

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

- II. PUBLIC COMMENT PROCEDURE**

- III. PRESENTATIONS/HEARINGS**

- IV. DEVELOPER ITEMS**

- V. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS**
 - A. Kimberly & Alois Schmidtner - Variance Request of Side Yard Setback to Install Solar Panel Array
 - B. Approval of Articles of Agreement for Regional Police Study
 - C. Review of RFP for Animal Detention Services
 - D. Township Representative to Northampton County Gaming Revenue & Economic Redevelopment Authority
 - E. Northampton County Gaming Revenue & Economic Redevelopment Authority Update
 - F. Heller Homestead – Revised Scope of Work for Window Painting Bid Advertisement
 - G. Discussion of Hunting on Township Owned Properties
 - H. Discussion of Trail Head Sketch Plans

- VI. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS**
 - A. Approval of November 16, 2011 Minutes

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

- VIII. COUNCIL & STAFF REPORTS**
 - A. Township Manager
 - B. Council/Jr. Council Member
 - C. Solicitor
 - D. Engineer
 - E. Planner

- IX. ADJOURNMENT**

Next Park & Rec Meeting: February 6, 2012
Next EAC Meeting: December 13, 2011
Next Council Meeting: December 21, 2011
Next Planning Commission Meeting: December 15, 2011
Next Zoning Hearing Board Meeting: December 19, 2011

www.lowersaucontownship.org

I. OPENING

CALL TO ORDER: The General Business & Developer meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Wednesday, December 7, 2011 at 7:02 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. Tom Maxfield, Vice President, presiding.

ROLL CALL: Present: Tom Maxfield, Vice President; Ron Horiszny, Sandra Yerger, and Priscilla deLeon, Council members; Jack Cahalan, Township Manager; Leslie Huhn, Assistant Township Manager; Linc Treadwell, Township Solicitor; Brien Kocher, Township Engineer; Judy Stern Goldstein, Township Planner; Jr. Council Member, Jameson Packer. Glenn Kern, President arrived at 7:42 pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ANY EXECUTIVE SESSION (IF APPLICABLE)

Mr. Maxfield said they do plan to go into Executive Session tonight after the meeting to discuss personnel issues and a revenue tax appeal issue.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Maxfield said if you are on the agenda, you have Council and staff's undivided attention for the discussion period. At the conclusion of the discussion period, we do open it up to the public at each and every agenda item, so you have an opportunity to comment. If you do choose to comment, we ask that you use one of the three microphones that you see here as the minutes are transcribed verbatim. We want to make sure we get every word into the record. We also ask that you state your name for the record so the transcriptionist can duly note that. He asked if anything has been taken off the agenda? Mr. Cahalan said yes, Item V.A., Kimberly & Alois Schmidtner – Variance Request of Side Yard Setback to Install Solar Panel Array.

III. PRESENTATION/HEARINGS – None

IV. DEVELOPER ITEMS – None.

V. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS

A. KIMBERLY & ALOIS SCHMIDTNER – VARIANCE REQUEST OF SIDE YARD SETBACK TO INSTALL SOLAR PANEL ARRAY

Taken off the agenda

B. APPROVAL OF ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT FOR REGIONAL POLICE STUDY

Mr. Maxfield said the Township has agreed to join with Hellertown Borough in having the DCED Governor's Center conduct a regional police study. A kick-off meeting for the study was held on November 17, 2011 with representatives from the Governor's Center, the peer consultant assigned to conduct the study, and representatives from the Township and Hellertown Borough. DCED has requested that Articles of Agreement, which sets down the terms and conditions of the study, be signed by the Council President.

Mr. Cahalan said we did have the kick-off meeting here on November 17th at Lower Saucon and met with Ron Stern from the Governor's Center at DCED, and with Joe Kirschner, who was a retired police chief of Towamensin Township. He has been assigned to be the peer consultant for the police study. It was a good meeting and there were some good questions from the Council representatives, police chief's and manager's from both municipalities. Since that time, he sent us

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

some additional information which has been distributed to Council which laid out the template for the study. He also gave us these articles of agreement which are in your packet. It basically sets down the terms and conditions of the study at both ends. That has been signed by the Council President of Hellertown and it's before you tonight for approval for the Lower Saucon Council President to sign that document. Additional information is that the peer consultant has indicated he will be here on December 21st and said if anyone is interested in meeting one on one with him for a meeting, let Mr. Cahalan know and it can be set up. Mr. Cahalan also sent that to Hellertown and he will go down there and meet with the Council members from Hellertown Borough.

Mr. Maxfield asked if there were any comments? Mrs. deLeon asked if this was pretty much like the last agreement they signed or are there any changes? Mr. Cahalan said it's a standard document that municipalities fill out. It was signed by Hellertown already.

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for approval on the signing.

SECOND BY: Mrs. deLeon

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

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mr. Kern – Absent)

C. REVIEW OF RFP FOR ANIMAL DETENTION SERVICES

Mr. Maxfield said due to issues with the proposed 2012 contract for animal control services that was sent to the Township by the Center for Animal Health & Welfare in Williams Township, Township staff is exploring other alternatives to deal with the seizure and detention of stray dogs in the Township.

Mr. Cahalan said he gave Council some documents in the packet about this issue. We talked about it briefly at a previous meeting. We got the proposed contract from the Center for Animal Health & Welfare. A lot of the municipalities in the County were not happy with the terms and conditions that they put into this agreement. The cost of dropping off the animals is increasing, which is understandable with the economy and the problems they are having with fundraising at the center. The two issues that we have a serious problem with is the fact that they will not allow us to restrict the drop-offs to just dogs. The agreement states it's for all companionable animals, which could include stray cats. The second issue is that we have only had police officers drop off the animals or call for the pick-up of the animal. This would allow anyone from the Township to drop off an animal at the center. The letter that is in the packet which he sent to them on November 14th indicated to them that we ended the drop-off of stray cats back in 2007 and we instituted the trap, neuter and return program. That was done at the urging of the center. That dramatically decreased the number of stray animals that were being dropped off at that facility. We also instituted the requirement that only police or animal control officers could drop off the animals and that has also been working successfully since 2007. He indicated to them we would be willing to agree to the agreement with them if they could drop and reinstate the drop-off of dogs only and restrict the drop-offs to Township police officers. He hasn't heard back from them. We have until the end of December and we have another meeting on the 21st and he's hopeful we will receive a response by then. The problem with this agreement is that there aren't too many other options for us. There doesn't appear to be another facility in the area that's licensed by the state to accept stray animals. The nearest facility that we've been in contact with is in Lehigh County and they have been trying to obtain the needed licensing from the State to accept stray dogs from municipalities in Lehigh and Northampton County. That has not happened yet, so it isn't something we can look at as an alternative. Under the PA dog law, a municipal police officer and animal control officer can detain, keep and feed any unlicensed dog for a period of 48 hours at a licensed kennel approved by the Dept. of Agriculture. He put together, for your review, a request for proposals that he'd like to send out to kennels and animal hospitals in the Saucon Valley area to determine if any of these facilities are able to house these dogs for the 48 hour period. If he does hear from them, it may not be by the end of the year, but it's something that needs to be explored. If that can be done, if it's an unlicensed dog, we're required to keep it for the 48 hour period which could be done at this kennel,

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

then after the 48 hour period, the dog can be given to a humane society or an association for the prevention for the cruelty of animals. We would have to find a service that would do that. That's not in place, so it's something we'd have to work on. The other thing we could look into would be to look into whether we want to set up a kennel on Township grounds. This is something that is done in neighboring municipalities. He thinks Hellertown was looking at it last year. It would basically be a fenced-in area with a shelter that would be able to withstand the weather. The dogs would be fed and cared for. That type of situation would probably require having somebody like an animal control officer to take care of the dogs. He understands historically that we did have that here in the Township over by the Public Works garage, but it was discontinued. That is for unlicensed dogs. For licensed dogs, they can also be kept at a licensed kennel that is approved by the Dept. of Agriculture until the owner is identified and then they can come and pick them up. He understands the majority of the owners will pick them up as soon as they are identified. If that is done, the Township under the PA dog law, can charge a \$50 fee to the owner along with the cost of the detention. If the dog is not claimed within five days, it can be sold or turned over to the humane society or a society for the prevention of cruelty of animals. Some dog owners do implant a chip in the dogs to provide basic I.D. information. We could also purchase a microchip scanner which could be used by the police to retrieve this information. There's several different ways that this could go, but unfortunately, it's close to the end of the year. It looks like the Center for Animal Health & Welfare is the only approved facility in this area and if they don't agree to modify the terms, it looks like he may be back here on the 21st asking Council to sign the agreement. With the restrictions that we've put in place, we've been able to keep our costs down to about \$1,400.00 a year for the past several years. If we go forward with this agreement with these changes, that could triple our costs to the \$6,000.00 to \$8,000.00 range. We've budgeted for that, but it will represent an increase in cost. You can see from what's been in the newspapers, the other municipalities are also going to be faced with some exorbitant costs here for animal control services. Mr. Horiszny said does the PA dog law require us to have a program set up or an agreement in place? Mr. Cahalan said no, but we do have to have somebody who is responsible for the pickup of stray animals. We don't have to have a kennel or anything like that.

Mr. Maxfield said he likes the idea of exploring a local vet and things like that. He likes it also because it's local. He doesn't know where the proposed one in Lehigh County is.

Mrs. Yerger said she knows where it is and they are stacked to the gills. It's also a kill shelter. They euthanize animals. She knows as her daughter was just there. They have reached their peak and they are in the same bind financially. The counties have either dropped funding or cut funding. They are inundated at this point.

Mr. Maxfield said the microchip idea is pretty interesting. He was wondering if we'd be able to promote a microchipping program here in the future. Mr. Cahalan said that was something we were considering bringing back for your consideration. If we do get involved in them accepting cats and dogs being dropped off, the cost for the microchipping runs \$30.00 to \$50.00 and the registration is \$20.00. The Township could consider providing a one-time incentive to residents to go and do that. It would aid in identification.

Mrs. deLeon said can we put that information on the website about the chips. Do you know what it would cost to purchase one of the scanners? Mr. Cahalan said it's about \$300.00. Mrs. deLeon said do you think maybe it would be beneficial to have one anyway regardless of what we do because that way the owner would be contacted within hours. She would really like that. She will make that motion.

Mr. Maxfield said he would like Mr. Cahalan to explore the idea of promoting the program, and it goes hand-in-hand with the scanner and tie it up into one big package and really go for it.

Mrs. deLeon said in the meantime, there are dogs out there with chips already, and the scanner would be beneficial. Mrs. Yerger said any dog that's been adopted from one of the shelters, they

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

automatically get a chip implanted. Mr. Maxfield said then it would make a sense to make that purchase.

- MOTION BY:** Mrs. deLeon moved for approval to purchase a scanner for reading microchips in dogs, as discussed above and regardless of what we do with the program.
- SECOND BY:** Mrs. Yerger
- Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 4-0 (Mr. Kern – Absent)

Mr. Maxfield said he would like approval of the RFP for the animal detention services. It doesn't involve any commitment on our part. It's just to determine if there are facilities in this area who could help us with the detention of the care and feeding of the animals for that 48-hour period. Mrs. deLeon said the center didn't respond to your letter? We might have to pass this. Mr. Cahalan said yes, we may have to, but he'd like to see if there are other options.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved for approval of the RFP to send it out.
- SECOND BY:** Mrs. deLeon
- Mr. Maxfield asked if anyone in the audience had any comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 4-0 (Mr. Kern – Absent)

Mrs. deLeon said this may be something we may be able to promote at Community Day. Mrs. Yerger said it's not completed yet, and she doesn't know what their reception area is, but Bucks County is building a new SPCA shelter in Upper Bucks. They are doing a huge capital campaign for it. She's not sure when it's going to be open, but it may be an alternative sometime in the future. It's right outside of Quakertown, in Richland Township. They have one down in Central Bucks, and had to build the second one because of the overflow of animals. She's not sure if they are going to embrace anyone else bringing animals.

D. TOWNSHIP REPRESENTATIVES TO NORTHAMPTON COUNTY GAMING REVENUE & ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Mr. Maxfield said Council has been requested by the Northampton County Executive to recommend a representative to the Gaming Authority.

Mr. Cahalan said this information came into him, via the Council President, and it was indicated that Mrs. deLeon had advised she did not wish to be reappointed as the representative. He did contact Mrs. deLeon and she did confirm that it is the case. Mrs. deLeon said she spoke with John Stoffa at the end of October and relayed that to him so he'd have time to look for a replacement. Mr. Horiszny said we should thank you for serving on that Committee. It's very much appreciated. At one time, we had a citizen application for that. Is that something we need to do before the reorganization meeting in January? Mr. Cahalan said it's two part. You would recommend someone to the County Executive who would recommend them to the County Council. They are looking for a recommendation from the Council for someone to appoint. Mr. Maxfield said do we have a deadline on that recommendation? Mr. Cahalan said he thinks they indicated to Mr. Kern that they were looking for someone as soon as possible. Mrs. deLeon said her term expires on December 31, 2011. Mrs. Yerger asked if Mr. Cahalan wanted to approach the citizen and see if they are interested? Mr. Horiszny said if we can find someone who is not a Council member, then we have more citizenship involvement in the government of the Township, we ought to do it, if at all possible, all of the time. We can request that individual and see if he's still interested.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved for approval to request that Mr. Cahalan contact the previous individual who was interested in being a Township representative for the Northampton County Gaming Revenue & Economic Redevelopment Authority.
- SECOND BY:** Mrs. Yerger

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

Mr. Maxfield asked if anyone in the audience had any comments? Attorney Treadwell said he doesn't know when County Council does it, but if that individual is still interested and tells Mr. Cahalan he is still interested, do you want to make that recommendation or do you just want to wait until the 21st? Mr. Horiszny said if we need to make a deadline, we should do it now. Attorney Treadwell said it was John Blair who expressed interest. Mr. Maxfield said we'll just assume if Mr. Blair is interested, we'll just go for it. Attorney Treadwell said the motion would be to recommend to the County Executive that John Blair be appointed to the Gaming Authority provided that he lets Mr. Cahalan know he's still interested.

ROLL CALL:

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny amended his previous motion and moved to recommend to the County Executive that John Blair be appointed to the Gaming Authority provided that he lets Mr. Cahalan know he's still interested.

SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger amended her second
Mr. Maxfield asked if anyone in the audience had any comments? Mrs. deLeon said the recommendation goes to John Stoffa and he makes the recommendation to County Council, and there may be a committee that it has to go through first, and then it goes to County Council. They probably would make it at reorganization. Mr. Maxfield said hopefully we'll have a report by next meeting. Mr. Cahalan said yes.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mr. Kern – Absent)

**E. NORTHAMPTON COUNTY GAMING REVENUE & ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT
AUTHORITY UPDATE**

Mr. Maxfield said Councilwoman Priscilla deLeon, Lower Saucon Township's representative on the NCGR&ERA, would like to report on the 2011 Local Share Restricted Municipal Gaming Fund applications. Mrs. deLeon had a power point presentation.

Mrs. deLeon said to the grant, you were at the meeting and the Gaming Authority did approve the request for the amendment. Mr. Cahalan said that had to do with the grant we received with Hellertown jointly for installation of pre-emptive devices on the signal intersections in the Township and the Borough. They put that out to bid and it came in less than what the grant was leaving a little bit of an amount over. The Township and Borough had incurred engineering cost to submit signal plans to PennDOT, and they asked if the money that was left could be used for that purpose and they agreed with that and approved that request.

Mrs. deLeon said there were 25 actual applications submitted. You can see the seven entities. You can see each of the grants that the entities submitted and the amounts and they total \$3,254,268.13. The authority was asked to go through and score them. She said that's the 25 applications as they ranked. For the Township, she voted yes to the ATV, but it did not get approval, and it was ranked No. 22. There was no documentation for the trailer cost, so that would have been minus \$6,000.00 if it would have been approved. The Township did get a police officer and vehicle. The administration said it lacked documentation for vehicle equipment and the compute for \$7,541.00, and approximately \$5,000.00 was in overtime and they subtracted that from the grant, so we ended up with \$100,701.11, and then we got the joint grants. She did try to get the authority to go revisit those, and it didn't work. They have a legal opinion, and she tried. The authority voted to create a sub-committee to look at updating or revising the application for the next round and combining it with their criteria so it's all in one place. There is going to be a checklist and that will be discussed at the meeting on Monday night. The total request was \$3,252,268.13. Of that, the grants that got awarded totaled \$775,765.61. That left \$824,058.04 which now will roll over to uncommitted money. Mr. Maxfield said do you recall the uncommitted amount that went in to this before? Mrs. deLeon said at the end of the year they created a budget. She doesn't have those numbers in front of her. They took about \$300,000.00 as a budget guessing that there would be \$125,000.00 each year that they'd need for operating expenses. It didn't leave much in there. There was a question whether or not there was going to be a uncommitted round of money as we really didn't have any, but the way the vote ran, now they have their money.

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

Mr. Horiszny asked if Mrs. deLeon said the difference between the Freemansburg Borough police officer request and the Hellertown Borough police officer request? It was No. 10 and 13. Hellertown got shot down and it looks like it's almost the same request. Mrs. deLeon said the numbers are the same, but the information that went in the application was deficient. Mr. Horiszny said it's police officers versus vehicles. Mrs. deLeon said she and Stephanie objected to having the five contiguous municipalities, the City of Bethlehem and Northampton County all being rated to 15 points because to us that didn't say that priority was given. Depending on who was doing the scoring, it was up to the scorer to give priority to the contiguous municipalities. There should have been a separate box for the contiguous and another lower number for the City of Bethlehem and Northampton County and that did not happen. We'll see if it happens on Monday.

Mr. Horiszny said was it in the detail of the request that there were differences? Mrs. deLeon said she'll show you the questions that are supposed to be answered and this is required information. The administration, Alicia Karner and her staff was supposed to go through all the applications and they did reject some as they didn't have some information. Mrs. deLeon said they were given score sheets based on the 25 applications and the night of the vote they discovered there were deficiencies. To her, they shouldn't have gotten that far. They should have been pulled. To her, they were already eligible. She showed what every project was supposed to have, the description, the explanation, the resolution, the schedule. This is all supposed to be detailed. Technically, when they accept these applications, these sheets are supposed to be in there. She said she's not asking them to read them if they make sense or not, we're supposed to do that. They were given a document which was three pages for each of the applications. The first page was supposed to be what the administration was supposed to do and the last question was, "did the application attempt to show the project, its cost, its use or need and demonstrate an association as a result of the casino". Yes or no. If it said yes, then it was an eligible project. If it said no, then it shouldn't have gotten to us. The other pages where the other rankings are with the 15 points, she found problems with. This round of funding isn't open to anybody but contiguous municipalities. To say you're given 15 points for that, it's useless points. You can't apply for the grant unless you are contiguous. Just because you walked in the door with the application, those 30 points should be eliminated. On Monday, they are supposed to get a report from the sub-committee and approve the application which should be revised. She's anticipating the grant funding to start January 1st to close the end of March. They want to have two funding rounds next year. How do you know how much money is going to be in the kitty and do you wait until the end of the year for the money. Are they doing this to get smaller grants, lesser money? She doesn't know. Mr. Horiszny said that's confusing plus the fact of \$800,000.00 sitting there in the end bothers him. Mrs. deLeon said you can't imagine how it bothers her. There will be a round for uncommitted money. She's assuming it will be in the summer and then probably another round of restricted. She said this at the meeting that it was unfair to ask the municipalities to do it twice. It does take time to put all this together.

Mr. Horiszny said with your experience with them, do you think you could get them to work in whole dollar amounts? It makes so little sense that we shouldn't deal in pennies. Mrs. deLeon said that's minute compared to the bigger issues. If the bid or quote comes in, they have to put what the quote is. They were complaining that the quotes were from 2009. When she talked to Cathy, Cathy said that's what Co-stars was using. You tell them and it doesn't matter. If anyone has any questions, she'll try to answer them. No one raised their hand.

F. HELLER HOMESTEAD – REVISED SCOPE OF WORK FOR WINDOW PAINTING BID ADVERTISEMENT

Mr. Maxfield said Township staff has prepared a revised scope of work for the painting and repairs to the exterior windows at the Heller Homestead house. If Council approves the scope it will be included in an advertisement soliciting bids for this work.

Mr. Cahalan said this is the third time they are back with this. They did add, after the last meeting, on the first page, under surface preparation, that the contractor would remove all paint down to bare wood

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

on window sills and frames. It talks about how that could be done with scraping and hand sanding. On the third page, they added the names of the paint for the primer and for the finished coat. They also broke it down into a paint schedule A and a paint schedule B as there was a request for two coats of the primer. Paint schedule A has one coat of the primer and two finished coats. Paint schedule B has two primer coats and two finished coats. The bidder would be asked to give us a price on both of those schedules. Those are the changes that were requested at the last meeting. If that is okay with Council, you can approve this scope of work and we'll send it out and see what we get back.

Council President Glenn Kern arrived at 7:42 PM.

Mr. Maxfield asked if anyone had any comments? Mrs. deLeon said we talked about the additions last meeting. Mr. Kern said there is one thing he did notice. It's okay, but there was something about removal of paint down to the bare window sills and frames, and then provide barrier coats over incompatible primers and remove and re-prime. If we take it down to the wood, there should be no primer. Mr. Maxfield said unless you think there may be residual oil? Mr. Kern said there might be a little bit. The whole idea is to get it down to the bare wood, so there shouldn't be any incompatible primers to deal with. Mrs. deLeon said what happens if they take all this stuff out and the window falls out? Mr. Kern said they are only touching the frame and the sill. They are not taking it down. They are leaving it as it is. What's holding some of the stuff in now is paint. Mrs. deLeon said do we need to do something to keep the glass in? Mr. Kern said they did that where it was needed on the last project. It's stabilized right now. It would be a major, major undertaking for them to remove the putty as well. Mrs. deLeon said we do have a volunteer from the Conservancy who wants to be there while this is happening. If they see something, do we call Mr. Cahalan? Mr. Kern said yes. Mr. Maxfield said it seems like that's something Public Works could do much cheaper than a painter could do if there was caulking or glazing. Mr. Kern said let's not change it, but just make the adjustment and make sure the volunteer is on site.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved for approval of the revised scope of work and approval for putting out a bid advertisement.
- SECOND BY:** Mrs. Yerger
- Mr. Maxfield asked if anyone in the audience had any comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 5-0

G. DISCUSSION ON HUNTING ON TOWNSHIP OWNED PROPERTIES

Mr. Kern said Staff is asking for Council's direction as to whether hunting should be permitted or prohibited on Township owned, non-park properties.

Mr. Cahalan said this came up on one of these properties. We had a neighboring property owner call us up and was concerned that the people were hunting on the Township property. We had the police out there, but we're not able to identify anyone who was doing that. The question came up about what the Council would like us to do as far as prohibiting or approving hunting on the properties owned by the Township. These are not the open space properties and conservation easement properties as those properties already prohibit hunting in the conservation easement. These are properties like the Clover View parcels, the Draveczech parcels, and then some other parcels, some of them pretty small, that the Township owns. The only one posted with "No Hunting" is the Clover View parcels. We did that last year as someone had put up a hunting stand on one of the parcels. We just wanted to bring it and discuss it. The Solicitor can talk about what can be done based on what your pleasure is.

Attorney Treadwell said it's a simple thing to solve, but it gets complicated in the enforcement. Your park properties you don't allow hunting as it's a public park. You own a bunch of other properties that aren't necessarily in the park system. For Draveczech, you could designate the parcels as parks, which then prohibits hunting on them. That doesn't necessarily cover the Clover View types parcels as he doesn't know if you want to designate them as park systems. If you want to

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

prohibit on all Township owned property, we just do an ordinance saying hunting is prohibited on all Township owned property. You would then need to post the properties that you own with no hunting signs. Where it gets complicated is it's hard to enforce because the propriety lines aren't clearly delineated in the woods, so someone could stray onto a Township owned property while he's hunting on someone else's property. It's also a little difficult with the "No Hunting" signs and using Dravec as an example, we don't have a full complete survey of the Dravec parcel so we don't know exactly where the lot lines are or do we know which trees to post "No Hunting" signs on? In that type of situation, you could obviously put "No Hunting" in the area you come in to access the Dravec parcel just so everybody knows. Even if we get a report that someone is hunting on Township property, by the time someone gets out there to look, they are gone. The basic question is do you want to prohibit hunting on all Township owned property? Then we'll just do an ordinance that says so.

Mr. Maxfield said since you are using Dravec as an example, from what he's been told by the Game Commissioner, if you have a habitual sort of activity on a property and somebody's been hunting on the property for 20 years, with new rules, it takes about six years to basically train everybody that has been coming on to the property, which is a considerable amount of time. For Dravec, he was thinking if we really wanted to make it trails, we might as do it right now and put "No Hunting" right now as there is going to be this transition time, and we might as well get it over with. He doesn't know how this goes with other properties. That's about the biggest piece we own. Something like Clover View because of the safety zone and the houses, there wasn't any hunting on those properties anyway. Mr. Kern said that was a safety issue at Clover View. Attorney Treadwell said what we did, and it was more of an immediate thing last year, we just posted it "No Hunting". We don't technically have an ordinance that says "No Hunting". That's what we're trying to clear up and figure out what we want to do. The Benner property, if it goes through, will be an easement. Mr. Kern said historically on the other properties, are they hunted? Attorney Treadwell said no, none of the Township ones. Mr. Cahalan said some of those got in on the list that should be taken off.

Mr. Kern said why don't we just post Dravec? Mr. Maxfield said we don't know where the lines are. Attorney Treadwell said you could post Dravec at areas where we know and are calculated for people to see. Mrs. Yerger said along the trails as they are more in the heart of the property. As Mr. Maxfield said, we should post the signs at the entry way also. The enforcement is a different issue. She said she always has hunters going through her property. They just don't know where the property lines are. Mrs. deLeon said when you put up signs for "No Trespassing" and they are cited, is that all you need to cite someone? Attorney Treadwell said what we would do is put up "No Hunting" signs as opposed to "No Trespassing" signs. We can do a simple one page ordinance that has a penalty in it for violating the "No Hunting" restriction. Mrs. deLeon said do we have that big of a problem that we need to do this? Attorney Treadwell said the other option is to just post it with "No Hunting". Mr. Maxfield said there's a potential problem on the Dravec property. Maybe we could post it in a reasonable place. He understands there may be a property dispute there. Mr. Kern said why don't we do that.

Mr. Maxfield said at first we were talking about conserved properties. Way back, when Ann Rhoades did the study, she recommended that we not stop hunting on Township conserved properties or any public property because of the deer population and the preservation of habitat. He thought that might be something we may want to look at for conserved property. Maybe a lot of them have traditional hunting going on and we may want to continue that. We might want to discourage in the conservation easement language, things like target practice, shooting ranges, things like that which would not be beneficial to the general public but could result in being some sort of annoyance.

Mrs. Yerger said a lot of municipalities that have substantially conserved properties, they have gone to "professional hunters" to control the deer. It's limited to cross bow. It's for people who have qualified for a certain level of expertise. That's not answering this question. This question is

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

do we want to allow random hunters on the property. That's the answering your question on how they are controlling the deer population as they have some large agricultural areas that are under conservation easement and adjacent to developments and things like that, so it became a big issue as they don't want them discharging firearms. They still want to control the deer population, so it's something we may want to consider going down the road. Mr. Maxfield said it sounds like a discussion for another time.

Mrs. deLeon said she may have a problem with a target with bow hunting. She doesn't know how restrictive it is. Mr. Horiszny asked if we are in a shotgun area only here? Mrs. Yerger said we petitioned for that. She just talked to someone who was an avid hunter and he said they've gotten the shotguns that are so high powered now that it doesn't matter at this point anyway. Depending on what kind of ammunition you use and the shotgun you are using, it's not all that much better. Mr. Maxfield said that has to happen from the Game Commission. We did petition it once before and got it turned down. Mrs. Yerger said they got a lot of pressure from Upper Northampton County where hunting is still very active up there. You have to do it county-wide. Mr. Maxfield said there was a lot of pressure years ago when a woman was shot in her driveway. There was a big move at that point, but it died down. It would make sense to do it now. The other thing we need to think about is that now, he doesn't know if it went into effect, the Game Commission is thinking about seven day a week hunting as permits are down. Mrs. Yerger said it isn't in effect yet. It's still open for discussion. It's definitely proposed.

Mr. Horiszny said even though he's been on the Dravec property, it sure would be a great spot to hunt. He'd hate to see it shut down for hunting, or at least have it for archery if we are going to keep the deer population under control. Mr. Maxfield said if you talk to any Game Warden, you'll come to the conclusion that we can post it if we want to, but we're not going to stop hunting. He said post it.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved for approval to post the Dravec property and Clover View with "No Hunting" signs.
- SECOND BY:** Mrs. Yerger
- Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 4-1 (Mr. Horiszny – No)

H. DISCUSSION OF TRAIL HEAD SKETCH PLANS

Mr. Kern said the Township Planner will review sketch plans for possible improvements to the future site of the Saucon Rail Trail trailhead on Reading Road.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said you are all familiar with the Timko property. They've been asked to come up with a couple of sketches for alternatives for a trailhead. They include parking, area for ADA port-a-potty, kiosk, area for potential future building that would house equipment and different things, picnic area, and a connection to the rail trail. There is Concept A and Concept B. The one in on the screen right now is A. It's one way. It has 15 parking spaces and a couple additional reserved spaces, if needed, a total of 7 additional reserved spaces. They are looking at this to be gravel, and to be not a major park or parking lot, it's a trailhead. It's to get people off of the road, park in a safe place, go and enjoy the rail trail. It's not meant to be anything more than that. It will provide information. The kiosk will be there. The kiosk in Hellertown right now is pretty cool. They included a detail of a more simple one in the packet you have. A couple things to think about – the basic site is the same on both sketches. It is two acres, and there are some wet and natural areas. It's triangular shaped with awkward parking within the front and rear setbacks, just because the nature of the property. Sketch plan A has a few more little things that need to be looked at than at Sketch plan B. Sketch plan B has more woodland disturbance than what would be permitted by ordinance. It is compliant. Sketch plan A also has the setback issues which are common to both. The woodlands is unique to A. The intersection spacing is unique to A. In order to do one way, you need an in and an out and you just can't get far enough away from the intersection of Bingen Road. Sketch plan B is two way, so it only

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

has one entrance. It has 14 spaces and room for 6 reserved spaces. It has a little less impervious surface and is compliant with the woodland disturbance. It still features the connection to the rail trail, the kiosk, ADA port-a-potty, area for the building. They are very similar. The difference is B is from your own ordinances. It's two ways instead of one way. Those are the major differences. One way is nice if you can delineate the spaces. There are ways to delimitate spaces in gravel parking, but they become a little more expensive, a little more problematic, and just a little more intrusive on the site. It really depends on what you want. What she understands, one of the gentleman on the Rail Trail committee liked the one way sketch. The Park & Recreation Board met on Monday night and they like the two way sketch. They think either one could work, but right now it comes to a matter of preference for the Township. If you are looking at it purely analytical, Sketch B requires less relief. Mrs. deLeon said what's the width of the parking spaces? Ms. Stern Goldstein said they meet the ordinance. They are 10'x18'. Mrs. deLeon said why wouldn't you just put the reserved spaces in now? Ms. Stern Goldstein said they were asked to look at 14 to 14 spaces right now and see what could be put in later. It was a matter of not having too many to start with. That's an option and you could put them all in right now, or you could see how many you really need, and how heavily it's used, and then put more in later. She's always conservative when it comes to spaces for the function, but when you put more spaces in than what the function needs, it's an unwanted gathering spot. If you only need 5 and you have 20, it becomes a problem, especially with gravel. Mr. Kern said what about using the same surface as the rail trail? Would that be money saving? Ms. Stern Goldstein said she thinks that's kind of expensive. Mr. Maxfield said do you have any recall with any of the plans of the alignment of houses across the street of the exits and entrances that might be bothersome to people. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it's only the out that could be an issue, and it's a dawn to dusk trail; however, we know people can still drive. Mr. Maxfield said it reminds him very much of a parking lot he's familiar with and it's a two way parking lot and he's been in this parking lot when people are coming in and we're trying to get out. It's tough. They actually have the option to almost make a circle, and it seems it would be so much cleaner. He's almost been hit by people backing out as he drives by with his car. He thinks he'd prefer the one way for clarity you come in and go back out and head in the same direction. Mr. Horiszny said if we went one way, could you angle park and be better or worse off? Ms. Stern Goldstein said you are worse off compliance wise. The way it works, it's not quite as efficient on site. They can certainly make it angled. Mrs. Yerger said some of her experiences with one ways; people don't listen to it anyway. All you have to do is take any parking lot with the arrows on, people don't listen anyway.

Mr. Kern said he's leaning towards the two way, but he'd like to hear Roger Jurczak's opinion as to why he would want the one way. Mr. Jurczak said the one way gives a better clarity as Mr. Horiszny pointed out. It brings you in at the beginning of the parking spaces. Initially, you are going to use a gravel type surface or the crushcrete, but eventually, hope would be the lot gets paved like the Polk Valley Park and gets diagonalized. When you have a one way situation, it's a natural way to park, easier to back out, and you are already heading for the exit. With gravel, it's hard to delineate the spaces and over time; you end up creating a wave effect. It's taken us a long time to get this trail up and running. Once this parking area gets set up, his guess would be to modify it and expand it would take a long time for it to get to the next phase. His thinking is that we have a very constricted plot and we're taking 20' setback, which he understands is part of the existing ordinance. His question is, is that a rear setback line, and who is our back door neighbor? Ms. Stern Goldstein said that's actually the buffer line and all the setbacks are below this one. The rear setback is actually the dashed line. The 20' distance buffer is one more thing to get out of the mix if we want to go closer to the property line. Mr. Horiszny said the setbacks are all for front and back yards? Ms. Stern Goldstein said front, back and rear, but you can't have parking in the yards. Mr. Horiszny said this is not a residential property, so he'd think we could always variance them. Ms. Stern Goldstein said there's a list of things that would be variances and that is one of them. She was pointing out the 20' wasn't a setback, it was a buffer. It's just one more rule we can chose to ask for a variance. Mr. Maxfield said he just figured what you were talking about the diagonalized parking spaces, you can't utilize corners. Ms. Stern Goldstein said right, you lose spaces on the length of the driveway. Mr. Horiszny said another valid point to consider, and you might lose space, if you angle in and you are unloading bikes on the back of a car, you wouldn't be sticking out in the parking lot like you would be on vertical spots. A lot

General Business & Developer Meeting December 7, 2011

of people will be unloading bikes. He thinks the diagonal parking has some real merit even if it has some detrimental points of losing space. Ms. Stern Goldstein said in most areas where there are trailhead and heavily used trails, people back in when they are unloading their bikes because either the bike is on top of the car and in the back of the car, and you need more room and you don't want it sticking out in the travel lane when you are getting your bikes down. Mr. Horiszny said then you could go in like the police station or even like on Main Street in Bethlehem where they are angled in. Ms. Stern Goldstein said people aren't used to that in this area, but if you go out West, they have all angled in parking spaces. If we want traditional diagonal, you lose that option. Mr. Horiszny said you have it on Main Street in Bethlehem. You go past the space and back into it and unload your bike without any danger. When you pull out you can see where you are going. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it's just a matter of training the basic population. Main Street in most places, it's heavily signed. There are two lanes of traffic so you can't swing around. It's just a matter of preference when you come down to it. The more we get a little unique in the traffic pattern, the less lightly people will follow it. We can do all the wheel stops and elegant cobble curbing for the stripes, when you get down to it, it's a gravel lot, people tend to pull in and park. In reality people can park 18 cars or 5 cars depending how they pull in. We want to make sure there's enough for the ADA. The more we deviate from the straight perpendicular parking, the more we are limiting people's option. Mr. Kern said the initial discussion was plant grass and see where the pathways form and then they put the macadam down. We'll see how many people use it and then tweak it. Ms. Stern Goldstein said if we are going to make a conscious effort to do that, we have to come back and revisit and not just close the door. Mrs. deLeon said at the Wood Street Post Office, you have to pull in and she pulled in and was in the corner and the lady in front of her tried to back up and she was in a big SUV, and she didn't see her, and she hit Mrs. deLeon. She goes in there on a regular basis, and she's always afraid the cars are going to back into her when she's putting her mail in the box. It's a one way. In the middle part is where the drop-off mailboxes are. The people pull in to go inside the post office, and then they come out and back out. Mr. Maxfield said it's very tight there. Mrs. deLeon said is there enough space if someone is pulling in? Ms. Stern Goldstein said we have a 21' aisle, which there will be enough room for a car to maneuver. Mrs. deLeon said she likes the fact that they back in and load from behind and they are not doing it while cars are driving by. Ms. Stern Goldstein said you are going to get the person who has the oversized vehicle with the bike rack in the back and pulls in frontwards.

Mr. Jurczak said would someone back in and unload their bike and walk through the trees there or would they get their bikes out on the parking lot and walk their bikes on the paved surface to get there to the trail? Ms. Stern Goldstein said people are just as likely to unload at the rear and walk along the edge of the parking in the back over to the trail or come back through the cars and come over. It's going to be uncomfortable to walk through the wooded area with the bike and people tend to not do that. She knows from experience. Mr. Maxfield said they seen that at Front Street in Hellertown. There's a barricade and people will still unload on the barricade side and try to squeeze in between cars.

Mr. Jurczak said the single handicapped parking lot, he's been using the trail and been parking in this area to familiarize himself. It's undeveloped now and he usually goes up there on a Sunday and four or five cars are parked in there right now. They are working on a website, and once it gets developed, a lot of people are going to come down to the trail who are out of the area. We've got 15 or 20 parking spaces, he doesn't know if a study has been done on how many people are using the trail. The Grist Mill, when there's a game going on, it's hard to tell, but there's probably about 100 cars parked there. If you go over to the Water Street Park, generally speaking on a Sunday when they have the Farmer's Market, it's hard to tell who's at the park and who's at the market. He sees people do their marketing and then go for a bike ride. If this becomes a popular space and we lock ourselves in, he doesn't know how 20 was arrived at, but that's a good starting point. What he's seen on the trail are a number of elderly people. He's even seen people on trikes. In Florida, you see them all the time. If you get two people that are handicapped and you only have one parking space, what's going to happen then? The people he's seeing on the trail on weekends are elderly and they are just making it on the trail, so he would consider them potential candidates for handicapped parking. Mrs. Yerger said don't they have to have the legal handicap sticker to use the handicapped sticker? Mr. Kern said yes. Mrs. deLeon

General Business & Developer Meeting December 7, 2011

said if there's only one space there, what's the ratio? Who comes up with out of 14 spaces, should there be one or two? Ms. Stern Goldstein said they are ADA regulated. It doesn't say you can't have more. She thinks for the first 25, you can have one. It goes on increments based on the number of parking stalls. You get into the number of handicapped spaces. If it's 8 or less, the first space has to be van accessible, so this is only one space that's van accessible. Mrs. deLeon said if we put a second one in there, it wouldn't have to be van accessible? Ms. Stern Goldstein said they would make them van accessible with a strip between the two spaces. Mr. Kern said they are using handicapped parking to exercise on the trail, so what difference does it make if there is handicapped parking a foot from the access or twenty feet from the access because they are out there to get exercise or move. Ms. Stern Goldstein said in the recreation guidelines, the number of handicapped spaces are prescribed by the regulations. Then they need to be the closest physical spaces to the activity or the entrance of the activity for which they are designed. It's not as much for not being able to get to the trail, they also need to be paved. They can't be graded in excess of 2% in any one direction. That access area is to unload and load the equipment. That's why you have an 8' wide aisle next to the 8' wide space. It's all meeting the regulations. All the regulations have specific reasons why they have been adopted. Everyone could name five or fifty ways they've been abused, but every time a space is there, she can guarantee it's being used by people who need it. Mr. Maxfield asked if the ratio meets the regulations? Ms. Stern Goldstein said yes. It's up to 25 for one space. Mrs. deLeon said she would like to see two spots for handicapped. This is the only lot we can park on for Lower Saucon. Mr. Maxfield said he doesn't see a problem with two. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it won't be a major issue. They are going to be off to the right.

Ms. Stephanie Brown said she's not crazy about the one way. It's an isolated area. You don't need to wait until the website is up and running. People are going to find out about this parking spot. It's going to be very crowded. She spends a lot of time down at the Trexler Game Preserve as it's near her boyfriend's house. The parking there is horrendous. They didn't think when they put the ADA accessible trail in. There's only one handicapped parking space and people fight over it. Elderly people think they have the right to it and don't like giving it up to younger people. Please put two in right away. It depends if you are driving or a passenger. Mr. Kern had said if you are handicapped and are going out for exercise. Mr. Kern said Ms. Stern Goldstein answered that for him already. Ms. Brown said people do it. Her boyfriend does it and it's very difficult for him to walk long distances. There must have been 25 or more people where she goes to walk because it's been so nice. The need for parking is just there. With handicapped parking, she sees a lot of the newer Walmart's have put handicapped parking sideways, is that legal? Ms. Stern Goldstein said perpendicular to the normal parking spaces is legal as they are meeting more than the minimum required parking stall space when you count the area around it. Ms. Brown said could this be on a spot this small? Ms. Stern Goldstein said if you notice how it's done in the Walmart's parking lot, it's unique to Walmart. She hasn't seen it anywhere else. It's in the middle of a sea of paving so you can maneuver and do 20 turns to get in if you need to. We don't have that luxury of endless paving here. The way they are designed and especially if we do the two together, there are options no matter which side or which part of the vehicle you need to access to maneuver a person in or out. Ms. Brown said what about the single parking spaces that are parallel that are reserved? She can see people parking there and using those. Some people are really picky about parking close to other people. If it's crowded on a weekend, people will take that spot. She can see that being used without any parking spaces there. She doesn't like the one way and it causes a lot of problems.

Mr. Kern said he sort of likes the two way as it's less intrusive, but he's not totally sold on it. It's really 50/50 for him. Mrs. Yerger said she agrees with Mr. Kern. One reason she likes it if we always request people to minimize the amount of variance of relief they are looking for and if we can comply in the same way, then it's a step in the right direction. Ms. Stern Goldstein said A was the one they thought worked well and they looked at the amount of relief and that's why you have B presented to you. B is less disturbance and less impervious. You're within the woodland disturbance permitted. A, you are slightly above the woodland disturbance permitted. There's more impervious. We're talking about a quarter acre impervious on the whole thing. It's a difference of about 2,000 square feet. One has 10,300 square feet impervious on option A. Option B is 9,000 square feet, so it's a

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

difference of 1,300 square feet. It's small in overall magnitude, but it's 10%. Mr. Maxfield said is it floodplain here? Ms. Stern Goldstein said there are hybrid soils. She mentioned this to Mr. Cahalan and Council; this is based on your GIS information. There's no definitive survey. They didn't go through and have Hanover do a detailed survey yet. The level of accuracy is the level of the GIS at this point. It's close enough for sketch, not close enough for construction.

Mr. Kern said let's take an unofficial poll to see what Council's desire is, and then someone can make a motion. Mr. Kern asked who is for A – Mr. Maxfield and Mr. Horiszny raised their hands. Mr. Kern asked who was for B and it was he, Mrs. Yerger and Mrs. deLeon. Attorney Treadwell said we don't own it yet. This is for discussion. Mr. Cahalan said it would be for the Planner to move ahead with the further design. Ms. Stern Goldstein said just let them know what your direction is so when it does go through, they can go to the next step which would require a little more design. Mr. Kern said this is just direction for the Planner.

- MOTION BY:** Mrs. deLeon moved that their preference would be, once we own the land, that we would opt for Plan B with two handicapped spaces, and it would be the two way.
SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any comments? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 3-2 (Mr. Maxfield and Mr. Horiszny – No)

VI. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

A. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 26, 2011 AND NOVEMBER 16, 2011 MINUTES

Mr. Kern said the minutes of the October 26, 2011 and November 16, 2011 Council meeting have been prepared and are ready for Council's review and approval.

- MOTION BY:** Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of the October 26, 2011 minutes.
SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger
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)

Mr. Horiszny said on page 14, line 5, it says Polk Valley Road, and it should be Polk Valley **Park**.

- MOTION BY:** Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of the November 16, 2011 minutes, with correction.
SECOND BY: Mrs. Yerger
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)

Mrs. deLeon said the deed of dedication for Old Mill, did the blank lines ever get filled in? Attorney Treadwell said they did not record them yet, as he has to put the descriptions on. Mrs. deLeon said if it snows tonight, are we going to plow them? Attorney Treadwell said yes, we took them over, we just didn't record them.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS

- Ms. Stephanie Brown, resident, said she was at a Township meeting in a different Township and they had a similar situation about development roads and who was going to plow them. They basically were going to plow their part and leave the rest of the snow there. She walked out shaking her head.
- Ms. Stephanie Brown said she has a question about some underage drinking at the Meadows and she was wondering if the Township has taken a position on this problem. Who knows how long it has been going on? Mr. Maxfield said it's a police matter. Ms. Brown said anybody can make a

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

complaint on an establishment that is allowing drinking. Mr. Kern said there is nothing Council can do about it. Mr. Cahalan said that's up to the Liquor Control Board. The Meadow's has a license from the State.

- Ms. Stephanie Brown said she's been using the media to be kept up to date on Lower Saucon. She's really disgusted with the Police Department. Knowing some of the troubles she had with them, she's asked every year to talk with the Township Manager about some things that happened that she's not very happy about. She wants to know either you are going to meet with her or what should she do? She had her family taken away from her because of the Township Police Department. She's in a very difficult situation in her life now because of it. The Township has never responded to it. This is the last time she's going to ask if you are going to meet with her about it. Mr. Cahalan said he has no idea what she is talking about, and he has no recollection of a request for a meeting. Ms. Brown said there was an email sent. Mr. Cahalan said he didn't receive the email. Ms. Brown said it went to Chief Guy Lesser also when she complained to him. This was months and months ago. Does she need to send another email or can they arrange it tonight? It's horrible what she went through. It took her family away, her only support system. It was all done in retaliation for complaints that were made about a certain Police Officer and he had no right to retaliate against her because she complained he didn't do his job. Mr. Maxfield said we shouldn't be sitting here listening to accusations about the Police Department. Ms. Brown said it's okay to insult her and say she's going to sabotage the gas pumps when she spent 15 years working for her father at a gas station. She already made a complaint with the Department of Justice. She's talked to someone from the ACLU. The ball is in your court now. She just needs an answer. Attorney Treadwell said if there's a legal issue going on here, then we shouldn't talk about it at all. Ms. Brown said she wants to talk to the Township Manager about what happened. Mr. Cahalan said the last time you mentioned potential litigation, you were referred to the Solicitor. Ms. Brown said yes, and he refused to answer her emails. Attorney Treadwell said that's not correct. He said he would be more than happy to talk to her lawyer. Ms. Brown said she'd like to talk to the Township Manager and you are telling her she can't do that? Mr. Cahalan said he'd have to rely on the advice of the Solicitor. Ms. Brown said is that what he is saying? Attorney Treadwell said no, that's not what he's saying. Actually, you can talk to him if you want. Ms. Brown said that's fine, she'll talk to him. Mrs. deLeon said are you going to get in touch with her to follow up? Mrs. Yerger said it's Ms. Brown's prerogative to get in touch with Attorney Treadwell. Attorney Treadwell said he's more than willing to talk to her about this issue, so if she wants to contact him to set it up, that's fine. Mr. Maxfield said as a Council, we should say that if Ms. Brown wants to talk to the Township, she should talk to Attorney Treadwell as she's threatened us with litigation before and threatened us with calling the ACLU. Right now, it's past the point of speaking with the Manager, so should say she should speak to Attorney Treadwell if she wants to speak to him.

VI. COUNCIL AND STAFF REPORTS

A. TOWNSHIP MANAGER

- Mr. Cahalan said he has two requests for their Air Quality Consultant, Lou Militana. The first one we have received another compliance stack testing report from BRE. They are required to perform this testing on a bi-annual basis. The last one we received, Lou took a look at it. Mr. Cahalan is asking for approval to send the latest report to him for his review. Mrs. deLeon said she doesn't remember this being twice a year. Mr. Cahalan said it's every two years.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for approval to send the latest compliance stack testing report to Lou Militana, our Air Quality Consultant.

SECOND BY: Mrs. deLeon

ROLL CALL: 5-0

- Mr. Cahalan said the second request is on the notice we got from Calpine on Applebutter Road for the Title V renewal application. We did send off a letter to DEP which Council directed him to do to request more time to conduct the review. He spoke to Jim Birdsall

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

and he said if Lou was authorized to look into this, he could call someone at DEP or at Calpine and find out if the renewal includes any change that would allow relaxation of any of the criteria. If nothing is changing or the renewal has additional restrictions, then Lou would not have to go up to Wilkes-Barre and review the files. He'd like authorization for Lou to look into this. Mrs. deLeon said they never answered the question? Mr. Cahalan said he put it in the letter, and they never responded either way. Mr. Maxfield said maybe because of holiday schedules. Mr. Cahalan said he will follow up on this with DEP.

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for approval to use Lou Militana to follow up on this with DEP.
SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
ROLL CALL: 5-0

- Mr. Cahalan said he has a year-to-end report on our Adopt-a-Road program. It's highly successful. It's been in operation for two years. We have 21 organizations or family groups who have adopted roads in the Township. They go out twice a year and remove debris from these roads. The yearend total that Diane put together on this program, the groups collected 150 bags of trash; they removed 50 tires from the roads; one lawn mower, a furniture drawer; a sofa and a kitchen table; two car fenders; and one car door. We had 131 participating and they spent a total of 72-3/4 hours on the pick-up. It's been a terrific effort by everybody and it's keeping Township roads looking beautiful. Mrs. deLeon said does the landfill take this stuff? Mr. Cahalan said yes, except for the tires. We turn them over to a local garage and pay \$2.00 each for those. Mrs. deLeon said is there charge for us to deliver this stuff? Mr. Cahalan said it's usually waived for the Great America Clean-up. Most of these bags are incorporated in our trash which we pick up from the parks, so it's covered under our trash contract.

B. COUNCIL

Mr. Maxfield

- He said he spoke last weekend to a retiree who is a resident of Upper Saucon, but uses our dog park every day. He gave some great ideas. He said if we ever are thinking of expanding the dog park, he has some good suggestions. Part of it is that he said there are flash mobs of Great Danes that show up there and have actually knocked people over. He had suggestions for areas for middle sized dogs, large dogs, whatever. We certainly have room there. The one thing he did tell him was we are still having a horse problem through Polk Valley Park. He would ask that the Police be vigilant.

Mrs. Yerger – No report

Mr. Horiszny

- He said after the last meeting, he had a citizen express concern about both emergency shelter availability and our communications during the snow storm and Hurricane Irene. He wondered if we had a list of places people could go. Has there been any more on the communications? Mr. Cahalan said there's a list of the shelter's in the Emergency Operations Plan and it's normally the schools and fire houses. The communication issue is being discussed by the Saucon Valley Partnership. They are working on collecting information so it can be brought to the Partnership and be discussed jointly. Mr. Horiszny asked if we had the shelters on the website? Mr. Cahalan said no, we don't. Mrs. deLeon said that was one of her concerns when the power was out. She thinks the Chief needs to go and do a plan B as the shelters weren't opened as they didn't have any electricity, and she doesn't know what Plan B would be. There needs to be a Plan B. Mr. Cahalan said if the list of shelters are on the website, it doesn't mean they've been activated as a shelter. We wouldn't want to confuse people and then they go to Saucon Valley School District as it hasn't been activated. We have to get the Red Cross there to provide food and other necessities. If it is open, the information is put out after it's activated by the Emergency Management people. There is an inventory of potential sites that could be used and

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 7, 2011**

activated for shelters. If we give out the list, he hopes people don't think they can go there the next time there is a severe storm. Mr. Horiszny said it's incident specific. Mr. Cahalan said yes. Mrs. deLeon said after the storm, she asked that we talk about this and it was put on the Partnership meeting and Bob Mateff came and spoke. It was very enlightening and as a result of that, we had some good input from the school district and Hellertown. It was a good discussion, and we'll continue to discuss it next week.

- Mr. Horiszny asked about emergency traffic signals and wondered if we were looking further into Sgt. Barndt's memo regarding the six traffic lights and the way to make them run when we have power outages. Mr. Cahalan said they intend to submit it to the Gaming Authority for the next round and will follow through with it.

Mr. Kern – No report

Mrs. deLeon

- She said the blinking light is still blinking on Friedensville Road. Mr. Cahalan said Roger was supposed to go out there yesterday to look at it.
- She said is there any way on the bottom on our meeting agendas when we can add when the SVP meets? Ms. Huhn said yes.
- She said tomorrow night, the Hellertown-Lower Saucon Chamber is holding a holiday dinner mixer at Sagra's from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m.
- She said on Friday, December 2nd, she attended the Hellertown Historical Society's Christmas party. It was very well attended. If you haven't been there for awhile, on the second floor they created nooks of different periods. There's a schoolhouse, a barbershop, a church, Prosser's Pharmacy and a little store. It's very nice the way they did it.
- She said on Monday, December 5th, the Saucon Valley Conservancy held their gathering. It was very well attended and people had a good time.
- She said on Monday, December 5th, she attended a Northampton County event celebrating the Courthouse's 150th anniversary. It was very nice. They launched the Passport to History Book. It will start in 2012.
- She said tonight she attended the annual Northampton County Elected Officials event at Martin Guitar. It was nice.

JR. COUNCIL PERSON – No report

- C. **SOLICITOR** – No report
- D. **ENGINEER** – No report
- E. **PLANNER** – No report

Council went into Executive Session to discuss personnel matters and a tax assessment appeal. The time was 9:07 p.m. Council reconvened at 9:23 p.m. Attorney Treadwell said the tax appeal was for 1785 Old Mill Road.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- MOTION BY:** Mrs. Yerger moved for adjournment. The time was 9:23 PM.
SECOND BY: Mrs. deLeon
Mr. Kern asked if anyone had any questions? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 5-0

Submitted by:

Jack Cahalan
Township Manager

Glenn C. Kern
President of Council