Mr. Birdsall said your service vehicles would come in his driveway as a cross easement? Mr. Milotich said that is correct. Mr. Birdsall said you wouldn't need a separate driveway off of Village Lane? Mr. Milotich said the ingress/egress is provided for in the lease agreement that we have with that landowner. Mr. Birdsall said would you and the landowner be willing to merge that with a consolidation deed so we don't have a separate piece of land that is really non-conforming. Mr. Milotich said he'd be happy to discuss that with the landlord.

Mrs. deLeon said all four sides of the property do not meet the fall zone? Mr. Milotich said that's his understanding. Mr. Birdsall said if they own the parcel together, there is a certain direction, maybe 40 degrees, that it may meet the fall zone on the one side. Mrs. deLeon said you made a comment that you were to meet the criteria, but you couldn't find any leaseable properties. Does that mean the people would not lease to you? Mr. Milotich said the larger properties that would have sufficient space to meet a setback are exclusively owned by the City of Bethlehem in the area to the east. Mr. Birdsall said it's a little hard to see on the one map where the pole would be placed relative to all the structures. Directly to the east, there is a one story framed garage that would be within the 72'. From the pole over to the framed garage, approximately what is that distance? Mr. Milotich said it would be under 40'. Mr. Birdsall said how about directly to the south that would be the existing house? Mr. Milotich said slightly over 80'. Mr. Birdsall said the closest house to the west? Mr. Milotich said that would be about 80'.

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

Mr. Maxfield said can we review what you said about the direction you got from Council last time, specifically the wooden pole for one. Mr. Milotich said he believes the suggestion given to him was perhaps Council would consider something that's smaller and better designed to fit into the wooded nature of this area. It was his interpretation that a wooden pole blends in with the existing PPL poles and the trees in the area, and he apologizes that he made a mischaracterization. Mr. Maxfield said our main objection was the fall zone and the safety issue and the fact that the fall zone encompassed part of 378 and several of the houses in the area. We still seem to have that sort of problem, especially with the neighbor who is not the property owner. Mr. Birdsall said it may be 72' back from the street. Attorney Schock said it's 74' on the plan. Mrs. deLeon said it was supposed to be 1-1/2 times. Attorney Schock said presuming the distances are correct, and presuming it would collapse, it would exceed the height of the structure. The ordinance says 1-1/2 times, but there are probably more ordinances that require a 1 to 1. Mrs. deLeon said we are talking about LST ordinance. She was very involved when they formulated and passed this ordinance and that was very, very important to them about the fall zone. Mr. Maxfield said we always considered that part of the array, it may break off and go flying as the pole collapsed, so they were adamant about the 1-1/2 times. Mrs. deLeon said a lot of thought was put into this ordinance.

Attorney Schock said if you had a wind that was going to take this down, you'd have a lot more damage from the 70' trees and other things before this actually went down. Mrs. deLeon said we didn't approve those trees, they grew there naturally.

Mr. Kern said the main issue tonight is what Mr. Maxfield brought up, which was the last time our main objection was not so much aesthetics as it was the fall zone issue, and has anything improved with this plan regarding that issue. Mrs. Yerger said we still have a property that falls well within the fall zone to the west which is a risk. Mr. Birdsall said he would say the biggest improvement was that the prior one would have fallen on to 378 and possibly create a lot of traffic problems and safety problems. To that extent, there is an improvement. Mrs. deLeon said this is the first wooden pole cell tower, do you coat that with something? Mr. Milotich said they do use laminated poles. He doesn't know the life of the poles, but he'd be happy to research it. They have a 29 year lease, and they would not accept a pole that has a life expectancy less than that. Mrs. deLeon said if this is approved, it will be here for 29 years? Mr. Milotich said that is what the term of the lease is. If the site is no longer needed or required, they are obligated to under the lease to remove it below foundation. They have to remove it if it is not being used. It is in compliance with the ordinance. Mr. Kern said what options are left is we opposed this? Mr. Milotich said there are no parcels that have enough space to meet the setbacks required by the ordinance. Attorney Treadwell asked if they talked to our Zoning Officer about that – existing structures that you might be able to mount something on top of? Mr. Milotich said there are PPL poles in the area – none that have the required height they need. They have had extensive negotiations and discussions with PPL and they have not offered any wooden distribution poles to them, although they do have a master agreement in place with PPL to make use of their metal transmission towers. PPL is kind of hesitant to summarize their position. They have an email from PPL stating clearly they will not consider leasing them a wooden pole in the area. They had a pole picked out that they pursued with them and he has an email stating that they are not going to lease that site to them.

Mrs. deLeon said do other areas like Verizon or your competitors service that area? Mr. Milotich said absolutely. There are other carriers that have this area in their service area. Mrs. deLeon said how come you have a pole and they have it covered? Mr. Milotich said each carrier has a slightly different technology that affects their footprint. He does not have an intimate knowledge of the other carrier's network. It does not mean that they do not have weakness in this area, he just couldn't give testimony one way or the other. It

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

could be that they do, and they simply do not have the budget or desire to build right now. He doesn't have knowledge of their footprint. Attorney Schoch said if you took ten towers and put every carrier on each of those ten, you wouldn't have the same service from each of those carriers just because you were all in the same place. Mr. Milotich said this wooden pole certainly can be designed to hold other carriers as well. Mrs. deLeon said our ordinance requires it. Mr. Horiszny asked if they have measurements to the other various buildings in the area from the pole site? Attorney Schoch said they don't have permission to go on other people's property to take exact measurements, although there is an overview provided on Z1 which should be to scale. It was roughly 40' to the barn and 80' to the two houses. It's scaled off 74' to the street at the edge of the property.

Mr. Kern said it is an improvement. No residents were present that lived west or south of the pole. The neighbors got notices for the ZHB and they will probably show up there if they are interested. Attorney Schoch said the property is 36' wide. Mr. Maxfield has a hard time not opposing this due to the safety issue. There are not sign offs from any of the neighbors. All the houses fall within the setback. Attorney Treadwell said there is notice required to the property owners for the ZHB. Mr. Maxfield said if you are putting another person's home within the fall zone, that you would definitely want to speak to them and get their okay. Attorney Schoch said they have one other thought which they would propose to try to put this down to 60' and then redesign other sites in the area. It would put them a lot closer to the fall zone from the houses. Then they will be 1-1/3. Mr. Maxfield said if it went down to 60', they could take a no position and the ZBH then could decide. Mrs. Yerger said that at least gives some cushion between the house to the west and the house to the south. Attorney Schoch said they will put it to 60' and they will maximize those two to the extent they can shift a little. They'll move it towards the owner's property. We'll put whatever we can do. They'll cushion the other two if they have the ability to do that. Mr. Maxfield said they are not going to meet the setbacks no matter what. This is a matter of whether somebody is in the fall zone or not. Then the ZHB should really decide from that point on as long as we're clear that somebody's house is not going to be in danger.

MOTION BY: Mr. Kern moved to take no position provided the applicant provides documentation that the pole will decrease in size to 60' and that if it's possible, to shift the location of the pole to minimize the fall zone implications. It would have to be submitted prior to the ZHB. Council would like the condition to include the consolidation of the merger of the lots and that they explore it.

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

2. **SCOTT & KRISTEN STOLL – 2060 CHARLES DRIVE – REQUEST VARIANCE FROM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE REQUIREMENTS TO CONSTRUCT DECKING AROUND POOL**

Mr. Kern said the applicant is proposing to construct decking and landscaping that will exceed the maximum allowable impervious surfaces around a recently constructed pool. They are seeking relief of 2.8%.

Scott Stoll, applicant, was present. They are applying for a variance on the ordinance to put decking around their pool. In April of 2006, Barry Bartokovits filed for a permit and it was granted to put a pool in their backyard. The construction of the pool was then started and in April, they also applied under Atlantic Ridge for a permit to put landscaping, and eventually decking around the pool. The first application was denied. Changes were then made, and they were working under the premise of the ordinance of .25% to reduce the

impervious surface to under .25%. There was a second application that was made and there was a response from the Zoning Officer, and again, changes were made on the plan to accommodate the ordinance of .25%. Document C is a memo from HEA regarding the impervious surface and the allowable disturbance of the land and the impervious surface. The pool was completed in July 2006. In September 2006, based upon recommendations from HEA, a second survey was taken of their property and it was after the second survey and recalculation of their property, slopes and woodlands that they were notified the impervious surface could be no more than 350 square feet around the pool. Our initial plan was 1700 square feet of impervious surface. Based upon the new site plan, they reduced that down to 991 square feet which is a small amount of decking around the pool and steps coming down from their driveway around the pool. Mrs. Yerger said after all this, you are still over. You were saying numbers that she's not seeing. Mr. Stoll said No. 13 is correct on the July 14, 2006 map. Mrs. deLeon said you realize that if this is granted and your 2.8% over, you really are limited in the future. Mr. Stoll said they absolutely realize that. Mr. Horiszny asked if they checked on impervious surfaces for under the decking and paver surfaces? Mr. Stoll said after talking with Chris, the area under the deck, because the deck is considered impervious, it's already included in the impervious surface, so that area they won't be able to work with. Mr. Birdsall said that would be accurate for zoning purposes for the purposes of trying to minimize your footprint impact, the ZHB might be willing to consider the permeable or impermeable nature of the type of deck you use or the type of paver. That's really more the question that is being asked right now. Mr. Birdsall asked if there is a difference between what you are calling a deck and what you are calling a patio? Mr. Stoll said we have a deck coming out from their second story and then the area underneath the deck is part of the patio. The patio for the pavers comes out from under the deck and around the pool. Mr. Birdsall said there are probably pavers under the deck already. Mr. Stoll said there are not pavers under the deck, but they intend to follow the footprint of the deck. The type of pavers they are using are a concrete block paver, only 5% of water is going to get into the ground. It's basically like poured concrete, but just decorative. Mr. Kern said are you suggesting that if that was an alternative material, it might be more beneficial. Mr. Birdsall said they wouldn't necessarily improve the technical zoning aspect of the decision of the Zoning Office, but they might be able to prove to Council and the ZHB that the patio is slightly more forgiving than concrete, and get the 5% reabsorption up to 20% reabsorption or more. Mr. Kern asked what would an alternate material be other than concrete? Mr. Stoll said there are pervious pavers that grass grows up in between, but it's really not ideal for around the pool with four children with the amount of debris that could be taken into the pool. If that's our option as to what they have to do, then they'll explore those avenues and figure that out. They are asking for a four foot walkway around the pool, and three and four foot walkways to get from the lower level of the pool up to the driveway area just for traffic from the driveway coming down. They are not asking for any entertainment or lounge areas with this pool decking. They are building a fire pit for the kids. There are natural boulders there with catch basins and drains underneath it to redirect the water out from there into the yard. It is considered pervious. Mr. Garges said you could liken it to some of the rocky areas of the Township and actually they get some good perk areas for sand mounds in rockier type soils. That would qualify as permeable.

Mr. Horiszny said you looked at pervious pavers and they had a dirt problem. Would pervious concrete or pervious asphalt be a possible solution? Mr. Stoll said he's sure they would be, but aesthetically, he doesn't believe blacktop would work around the pool. The pervious pavers they have asked for to be considered were still considered impervious through the Township.

Mrs. Yerger said your 2% is 2%. It's not huge deal, but they've had other developments where your 2% adds up to the neighbor's 2% and the other neighbor's 2%, and so on, and

then we have this issue with storm water. The nice thing is you have a beautiful area as you are in the headwaters of the Cook's Creek. It's an EV stream, exceptional value, very few of them left anymore because of storm water issues. Your home is there, and one of the responsibilities of living in an area like that is you have to be responsible to the downstream property owners. She's having an issue granting the exception because, we as a Township have adopted the source water protection plan for the Cook's Creek watershed which your property falls into, so we're kind of going against the very thing we said we endorse. Mr. Stoll said they wouldn't be in front of you today if it was a matter of just applying a patio that's going over by the 2.8%. They are in front of you today because their pool is being granted a permit and there has to be some sort of a decking around the pool. The walking path isn't even around the full pool. If they were in front of you asking for 10 to 12 feet of entertainment area, he would understand you saying you wouldn't approve it, but the four feet of decking around the pool and the three and four foot walkways to just simply get access from an elevation change of 9 feet where the pool is to basically up to the top of the driveway just to get access from the driveway down to the pool into the back yard. He doesn't feel that's encroaching on being considered above and beyond what they should be an issue. He doesn't think they are asking for too much. They had no intention of over stepping ordinances, then with the pool being started and already completed, they were in a position where they had a pool in the back yard and then as things progressed, they learned in October after the pool had already been completed, the new ordinance only allowed them 350 square feet. Had he known this in the beginning, he probably would have not started the project because he couldn't have completed it reasonably. These are things that evolved over time. After the second survey, that's when it became known to them. It's more of a hardship position than an application for a variance in a new construction. Mr. Maxfield said when you talk hardship and you talk variance, you are also talking a part of the ordinance where it talks about the minimum relief. He agrees what Mrs. Yerger is saying. You are telling them things like a fire pit and you talked about 12 feet, but he sees part of the paver path that is eight feet wide. We'd really see this cut down as much as possible. This may be your dream, but it doesn't fall under minimum relief. Mrs. Yerger said there's constantly new materials being explored as far as porous pavers. You could explore some of those.

Mr. Stoll said would pervious pavers then be considered? Mr. Kern said he would like to suggest that even though in the ordinance it says it is not considered part of it, that if they do go to pervious pavers, that we say it's okay. Mr. Maxfield said it would be like the last agenda item where we would let the ZHB decide that and take no position. It would have to be a material that is recognized as pervious. It would make a significant difference. Mr. Stoll said in talking about minimum relief, where would that fall? 350' is going to be narrow and limit them pretty much, but what is considered minimum? Mr. Maxfield said he'd think the type of construction that accomplished exactly what you said the goals were earlier on which was to keep things out of the pool, to provide for a walkway around the pool. Mr. Stoll said just bring it down to a more reasonable level. Mr. Maxfield said yes. We have definitely sat here and listened to people from Leithsville, and our obligation is to make sure these people aren't under any more water than they have to be. If you could modify this to meet closer to the ordinance and use materials acceptable to us as pervious materials, that would definitely help and we'd be willing to put it in the hands of the ZHB and let them decide. Mr. Stoll said that sounds great. Attorney Treadwell said does the applicant agree to postpone the ZHB hearing until he can revise plans and come back to Council? Mr. Stoll said yes. He will talk to Chris tonight.

B. ORCHARD VIEW – ROAD – REQUEST FOR SECURITY REDUCTION

Mr. Kern said the developer has requested a reduction of their security for work completed to date. HEA has done an inspection and has authorized a release in the amount of \$55,274.40.

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Kern moved for approval of the security reduction, per staff recommendation, HEA letter, of November 29, 2006.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 5-0

C. TOLL BROS. – THE MEADOWS – EMERGENCY GATE AT STOVER ROAD

Mr. Kern said the Meadows Subdivision created a linkage of Stover Road from the dead end off Arden Lane through to the newly constructed Viola Lane. The record plan for the subdivision has a note that states that the location and type of gate will be determined by the LST Council if deemed necessary after Stover Road is constructed.

Mr. Cahalan said this was something the Zoning Officer brought up at the staff level. He was talking to the Se-Wy-Co Fire Chief about the emergency access and they wanted to bring it to Council for your consideration. They did give Council information from Chief Lesser and Tom Barndt from Se-Wy-Co. Mr. Kern said this issue had been discussed at great length years ago and Council's position was very clear that there was to be a gate at Stover Road and he sees no reason to have that changed at this point. The purpose of the gate was that the creation of Stover Road was at question and not even have Stover Road in existence. There were discussions back and forth and the fact that Stover Road is there creates an east-west thoroughfare which is actually against our ordinances of introducing a new thoroughfare into an existing development. The compromise was that, yes, there would be a Stover Road, but there would be a gate to prevent that. His position hasn't changed over the years.

Mrs. deLeon said legally, we have an approved plan. We have a note on the plan. How would we be able to change that? Attorney Treadwell said the gate would be determined by LST Council if deemed necessary after Stover Road is constructed. Now it's been constructed and it's up to this Council to decide. Mr. Kern said it would be a great opportunity to test the new Knox box system. Mr. Maxfield said why don't we leave gate type and lock type to the emergency services and let them decide what would be the best to suit their needs.

Mrs. deLeon said would it be a Township gate or a development gate? Mr. Birdsall said it's tied into the development, so if you give the signal and we know what to do, we can pass the word back to the developer for the installation. He doesn't believe there's a HOA. The operation and maintenance would be the Townships. The installation would be the developer. If it is approved, it would not be for this winter. Mrs. deLeon said there was a parking issue and why the fire company didn't want this, would we have to put up no parking signs? Mr. Cahalan said we'd have to take care of all of that and enforce it. Mrs. deLeon said maintenance of the Knox boxes, do they in 29 years wear out, and then it would be a Township cost to replace the Knox boxes. Attorney Treadwell said correct. Mrs. deLeon said do we have any requirements of the fire companies – do they go and check these keys or would it be a public works thing? Mr. Cahalan said it would be the fire company to make sure it works. Public Works and the Fire Company both need keys. Mrs. deLeon asked if we have a list of all the gates that require keys? Mr. Cahalan said we have a list and the Fire Companies know where the gates are. He knows where they are, but doesn't know if it's in a prepared list. Mrs. deLeon asked Mr. Cahalan to do that and make sure the road crews know this so those areas are taken care of. He said okay. Mrs. deLeon said did we talk about putting those pavers where the grass goes up through? Mr. Birdsall said in this case, it was to be fully paved and fully curbed. That was the final decision on this section. On the other side of the street, if you took Stover through, there was some discussion about whether there would be a walkway or a pathway or grass pavers. It is already paved. Mr. Kern said the fire company also was discussing the break away gate as a fail safe. Mr. Maxfield said there is no parking at all on

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

Stover Road on the sides of the roads. It would be probably better if we didn't encourage any parking on the road. Mr. Cahalan said he can recommend that and do some research on it.

Stephanie Brown, resident, said she can't just trust your judgment, Mr. Kern. She needs some understanding of what was decided years ago about this. These are public roads, how can you put a gate on a public road? Mr. Kern said the reason was because there was lengthy discussion and compromise reached because the creation of Stover Road created a major east-west transportation point throughout the Township. What that means is it violates one of the ordinances which says not to do that. You're creating a major thoroughfare into an existing neighborhood. It's not just to feed the neighborhood. It's a transition point from the eastern part to the western part. It's going to create traffic tremendously on Stover Road and Old Mill Road. Old Mill Road and Stover Road was not designed to handle that increase of traffic, so part of the discussion years ago was that the Council said there wouldn't be any Stover Road. It's a stub road now, and it just won't be completed. The Fire Company didn't like that idea and Council was ready to support that. As a compromise, the gate was suggested and endorsed about four years ago. Mr. Maxfield said when the plan was approved, it was approved with a gate drawn in. Ms. Brown said it was supposed to be a straight road and wasn't part of the original plan for the Wagner Farm development. Mr. Kern said it was part of the plan that was under discussion at the time of the gate. Ms. Brown said she doesn't want to see any more traffic on Stover Road, but with the traffic on Meadow's Road, she can't understand how Council has taken this position. Mr. Kern said it's for your benefit. Mrs. deLeon said can you imagine the traffic. Mr. Kern said this is for your benefit. Ms. Brown said and yours. Mr. Kern said why are you fighting this if it's to your benefit. Ms. Brown said she's not sure it is to her benefit because a lot of traffic is going to come down Meadow's Road. Is Old Mill Road not signed as a dead end road because it goes nowhere. Mr. Kern said it's signed as no outlet right now. Ms. Brown said she complained for months about problems with the roads and the development and they are not even public roads, but one of the problems is the stop sign where she lives. She's going to get the impact either way. Mr. Kern said this has no impact on him, it's not down his road. It doesn't go past his road. Mr. Maxfield said it doesn't go past his house and Glenn was on Council at that time, but he didn't do it for himself. Mr. Kern said they did it because this room had 25 people saying don't do it. Mr. Maxfield said don't make something out of this that it's not. It'd kind of evident. Ms. Brown said you don't live there. Mr. Maxfield said he sees the general wisdom in this too, and it doesn't affect him personally. Ms. Brown said she watched 12 times tractor trailers going over Meadows Road bridge the month of October. She couldn't call the police as by the time she would be able to get outside and get the plate, etc., the truck was gone. Mr. Kern said you need to call the police. Continue calling the police.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to propose that we okay a gate there with the emergency services having the final say on the type of gate and lock that are applied.

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

D. FRIEDENBERG LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT – 1334 SEIDERSVILLE ROAD & 1404 ILLES LANE – REQUEST EXTENSION TO MEET CONDITIONS

Mr. Kern said the applicant has requested an extension to complete the conditions of approval.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved to approve the request for the extension for 90 days.

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

IV. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS

A. PUBLIC HEARING AND ADOPTION – ORDINANCE 2006-12 – TO PROVIDE A STOP SIGN ON WHITEACRE DRIVE

Mr. Kern said Ordinance 2006-12 has been prepared and advertised for adoption of an amendment to the Vehicles and Traffic Code to provide for the addition of traffic sign at Whiteacre Drive and Bingen Road.

Mr. Cahalan said you did approve this once before, but it wasn't advertised by the newspapers, so they are asking that it be redone. It was advertised in the November 20 and 28 editions of the Express Times.

MOTION BY: Mr. Kern moved to open the hearing for adoption of ordinance 2006-12.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

Mrs. deLeon said in the ordinance was never approved and never went anywhere, what if someone sees it ten years from now? Attorney Treadwell said when we send it to the codification people, the previous ordinance which is not adopted, will just have a line through it saying it does not exist. We need a motion to rescind that previous ordinance.

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

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Ms. Brown said why is the Township paying to put stop signs up on private roads? Mr. Cahalan said we're asking the HOA to pay for the stop sign. Mrs. deLeon said we should go through the background to this ordinance. Mr. Cahalan said they were approached by the residents of Whiteacre Drive to erect a stop sign at Whiteacre and Bingen Road. Council agreed to that and Police did a study and recommended that the stop sign be erected since it goes out onto a highway. It was brought before Council with that recommendation. The cost of the sign is between \$75 and \$80, and that cost will be billed to the HOA. Council agreed back in May 2006 to adopt this ordinance and we went through the normal advertising process, but for whatever reason, it didn't get in the papers and wasn't valid. What we're now doing is we're doing this over so the ordinance will be valid. It hadn't been advertised properly. Mrs. deLeon said as a result of that meeting, we directed our Manager to come up with a policy. Ms. Brown said you advertise in the Express Times, but people claim they don't see this stuff and want to know why we don't advertise in the Morning Call, other than cost. Attorney Treadwell said if we advertise it in the Morning Call, then we'll have other people saying why didn't you put it in the Express Times. We will now do it in the Morning Call. Mrs. deLeon said you can get your name on an email list and you'll be notified on a regular basis about things like this.

ROLL CALL: 5-0

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to rescind Ordinance 2006-02.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of Ordinance 2006-12.

SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

B. RESOLUTION 62-2006 – ADOPTING LEHIGH VALLEY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

Mr. Kern said the Lehigh and Northampton County Emergency Management offices in partnership with the LV Planning Commission drafted the “Hazard Mitigation Plan – Lehigh Valley, PA” which addresses natural hazards that can impact the two counties.

**LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP
RESOLUTION #62-2006
RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE
HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN LEHIGH VALLEY, PA, JULY 2006**

WHEREAS, Section 322 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Stafford Act), 42 U.S.C. 5165, enacted under paragraph 104 of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, establishes a new requirement for local hazard mitigation plans in an effort to reduce natural disaster losses; and

WHEREAS, Section 322 requires local governments to have an approved local mitigation plan to be eligible to receive grants under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program; and

WHEREAS, Lehigh and Northampton Counties are vulnerable to a range of natural disasters such as flooding, winter storms, sinkholes, droughts and tornadoes; and

WHEREAS, Lehigh and Northampton Counties recognize the need for hazard mitigation planning to help protect the health, safety and welfare of Lehigh Valley residents; and

WHEREAS, partnerships with all levels of government, the private sector and the residents of Lehigh and Northampton Counties can reduce the impact of future events through hazard mitigation planning; and

WHEREAS, Lehigh and Northampton Counties, Lehigh and Northampton County Emergency Management Agencies and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission joined efforts to create a draft April 2006 regional hazard mitigation plan with July 2006 revisions based on municipal/public comments and preliminary Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency review; and

WHEREAS, Lehigh and Northampton Counties have adopted the July 2006 plan; and

WHEREAS, the governing body of Lower Saucon Township recognizes its responsibility in adopting the regional plan and implementing the actions defined in the plan for the protection of its residents.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Council of Lower Saucon Township hereby adopts the *Hazard Mitigation Plan Lehigh Valley, PA July 2006*.

ADOPTED and ENACTED this 6th day of December, 2006.

Mr. Cahalan said this plan was put together by the Emergency Management offices in Lehigh and Northampton Counties and with the assistance of the LVPC. They asked each of the

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

municipalities in those two counties to identify areas in the counties that were subject to natural types of disasters like floods, and so on. The idea on this is to come up with a plan to identify these areas and have a mitigation strategy to be proactive as far as addressing those in the future. We were asked to contribute the areas we felt were the most viable and Mr. Birdsall prepared the documents. There's 13 areas that were listed in LST that were the most susceptible and they were put in the plan and that's been out for several months. The Northampton County Emergency Management office is asking us to formally adopt this plan. Once that is done, it'll be in affect and that's one of the key items we need in order to request funding for FEMA.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of Resolution 62-2006 – adopting Lehigh Valley Hazard Mitigation Plan.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 5-0

C. POLK VALLEY PARK – APPROVAL OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION

Mr. Kern said Council will review the recommendations of the Township Engineer to determine if the landscaping stage of the contract with Popple Construction is substantially complete.

Mr. Birdsall said this summer has been full of activities in trying to get the contractor to seed in the spring and then reseed in the fall. We now feel that between the work he's done and the grass that has grown, even though there are still some punch list items, we are recommending a substantial completion of the landscaping so that the maintenance period can start on that aspect of the project. That does require Council action. Attorney Treadwell said it's subject to continuing negotiations with Popple regarding the maintenance period. Mr. Maxfield said they've noticed at the park there are areas being mowed, cut, and there are areas that they would not liked cut. It would be the south meadow up above the southern end of the property that was planned for a wild flower meadow. Also, the wetland, and south of the wetland area, which would be the highest wetland, to the west of that wild flower area. Also, the small triangular area down near the creek where we had previously done plantings. Those are areas that could go without mowing right now. Attorney Treadwell said they will include that in their negotiation.

- MOTION BY:** Mrs. deLeon moved for approval with the condition as stated above by Attorney Treadwell.
- SECOND BY:** Mrs. Yerger
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 5-0

D. DRAFT STORMWATER ORDINANCE – AUTHORIZE ADVERTISEMENT FOR PUBLIC HEARING FOR ADOPTION

Mr. Kern said a draft storm water ordinance has been prepared for Council's review and if it is the desire of Council they can authorize advertisement for a public hearing and consideration of adoption at a future meeting.

Mr. Birdsall said over the last five years, they made amendments to the storm water section of the ordinance trying to keep ahead of the curve with regard to changing technology and changing regulations. The LVPC now has caught up with themselves and he got their blessing of Act 167 plan for all the municipalities outside of the Little Lehigh Watershed. They had previously recommended that Council adopt most of the regulations that are in that plan as it was being processed. Township Council has gone a little bit beyond and been a little more restrictive in a couple of areas, but the LVPC never finalized their work product. Now they have finalized it and

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

it has gone through the process with Lehigh County getting approval and Northampton County giving approval. It has gone to DEP and now has received DEP's approval. It is now back on the desk of every municipality in the area except for the Townships in the Little Lehigh Watershed. As the official document, that is our watershed plan for areas outside the Cooks Creek Watershed. We as a Township and council have to adopt regulations that are substantially compatible with that which we already have. We are looking at the new plan and ordinance that was just issued. They talked to staff and incorporated them into a draft ordinance and they are now ready for distribution for public input.

Mr. Birdsall said this ordinance is the first step in setting the stage for some subdivision and land development regulation changes and some lot grading plan regulations. A year and a half ago, they revisited SALDO and little things like requiring super pave as opposed to ID2 since there is a change in the industry for paving. There were some changes in pipe character to get away from the metal pipe. Those changes are also being brought into this storm water management ordinance if they have impacted storm water. This is the first step. There is a draft SALDO amendment that will be coming along probably at the next Council meeting to address the removal of storm water into this, to make minor technical changes, and get ready for a much more global change to the SALDO which will be occurring probably next year. The third leg of this triangle for storm water management will be an amendment we have drafted for removing storm water management regulations from the lot grading ordinance. When somebody looks for storm water management regulations, they will always go to look at one ordinance. The SALDO ordinance will require every subdivision and land development to follow the storm ordinance. The lot grading ordinance will be greatly reduced in size and refer to the storm water management ordinance for one central location. Right now because of the way things have happened over the years, we've got that all cleaned up now and it's all one ordinance. We're in a position to recommend approval. There is a section dealing with Cook's Creek. It's one document that covers everything.

Mr. Maxfield said the EAC did review this last night and were very impressed by it. What was really nice as well as meeting the requirements that Mr. Birdsall was talking about earlier, the new things coming from DEP. It also met a lot of the things that we've been talking about at Council like moving the detention ponds away from the road, water dumping on to adjacent properties, etc. We voted unanimously to recommend it to Council for advertisement. Mrs. Yerger said they really did a great job.

Mrs. deLeon said this document from the LVPC talks about the Saucon Creek, years ago we did one, this is what they are amending? Mr. Birdsall said that's what they are amending. If you remember when they started the Act 167 process years ago, it was storm water rates only and it was only the Saucon. Then they did the other watersheds in the Township and eventually they covered all the Townships except Cook's Creek. That's all in here also. Mrs. deLeon said back in the late 1980's, Judy and Mrs. deLeon wrote a letter to LVPC and asked to get Saucon Creek up on the priority list of the watersheds to be done because of the sinkhole prone areas in the Township. Mrs. Yerger said one of the key components of this is addressing the water quality. Mr. Birdsall said now we have a full comp plan.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Kern moved to authorize for advertisement for public hearing for adoption of the draft storm water ordinance.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 5-0

E. ORDINANCE TO VACATE EDWARD STREET – AUTHORIZE ADVERTISEMENT

Taken off the agenda.

F. **KINGSTON PARK – REVISED SKETCH PLAN**

Mr. Kern said Rick Tralies Township Planner, will review with Council the revisions to the Kingston Park conceptual sketch plan that incorporates the recommendations from the first presentation of the plan at the October 18, 2006 council meeting.

Mr. Tralies said the summary pretty much says it. Judy Stern Goldstein was here a few months ago with a previous sketch plan and you gave her a list of recommendation changes you would like to see. There is a plan in front of you now that addresses all of those suggestions.

The first suggestion was to revise the trail system layout so there was no trail between the Lutz Franklin Schoolhouse and Country Side Lane. They reworked the trail system to go around the back of the schoolhouse between the hedge row and the schoolhouse. They were also asked to locate the remains of a historic cooking area. They found that within a hedge row that is shown on the plan. They were asked to locate some other existing features that we didn't get the first time including the remains of the historic slate fence, existing benches, existing sign, and the existing remains of the historic gateway out front of the schoolhouse. They also reduced the width of the paths overall to six feet except in a few areas, one of which being where the pathway runs behind the school next to the proposed restroom facilities. That pathway remained at a 10 foot width in order to get access for maintenance vehicles to the restroom facilities. They kept the pathway at an eight foot width around the school bus parking area due to the fact that if a school bus is pulling in, the front of the bus could over hang the path. The final change was to relocate the historic weigh station. It's at a path way near the driveway entrance. The thought of putting it there was so that when someone enters the site through that driveway, they'll see the weigh station, go past it, park and then they can come back to it on foot. Mrs. deLeon said you were supposed to put proposed relocated weigh station. Mr. Tralies said they will put it on. Mrs. deLeon said where it says existing utility shed, that's there now. It's off the property line. Mr. Tralies said this site hasn't been surveyed yet. Everything could be slightly off.

Mr. Maxfield asked about the materials to be used on the pathways? Mr. Tralies said they would all be the same materials. That's something that can be addressed when it comes down to budget issues. He's always imagined the pathways would be asphalt, at least the section behind the school where you need to get access to the restroom facilities with maintenance vehicles.

Barbara Ryan said she is going to respond to the plan on behalf on Dr. Kingston and his wife, Leslie. They had many meetings with Dr. Kingston. He donated the land to the Township with the intention it would work with the Lutz Franklin Schoolhouse. She read his letter. "Dear Council Members. After reviewing the most recent sketch plan for the park and schoolhouse area, we have the following concerns. The proposed bus turn around and parking occupies far too much of the park. It is the major feature of the acreage, when in fact, our vision is for a memorial park with contemplated features and abundant open space. It is our hope to have gardens consisting of wild flowers and foliage that attract butterflies which my mother loved dearly. A more appropriate parking area and bus turn around should include parking closer to the hedge line along Limpar Lane eliminating the circular turn around and formal garden and creating an exit on Limpar Lane. Perhaps angle parking can help reduce the area needed for parking and bus loading and unloading. An ideal location for restrooms would be west of the hedge row and south of the path leading from the park to the schoolhouse. In keeping with the historic nature of the schoolhouse property, we favor eliminating the roads behind and west of the schoolhouse as well as the north pathway to the pavilion. In closing, we thank you very much for allowing us the opportunity to revise the plan and suggest these changes. We would be happy to meet with the planners. Very truly yours, Rick and Leslie Kingston".

Ms. Ryan said there is one Eagle Scout project underway. This Eagle Scout troop is going to be recreating one of the original outhouses. That will be completed by the end of summer 2007.

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

They have proposed restrooms, almost in the exact spot as the outhouse. It would be nice not to have restrooms at all on the Lutz Franklin property and to keep them on the park area. Her recommendation is that you leave the Lutz Franklin half acre in tact and try not to chop it up with pathways, macadam, and gravel, whatever. We don't need all these pathways as they would serve no purpose. When they come to service the porta potties, the trucks all come through the front where there is an existing dirt worn path so they wouldn't come around the back and then back up into Countryside Lane. That's what the 10 foot proposed emergency and utility access would involve. Mr. Kern said where did Dr. Kingston and you suggest where the restrooms be? Ms. Ryan said if you look on the map, you see where the southwest corner is on that track, with hedges in front of it, and a path that leads from the circle towards the pavilion going east. There's an area in there and we propose the restrooms be off that path. That would give you equal distance from parking and the Lutz Franklin schoolhouse. You'd have access on a path for visitors from the schoolhouse right through the tree line. The natural opening is higher up where they have the stone summer kitchen. We have another proposal for an Eagle Scout project and they could recreate the second outhouse. There were two outhouses on the property – one for the boys and one for the girls. We would eventually move the shed which shouldn't be there anyway. We have 12 years left with our agreement with PHMC to have any site disturbances approved by that organization. Even though Council may approve this plan, anything you do on that ½ acre is subject to notifying PHMC, getting their input and working with them. They also want to utilize the three school bells they have in their collection. They'd like to do a bell sculpture garden with benches, areas for meditation. The garden is in the middle of a bus circle right now. A quote by Mrs. Kingston, "It's supposed to be a memorial garden, and it's a parking lot".

Ms. Ryan said her personal feeling is that the plan lacks creativity. They don't see any contours to the parcel. It's flat, there are no berms, nothing creative about it. She'd like to see some use of the trails in an interesting way or shrubbery or something to use for the children that come to the schoolhouse. They do not have any direct jurisdiction to oversee the park, but they do appreciate Council giving them the input. Mr. Kern said he'd like to address the parking area with Mr. Tralies. Mr. Tralies said the turn around circle is the biggest part of the parking area. If you want bus access, you're not going to be able to have a small parking area. Yes, we can look at it and try to rework something. He can't give you bus access and a tiny parking lot. This is meant to be a very conceptual plan. They envision the landscaping and grading to happen as well. At this point, they don't have a survey of the property. They haven't prepared a formal landscape plan for the property. Ms. Ryan asked why they couldn't have a second entrance or exit on Limpar to eliminate the bus turn around. Mr. Tralies said that may be possible. He didn't think that two entrances would be something that the Township or the residents of Limpar Lane would want to see. His first thought that two accesses on Limpar lane would be something the Township wouldn't want. Ms. Ryan said they probably will have no more than one bus out there. The school occupancy is like 50. They can't bring in two busses. There won't be hundreds of people coming at one time. Mr. Kern asked if a bus could pull in and then just back up. Mr. Maxfield said you don't realize the grading and disturbance of putting another entrance on Limpar Lane. Mr. Lenny Szy, said he did go to 4th grade at Lutz Franklin and is working hard to get it back into a beautiful museum. He's also a school bus driver. There is state law saying with children aboard, you cannot back up, even in a parking lot. It's illegal. Mrs. deLeon said can a bus without children back out of a spot? Mr. Szy said that's possible. With the one inlet and outlet at the far end, if a bus is coming in, he's going to take up that whole road. If a cars coming out, there is trouble. In the woods line, cars could park on an angle, busses can be on the right side. The walkway that's coming around, the busses can stop right there, park and leave it there and still have more parking spots. His choice would be one inlet and one outlet and go through the tree row. Mr. Kern said it would certainly add more open space. Mrs. Yerger said we'd have to look at distance for line of sight. Mr. Szy said as a bus driver, the way it is now, going in and out would be very difficult and unacceptable. Mr. Birdsall said a road like this is really a dead end road. It wouldn't be a problem as far as the spacing. Mr. Maxfield said what kind of ordinances do we

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

have – if you put an inlet down on that side, a one way inlet that close to an intersection? Mr. Birdsall said they'd have to look at that, but the volume of traffic on Limpar is very, very small.

Mr. Tralies said the drawing that the Historic Society just handed him shows a sketch of a revised parking area that they had described coming in approximate the same area and continuing through the woods, near the end of the historic fence and the other historic pillar which is in the woods, and then continue in with angle parking on one side and a pull off for busses on the other side, then continuing back out where he has the driveway shown. It has some of the pathways scribbled out and their proposed location for the bathroom is shown over farther. One concern is it's a lot more tree removal than previously proposed. Mr. Maxfield said there will be some grading issues. Mr. Szy said if you do keep one inlet and outlet, it should be a lot lighter. Mr. Tralies said you should be able to get one bus in or out, but again, you wouldn't be able to pass a car. It sounds like you are pretty close in your assessment. The driveway he proposed is located where it is because there's an existing opening in the hedgerow there. If you move the driveway down, you are going to be cutting through the hedgerow and as Tom said, you are going to have some significant grading there. If you do a T shaped parking lot, you end up with two dead end parking areas. They never proposed dead end parking lots any more. Mrs. Yerger asked if the trees in the hedgerow are large or scrubby? Mr. Szy said there's a lot of large ones. Mr. Birdsall said one of the things that is good about the Boucher & James plan is the pedestrian access from the cars to the school can be made without crossing any traffic. If you look at Rick's plan, whether you're in a car or in a school bus, you can walk right over to the walkway and you can walk to the school and pavilion without ever crossing a lane of traffic. If you do a one way in and a one way out, and you put your cars on the tree row side, and the school bus on the right hand side, the school bus kids are okay, but those who come in a car would have to walk across the entrance driveway to get over to the school. Mr. Tralies will rework it with the alternate suggestions. Mrs. deLeon didn't like the 10 foot width going to the outhouses. If you relocate the outhouses, must the paths be wider? Mr. Tralies said yes. Mr. Birdsall said could you tuck the restroom up closer to the parking lot. Mr. Szy said right now the service trucks for the job johnnies come in on the lower side, drive around the front of the school, down along the side, and out the back. They cover the whole lawn.

Mike Karabin, said when they discussed this plan, the first thing he saw was the circular turn around and it just blew open space right out of his picture. If we put a driveway around which would make it a loop, cutting down some trees to him is part of keeping open space beautiful also. Making an entrance in and an exit through is far safer than any aspect he's hearing so far. In order to expedite the whole plan, he'd suggest the board form some kind of minor committee that could meet some nights with the architects or whoever is coming up with these plans to not waste your time at a board meeting. A committee could make a solid recommendation and bring it to the board and have substantial plans and visions. Mrs. deLeon would like to see a plan note that refers to the covenant from two years ago from PHMC. Ms. Ryan said as a representative from the LST Historical Society, She doesn't believe they've asked for the schoolhouse property to be altered. It's really fine the way it is. She'd like to have the kids have an authentic experience. There's something special to the approach to this building. It just transforms you back to Little House on the Prairie. It looks cluttered to her with that plan and takes away the integrity of the schoolhouse. We're doing fine for four years without these paths. Mrs. Yerger said the only thing is the handicapped. You have to address that. Ms. Ryan said absolutely, good point. When they redo the fence in 2007, you are going to see the slate fence will have about a 3 to 4 foot entry way where there was no gate, just a 3 foot opening that would allow two kids side by side to walk through to the school. That would be a natural place to put a path.

Mr. Maxfield asked if the Eagle Scout projects have been submitted to the Township? Ms. Ryan said Christine Ussler is working on the plans and will have them in January for review. The outhouses are a replica of the old outhouses. Mrs. Yerger said be very cautious with your bells and where you put them out to be exposed as there is a lot of vandalism. It's becoming an issue. Mr. Maxfield said he likes the pavilion. Ms. Ryan said they like that also so the children can have

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

lunch there. Mr. Kern said the ingress and egress with walking across the traffic, if it was one way that way, pointing to the map, could the bus negotiate that going in and then park on the right? Mr. Birdsall said there would be kids getting off on the wrong side. Mr. Kern said you could have the light flashing. Mr. Szy said in school areas, no one listens to those red lights and the stop signs. Mr. Kern said once they are in the parking lot, they've slowed down. Mr. Birdsall said that's a good point. These are great discussions.

Lorraine Torrella, President of the Historical Society, said she had a vision if the bus pulled in and there was a loading or unloading zone where it's a stop and it's covered and if the weather was bad or too sunny, those children would get out under a covered area and the bus would go and park itself. Mrs. Yerger said another thought, Barbara had said you do not have plans to have more than one bus, and that may be true right now, but as you move forward and may be reaching out to other districts, there might be when they run the entire 2nd grade class, don't they normally bring all of them at the same time? You might regret not having capacity for two busses in the future. Ms. Torrella said the SV School District addressed that and they have a morning tour and an afternoon tour. The bus goes out, brings the children, stays there, the children go through the classroom, and load up on the bus again, go back to the school and the next class comes in – two classes in one day. She'd like to have more children and busses there, but it's limited to only 50. Mr. Maxfield said you may have a bus going to the park and one going to the schoolhouse. Ms. Brown said you could have other schools coming in and that might be an issue there. Ms. Torrella said anything is possible. Mr. Szy said two busses could park there without any problem. A lot of times they do leave and come back later.

Ms. Brown said she has a question about the flagpole you are putting up. Ms. Torrella said there are no plans to put up a flagpole. It was a suggestion.

Mrs. deLeon said we were here entertaining ZHB applications for exceedance of impervious coverage, did anybody calculate to see how much impervious coverage there is here. Mr. Tralies said it was not calculated. Mr. Kern said Mr. Tralies has his work cut out for him. Mr. Maxfield said will you need to go back out to the site again? Mr. Tralies said yes. Mr. Maxfield said he'd like to go along and check out the tree line. Mr. Kern said he'd like to go and Mr. Szy said let them know, they'd like to go also.

G. REVIEW OF DRAFT EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK

Mr. Kern said the Township Manager will discuss with Council the draft handbook.

Mr. Cahalan said this has been on the list for sometime. It's a handbook that sets out most of the policies for employees and ranges from leave of absence all the way down to substance abuse and covers the various benefits that the employees have from the labor contracts, holidays, medical leave, and so on. They put this together with the help of the Labor Solicitor who reviewed it and made suggestion and comments, and it's out here for your review. After adopted, it will be given to each employee.

Mrs. deLeon said on page 7, the third paragraph, last sentence, "No candidate for Township office shall remain an employee of the Township". Is that fair to ask somebody as a candidate or do you want to say once elected somehow? Elected official could be put in there. Mr. Cahalan said he can check that out. Mrs. deLeon said on page 8, you talk about full time employees. The sentence starts off "regular full time employees are paid on an hourly or salaried basis bi-weekly for full time employment. It goes on to say full time employees shall be entitled to the benefits", but it doesn't distinguish whether they are regular or hourly or salaried. Mr. Cahalan said what that statement means is that both of those categories are full time employees. They took most of this language from the labor contract. Mrs. deLeon said the salaried employees are not covered by the labor contract. Mr. Cahalan said they can add salaried employees. Attorney Treadwell said you

should adopt it the first of next year to make it fair to everybody. We'll have to put this on the agenda again. Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments. No one raised their hand.

H. MARRA PROPERTY – 2551 QUARRY ROAD – AUTHORIZE RAZING OF UNSAFE STRUCTURE

Mr. Kern said Council will consider staff recommendations to raze an unsafe structure at 2551 Quarry Road. A Demolition Mitigation Report on the structure has been completed by Heritage Conservancy.

Mr. Cahalan said they brought this to Council last year and Council asked that we take action on this. It's an unsafe structure and been inspected by third party inspector. It's owned by an estate. The owner didn't make repairs. We're faced with action to remediate the problem and it will be razing the structure. Council directed us to get an agency to see if there could be any mitigation work. It's in the Redington Historic district. Heritage Conservancy went out and did a report and identified it as a chapel. Heritage Conservancy has completed what they asked them to do which was the mitigation steps. They have provided you with a demolition report which covers the use of the building and any of the historical architectural features on the building. They went out there to see if there were any architectural features that could be removed before it was demolished. They indicated the only features were lintels over the windows and they could be removed after the building was razed. That step has been completed. The other two steps are documenting and preparing an educational display which they will do. The third one is to place a metal marker at the location which contains information about the building. They are ready to knock the building down. They can do this in-house. They'll need ten 40 yard dumpsters and a couple of extra 30 ton dumpsters for a total cost of approximately \$11,000.

Attorney Treadwell talked to the attorney who represents the estate and the estate is willing to give the property to the Township and then we can do what we want with it. Do you want to actually take ownership of the property and then spend \$11,000 and knock it down or should we proceed and get a court to condemn it and give us an order to knock it down and then file a lien which we may or may not recover depending on what the property is worth or talk to the neighbors and see if they are willing to split the cost. The cost for the legal avenue would be about \$1,000 or so. The best thing we could do tonight is authorize him to proceed to try and get it done as cheaply as possible. If you just let Jack and him do work on it, that's a good idea.

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved to authorize Attorney Treadwell to proceed to find the most economical method of resolving the issue.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Mr. Szy had a lot of pictures of the building. He said the white house next door to it could possibly be the Redington Schoolhouse. Mrs. deLeon said this has always been a sore subject with her as it's always been special to her. She was not happy with the way we are going here. Mr. Szy requested when it is ripped down, if there is usable slate and lumber that it be saved for them to use at the Lutz-Franklin Schoolhouse. Mrs. Yerger said the gentleman who did the analysis of the building be present when it's knocked down as he feels he can salvage some things for the Township. Mr. Maxfield said Bill Bergey asked about some metal pipe laying there on the property. He mentioned it to the staff and that will depend on what Linc and Jack find out about what we're going to do with the property. Mr. Cahalan said the SPCA will come out and make sure there are no cats in there. Mrs. deLeon said since this is along the Lehigh River, could Jack send the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage people a copy of this? Mr. Cahalan said sure.

ROLL CALL: 5-0

I. RESOLUTION 63-2006 – AUTHORIZING TRANSFER OF MONIES FROM ONE TOWNSHIP FUND TO ANOTHER

Mr. Kern said the Director of Finance is requesting Council approval to transfer monies from one Township fund to another to cover shortfalls in the accounts listed in the resolution.

**LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
RESOLUTION #63-2006 A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE
TRANSFER OF MONIES FROM ONE TOWNSHIP FUND TO ANOTHER**

SECTION 1.

The Council of Lower Saucon Township hereby authorizes the transfer of monies from one Township fund to another in accordance with Article XXXII, Section 3202 (f) of the Second Class Township code as follows:

<u>Amount</u>	<u>FROM</u>		<u>TO</u>	
	<u>Account No.</u>	<u>Account Name</u>	<u>Account No.</u>	<u>Account Name</u>
\$15,000.00	35.432.240	Snow Removal	35.438.240	Road Materials
\$ 5,000.00	35.430.700	Major Equipment	35,434.000	Street Lighting
\$ 600.00	35.430.700	Major Equipment	35.437.240	Repairs to Equip.
\$25,000.00	01.432.240	Snow Removal	01.438.240	Road Materials
\$ 2,000.00	01.430.140	Maintenance Comp.	01.430.141	Seasonal Comp.
\$ 100.00	01.430.373	Vehicle Maint.	01.430.380	Equip. Rental
\$ 500.00	01.430.373	Vehicle Maint.	01.430.420	General
\$ 300.00	01.452.510	Pool Pass Reimb.	01.452.370	Maintenance
\$ 300.00	01.452.510	Pool Pass Reimb.	01.452.420	General
\$25,032.00	01.487.165	Pension Fees	01.487.167	Police Pension
\$ 7,380.00	01.487.165	Pension Fees	01.487.166	Non-Unif. Pension
\$20,000.00	01.401.142	Office Personnel	01.404.312	Special Counsel
\$12,000.00	01.414.312	Consultant Fees	01.414.313	Open Space
\$ 300.00	01.407.751	Software Purchase	01.407.370	Maintenance
\$ 600.00	01.402.451	Bank Services	01.402.454	Payroll Services
\$10,000.00	01.487.156	Medical	01.408.310	Engineering
\$10,000.00	01.487.156	Medical	01.408.311	Eng. Plan./Zoning

SECTION 2.

The Township Manager is hereby directed to make the necessary transfers to implement this Resolution.

RESOLVED AND ENACTED this 6th day of December, 2006.

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for approval of resolution 63-2006

SECOND BY: Mr. Kern

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

V. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

A. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 15, 2006 MINUTES

Mr. Kern said the minutes of November 15, 2006 Council meeting have been prepared and are ready for Council's review and approval.

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

MOTION BY: Mr. Kern moved for approval of the November 15, 2006 minutes.

SECOND BY: Mrs. deLeon

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

ROLL CALL: 4-1 (Mr. Horiszny – No – too long)

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS

- Ms. Lorraine Torrella thanked Council for their assistance in the fundraiser LST Historical society is doing with the recycling and the placement of the bins. In the past, you have let us use that Blair House to store our archives. There is a phone in the house and it's not used anymore, so you can take it out. Thanks to the cooperation you've extended to her in regards to the ABC studios request to use the Lutz Franklin museum for a proposed documentary. Thank you for all the time spent with that and she thanks Barb Ryan for her time and coordination of the proposed shoot. What happened with this ABC's TLC learning channel, Mr. Kern and Mrs. Yerger received emails about it. At this time, their decision was to table doing the documentary. She would like the Townships blessing for the future for a documentary from an outside agency. There is interest from the Sesame people also. In the lease agreement, between the LST and the Historical Society, educational programs, society meetings, recreational activities and community service activities, so she wants a clarification what those words mean for the future. She's sure that the museum will be looked at by a number of people to do different things with. Maybe in the future we can talk about the clarification of the lease and it's purpose. Mr. Kern said some of those are self evident to the uses, but as far as film shooting, that needs to be addressed on a case by case basis so it's clear and needs to be addressed before Council to make a decision as there are some controversial aspects to certain requests. Attorney Treadwell asked if the company could give the Township and/or the Historical Society a written proposal as to what they want to do. Ms. Torrella said they wanted to shoot a documentary using the walls, the floors, the windows, etc. She asked to see the scripts, and according to their standards, they don't give scripts out. Attorney Treadwell said it's hard to make a determination as to whether it's an educational use – yes, it could be the learning channel, but without knowing what the learning channel wants to shoot, just because it's the learning channel doesn't mean it's educational. From a legal standpoint, we need to know what they actually want to do there and submit it in writing. Ms. Ryan said she got the emails from Katie Haggerty of ABC TLC, and she did outline very specifically what they were going to do in the shoot, so she did put it in writing as much as she knew. Attorney Treadwell said you need something a little more than an email. Ms. Ryan said where in our lease does it say we have to discuss issues that you might like or not like? Attorney Treadwell said it's not about whether the Township likes it or not, it's whether it fits into one of those four specific uses that are permitted. Just to say it's educational because it's the Learning Channel doesn't work. Is ABC going to make money on this, then it turns it into a commercial activity. Ms. Ryan said would you say we're doing a community service to them? Attorney Treadwell said not unless we know exactly what it is they propose to do which we don't know. Mr. Maxfield said the Township, being the owner of the building, we assume all liability for cost of damages. The contract should be with the Township since it's a Township structure. Ms. Ryan said the lease needs some clarification. If you look at that description, there's nothing for fund raising at the school house and it would have to be educational, and fund raising would be secondary. Sometimes we do an event where fund raising is the primary event. Maybe we need to look at the wording in our lease. Attorney Treadwell said if Council wants to look at rewording the lease, then that's something the Historical Society should discuss with Council. He did get a copy of an email from her saying the Historical Society may want to use it for weddings or private parties. That is certainly not covered in the lease. Mr. Maxfield said that is pretty clear, and when the Township went into an agreement with the Historic Society, they picked those certain areas for a reason. It should evolve within those areas and not outside of those areas. This agreement is existing. Ms. Ryan said if someone wants to use the building and it doesn't fulfill any of those purposes, and we're not even taking in money, what do we do? Mr. Maxfield said you need to come to the Township. Mrs. deLeon said she was here when they did the lease and we're leasing it to you to do those four things, and we always try to keep definitions broad because you

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

can't plan for everything. She didn't hear you were charging the TV station. Everything is subjective and everyone will have a different opinion when they read something. At first, she wondered if we were going to be a library in a community where you can't have that book in there because it has this or that. Who is censoring? It is what it is. History is history, reality is reality. She doesn't want to get into nit picking. Mrs. Yerger said when you start using it for commercial things like weddings, that opens up a whole different liability. Attorney Treadwell said it's a whole insurance liability. Ms. Ryan said she's aware of that. She does it for Historic Bethlehem, she does the leasing. She also knows there is a no sublet clause in their lease. She wanted to let them know they had people film there. If this wasn't a sensitive subject, would we be standing here today? They have had Channel 69 news out there many, many times. No one minded any of those things. Attorney Treadwell said he would have said the same thing about Channel 69 as what he was saying about ABC news. Someone needs to tell the Township what it's being used for. The Ashley picnic was a corporate picnic there. Attorney Treadwell said he didn't know Ashley had a picnic out there. Ms. Ryan said it was a thank you to Lou Pecktor for his donation. Attorney Treadwell said we need to have more communication. Ms. Ryan said the Township gets invitations to all our events. Mr. Maxfield said that's not quite the same as talking to the Township about the uses that are proposed to the site. Don't forget that it's a Township owned structure. The Township has control over what gets attached to it, what gets built on to it, what gets used on the site. The Township can have control of all those things. Ms. Ryan said that should be in the lease. Mr. Maxfield said it is in the lease. Ms. Ryan said how do you feel about children from the school being charged to come for the school program as that's in their plan. They have to have a way to pay their bills to have the school children there. They plan on soliciting donations when they come to the museum. Attorney Treadwell said if you are going to use it as a fund raising activity, you need Council to approve it, and if Council says you can charge school children, then you can charge them. Mr. Maxfield said there is an existing lease and anything that occurs outside that lease needs to be okayed. Mrs. deLeon said then the lease was deficient. Ms. Ryan said we need to re-look at the wording on the lease then. They might as well close their doors if they can't do anything like that. Maybe we need a whole list from council of accepted activities. Mr. Maxfield said how spontaneous are these events. Can't they call the Township and talk to them. Ms. Ryan said that's different than coming to a meeting. It's a two to three month process if we do that with every event. Mr. Maxfield said you are dealing with a government agency. We have to do things in the public realm. If that lease was deficient when you signed it, what can we say? Mrs. deLeon said she thought she read they cannot prohibit the public from using the site. Attorney Treadwell said that's correct, it's in there somewhere. Mrs. Yerger said there is a fine legal line between a donation and a specifically set charged fee and that's why a lot times when you go to a museum, there is a sign saying "Donation \$3". Should the public want to refuse that \$3, they are allowed to walk on to that property without paying the \$3 donation. When you are talking about fees, then you start talking in terms of contracts. Ms. Brown said the park is accessible to the public and you keep saying the schoolhouse is owned by the Township, who owns that property? Mrs. Yerger said the Township does. Ms. Brown said if she were to show up there and wanted to get married, are you going to stop me from doing that? Attorney Treadwell said it's a public park and the Township has insurance to cover people doing public things in a public park which is completely different from a catered wedding where you have people coming in. You are fine if you want to go in there and take pictures or go and get married. Mr. Maxfield said if something happened there and there was a lawsuit, it would be the Township that got sued. Ms. Ryan said say we're outside planting flowers and Channel 69 sees us and says it's May Day, we want to film this for tonight's program. We have to say no, you're not allowed to film us, or maybe they film from across the road. Attorney Treadwell said they are on a public road. Ms. Ryan said they come on the property, what are we instructed to do? Mrs. deLeon said she has the same questions now with the Conservancy. We're having our party on Tuesday night and now a photographer can't show up and take pictures. Ms. Ryan said they have the press at every single event they have. Attorney Treadwell said it's an access for the press if they are taking pictures of a public event. They are not using it for their own private benefit which doing a documentary is using it for their own private benefit. Mr. Kern said a general guideline would be if you have to ask yourself the question, is

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

this an acceptable use, then you need to come before Council. The second guideline is if it's something that involves a contract, like the ABC news should have involved a contract, then you need to come before Council. Everything else is fair game. Ms. Ryan said if we have an event at the schoolhouse and we have a contract with a performer who is going to play the guitar for an hour, do we need to come before Council? That person is benefiting by being a paid person. Attorney Treadwell said what is the definition of an event? Mr. Ryan said maybe we are going to use the schoolhouse for our own Christmas party. Attorney Treadwell said in the lease it says society events. Ms. Ryan said they are paying him. Mrs. Yerger said it's the receiving end of it that is the issue. If you are benefiting from this, that's where it usually comes in. Ms. Torrella said if someone is benefiting it, we are going to ask you if we can do it or not. Attorney Treadwell said based on the conversations tonight, we need to rewrite the lease and Council needs to come to an agreement. Mr. Maxfield said and draw the line with subletting and fundraising. We should allow fund raising. Ms. Torrella said they are a 501c3, not for profit. The only way they make money is fund raising. Attorney Treadwell said did he miss the whole thing about the Kingston Park tonight how nobody wanted to put a driveway around it. How are you going to get all these people in there if there aren't any parking spaces. Ms. Torrella said park around the area. Attorney Treadwell said he can't believe the police think it's a good idea. Ms. Ryan said they pay the police to be there and direct the traffic. Mrs. Yerger said she know she liability gets really complicated when money starts becoming involved. The whole thing comes down to the liability. Maybe the lease needs to be revisited, but before that happens, you as a Society need to sit down, talk amongst yourselves and decide what uses that you would like to see the school used for. That's your starting point to sit down and talk to the Township and see where the lease can be adjusted. Mrs. deLeon asked Ms. Ryan to try and get copies of some other historical society leases. Mrs. Yerger said they need to figure out what they want and come to us and we can respond to that. Mr. Maxfield said authorize Linc to sit down with them. Attorney Treadwell said you can revise the lease to say the Historical Society can do whatever they want on the property, revise it to say they can't do anything w/o Council's approval or something in the middle. Council had to make that decision. Ms. Ryan said for future reference, item 6 in the lease, it's negative agreements of society, whatever we were talking about tonight, it should fall in this category. "Society agrees that it should not do any of the following things without prior written consent of the Township – assign, transfer, mortgage, pledge or otherwise encumber ... make any structural alterations, extensive improvements, change fixtures, use or operate any machine or equipment that is harmful to the leased premises and so on". It seems if you want to rewrite the lease, you need to put in a clause that says any fund raising kind of activities need to come before Council. Right now, we're within our lease agreement to not bring that to you based on A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H as per their lease. It doesn't say in their lease they have to submit in writing to you the purposes of lecture series, fund raising, and art shows. She urges you to get the lease and read it and then come back to us. Mr. Maxfield said the lease is a total document. Don't forget what you are permitted to do, so they both work in conjunction together. Attorney Treadwell said why is this become adversarial in nature? Why can't we sit down and discuss this? Mr. Kern said there is no reason for it to become adversarial. We totally support fund raising activities. That's obvious. What triggered it was this ABC news shoot as that was a questionable activity. We are not questioning anything else. The ABC news thing is a controversial thing. Mrs. deLeon feels that these activities are broad enough, and it shouldn't be changed. Mrs. Yerger said her assumption was they feel it needs to be changed. If they feel the need it changed, they have to talk to Jack. Ms. Torrella said she respects all of Council. She wanted just a clarification and that's why she came to you. She knows you support them completely in fund raising. She enjoys the relationship they have with the Township. She'd like a little clarification, that's all. The relationship here is more important than some television shoot.

- Ms. Brown said Mr. Kern, you say regarding the problem with Meadows Bridge and the trucks, you want me to call the police, but when they show up and do nothing, why should she bother. She doesn't know what to do anymore. Mr. Kern said whenever you see a violation please call the police and you told us earlier you had not done that. In the future, please call the police. Ms.

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

Brown said most of the time she only gets a description of the truck and by the time the police get there, the truck is gone. Mr. Cahalan said when you called the first time, the police officer issued a warning to the driver. Council directed Mr. Cahalan to Toll Bros. telling them that if any of their trucks crossed the bridge, they would be ticketed. If you saw trucks come out of the development, he hasn't heard anything about that. Mr. Kern said keep calling the police, or sit out there and take pictures or get their license number and call the police.

- Ms. Brown had two questions about the vote on the emergency gate. She asked Mr. Kern if he moved recently that he doesn't live on Old Mill Road anymore? She was curious why he didn't abstain. Mr. Kern said he's a resident of the Township and he's representing a part of the Township and all of the Township. It does not benefit him. Attorney Treadwell said there is no need for any council member to abstain unless it's some type of financial benefit.
- Ms. Brown said Mr. Maxfield said posting Stover Road with no parking signs, is that all of Stover Road. Mr. Maxfield said from the two intersections on either side of the gate, but not the part by her house.
- Ms. Brown said is there anything about flag poles that are regulated in an ordinance? Mr. Kern said the height of the pole. She said Toll Bros. erected a flag pole on their model home and it has fallen down twice into the road. She's worried about the safety issue. Mr. Cahalan said he will check it out.

VII. COUNCIL AND STAFF REPORTS

A. TOWNSHIP MANAGER

- He said they will bring the budget to the December 20 meeting for an adoption.
- They received an application from Reen Development for general NPDES permit. It was reviewed by the Zoning Officer and there are numerous mistakes and inconsistencies in the application. They'd like to forward a letter to DEP pointing out these errors and will include a copy to the LVPC. Mr. Kern asked for any public comment? No one raised their hand.

➤
MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to send a letter to DEP citing the mistakes in the NPDES application for Reen Development.

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

- Priscilla and Jack attended the meeting at the City of Bethlehem on the Enterprise Zone request from the city that was to Freemansburg, Hellertown and LST to consider joining in their renewal application for the enterprise zone. It was a good meeting. They learned the city is getting state funding to pay for the application effort and hopefully there will be someone available to the Township. They are going to get the LVPC and Lehigh Valley Economical Development Corp. involved in this. The group was in agreement with the direction it was going. They are going to send a letter to each Township and borough indicating what they are going to do. This year going to file an application by the end of the year and they have the permission from the state for us to be added on to an amended application later on in the year. They still want to look in to see whether or not that exclusion of the adult oriented businesses would push it into the areas that they are looking at of creating the enterprise zone. Mrs. deLeon was pleased having all the entities sitting there.

B. COUNCIL/JR. COUNCIL

Mrs. Yerger

- Nothing to report

Mr. Maxfield

- Mr. Paul Pagoda was at the EAC meeting last night talking about the recycling of leaves and he will help out in any way he can.
- Tom Conlon resigned last night as a member of the EAC.

Mr. Kern

- Nothing to report

Mrs. deLeon

- Any update on weight signs on Route 412 for the Meadows Bridge? Mr. Cahalan said they are going to send something out and will follow up on that.
- For right now, Meadows Road is two ways, did we decide not to put the no left turn up? Can we put one up? Mr. Birdsall said there wasn't a decision, but if you do want to put a sign up, you do need a study done and it needs to be approved by PennDOT before you erect the sign.
- Mr. Cahalan, did you get the occupancy for the Widow's House? Jack said yes they will put it on the wall.
- She needs the email from Judy. Mr. Cahalan said she had a conversation with the cost estimate for the pavilion and he has a memo about the conceptual design plan. In it, they discussed what Judy felt the estimated cost for the pavilion. She said it could be in the neighborhood of \$100,000 and that's where that figure came from. She did say she would provide actual cost estimates later on as we move forward. Mrs. deLeon said \$100,000, she'd like to know where that is all going and would like breakdowns for the next budget meeting. Mr. Cahalan can give that to her tonight.
- The trees on Riverside Drive, we are making a little progress. She's waiting for Verizon and the cable company to come out as she doesn't think they are electric lines, and she thinks they are cable and pole lines. It's in the way of PennDOT and they are trying to have them get rid of them.
- DEP issued their permit for the Bethlehem Renewable Energy project. We have 30 days to comment on the contents of the permit. With the holidays, we need to get that to our consultants ASAP because they might not have included everything we wanted. They were supposed to coordinate this approval with all the other outstanding permits.

Mr. Horiszny

- He attended the Seruga trial last night and noticed the disappointing results.

Jr. Council Member

- The recycling containers are in place now at the school and Township. They are now making a plan to publicize the containers to the middle and elementary school.
- She is now collecting toys and treats for stockings for animals at the food bank. If you'd like to donate, please contact her.

C. SOLICITOR

- Attorney Treadwell said there was a hearing on Mr. Seruga's firearm violation and the Commonwealth was unsuccessful on the firearms violation, although there was a conviction on a disorderly conduct charge. He prepared a revised firearms ordinance for Council review. If you want to authorize it to be advertised, basically what it now says you cannot discharge a firearm within 150 yards of anybody's house. Mr. Kern asked if anyone had any comments in the audience. No one raised their hand.

**General Business Meeting
December 6, 2006**

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for advertisement.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

D. ENGINEER
Nothing to report

E. PLANNER
Nothing to report

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved to adjourn. The time was 11:38 PM.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0

Submitted by:

Mr. Jack Cahalan
Township Manager

Glenn Kern
President of Council