

REVISED

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

- A. Saucon Valley Meadows – Meadows Road – Deed of Dedication – Resolution #67-2011 & Authorization to Enter Into Maintenance

V. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS

- A. Ordinance No. 2011-05 – Restating and Amending the Earned Income Tax Ordinance
- B. Ordinance No. 2011-09 – Fixing General Purpose Tax Levy
- C. Resolution #65-2011 – Fixing EIT, Real Estate Tax & Local Services Tax for General Purpose
- D. 2012 Budget – Final Adoption – Resolution #66-2011
- E. Review of Revised Finance Clerk Job Description
- F. Approval of 2012 Contract with Center for Animal Health & Welfare
- G. Review of Draft Saucon Valley Recreation Partnership Agreement
- H. Approval of Saucon Valley Partnership Purchase of SurveyMonkey Plan Subscription
- I. IESI Bethlehem Landfill – Discussion Items for January 19, 2012 Presentation
- J. Consideration of a Donation to the Lehigh Valley Miracle League
- K. Announcement of DCNR Approval of Grants for Park Composting Toilets & for Acquisition of Saucon Rail Trail Trailhead Property

VI. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

- A. Approval of December 7, 2011 Minutes
- B. Approval of November 2011 Financial Reports

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS

VIII. COUNCIL & STAFF REPORTS

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

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Next Park & Rec Meeting: February 6, 2012
Next EAC Meeting: January 10, 2012
Next Council Meeting: January 3, 2012
Next Planning Commission Meeting: January 19, 2012
Next Zoning Hearing Board Meeting: January 16, 2012
Next Saucon Valley Partnership Meeting: January 11, 2012 – HB

I. OPENING

CALL TO ORDER: The General Business & Developer meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Wednesday, December 21, 2011 at 7:00 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. Glenn Kern, President, presiding.

ROLL CALL: Present: Glenn Kern, President; Tom Maxfield, Vice President; Ron Horiszny and Priscilla deLeon, Council members; Jack Cahalan, Township Manager; Leslie Huhn, Assistant Township Manager; Linc Treadwell, Township Solicitor; Brien Kocher, Township Engineer; Karen Mallo, Township Planner. Jr. Council Member, Jameson Packer arrived at 7:01 PM. Absent: Sandra Yerger, Council member.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ANY EXECUTIVE SESSION (IF APPLICABLE)

Mr. Kern said Council met in Executive Session prior to this meeting to discuss personnel matters.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Kern 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.

III. PRESENTATION/HEARINGS – None

IV. DEVELOPER ITEMS

A. THE MEADOWS – MEADOWS ROAD – DEED OF DEDICATION – RESOLUTION #67-2011 AND AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO MAINTENANCE

Mr. Kern said Resolution #67-2011 has been prepared to accept dedication of the roads located in the The Meadows Subdivision. The developer has provided the liquid fuel funds that the Township would have received had the dedication been done by the September deadline.

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE DEEDS OF DEDICATION FOR CERTAIN ROADWAYS KNOWN AS STOVER ROAD, CLARENCE DRIVE AND VIOLA LANE, LOCATED IN THE TOWNSHIP OF LOWER SAUCON, FOR USE AS PUBLIC ROADWAYS; SAID ROADWAYS HAVING BEEN CONSTRUCTED AS A PART OF THE MEADOWS SUBDIVISION.

WHEREAS, Lower Saucon Township approved a Subdivision Plan entitled “Record Plan, The Meadows”, prepared by Martin, Bradbury & Griffith, Inc. dated June 18, 1999, last revised August 9, 2005, recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds in and for Northampton County in Plan Book 2005-5, at Pages 632, 633 and 634; and

WHEREAS, the Meadows Subdivision Plan provided for the construction and dedication of Stover Road, Clarence Drive and Viola Lane to Lower Saucon Township for use as public roadways; and

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

WHEREAS, the current owner of Stover Road, Clarence Drive and Viola Lane now desires to dedicate those roadways to Lower Saucon Township; and

WHEREAS, Toll PA IX, L.P. has tendered and Lower Saucon Township has accepted Deeds of Dedication dated _____ for Stover Road, Clarence Drive and Viola Lane.

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the Township of Lower Saucon hereby resolves as follows:

1. The Deed of Dedication for Stover Road, dated _____ is hereby accepted by Lower Saucon Township, and said roadway shall hereafter be a public roadway within Lower Saucon Township. The aforementioned Deed, which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A", is further described as follows:

Deed of Dedication dated _____, for Stover Road, situated within the residential subdivision known as The Meadows, said Deed being recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds in and for the County of Northampton, Easton, Pennsylvania on _____, in Deed Book Volume _____, Page _____.

2. The Deed of Dedication for Clarence Drive, dated _____ is hereby accepted by Lower Saucon Township, and said roadway shall hereafter be a public roadway within Lower Saucon Township. The aforementioned Deed, which is attached hereto as Exhibit "B", is further described as follows:

Deed of Dedication dated _____, for Clarence Drive, situated within the residential subdivision know as The Meadows, said Deed being recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds in and for the County of Northampton, Easton, Pennsylvania on _____, in Deed Book Volume _____, Page _____.

3. The Deed of Dedication for Viola Lane, dated _____ is hereby accepted by Lower Saucon Township, and said roadway shall hereafter be a public roadway within Lower Saucon Township. The aforementioned Deed, which is attached hereto as Exhibit "C", is further described as follows:

Deed of Dedication dated _____, for Viola Lane, situated within the residential subdivision know as The Meadows, said Deed being recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds in and for the County of Northampton, Easton, Pennsylvania on _____, in Deed Book Volume _____, Page _____.

4. The Plan entitled "Record Plan – The Meadows" prepared by Martin, Bradbury & Griffith, Inc. dated June 18, 1999, last revised August 9, 2005, has been recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds in and for Northampton County in Plan Book 2005-5, at Pages 632, 633 and 634; and

5. The Public Roadways and legal descriptions for Stover Road, Clarence Drive and Viola Lane are identified as set forth in the Deeds of Dedication.

6. Pursuant to the provisions of the Second Class Township Code, Act 60 of 1995, Article XXIII, Section 2316, as amended, the Township of Lower Saucon hereby accepts **STOVER ROAD, CLARENCE DRIVE AND VIOLA LANE** to be used as a public roads for the benefit of the public.

Attorney Treadwell said this is similar to the dedication for Old Mill Estates that we did last month. Hanover has looked at the roads and improvements and everything is in. The developer provided the liquid fuels money and the maintenance bond which is about \$254,000.00 and the deeds of

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

dedication. If you so choose, the resolution is ready for adoption along with the staff recommendation to accept the roads and allows them to enter into the maintenance period.

Mrs. deLeon said she has a question on the ponding. Mr. Kocher said there's a low area on the portion of Stover, which probably used to drain out on what was called the Meadows Subdivision and just by the construction of the road, it's just the least bit higher than the area in the older subdivision. It's holding water; it's not much, maybe a fraction of an inch. When Spring comes, they want them to grade that. We don't want to do it now, but wait until the weather is better. Hopefully Attorney Treadwell will write it right in the maintenance agreement.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of Resolution #67-2011.
SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if anyone had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

Attorney Treadwell said we need to do the staff recommendation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE OF DEDICATION OF PORTIONS
OF VIOLA LANE, CLARENCE DRIVE, AND STOVER ROAD WITHIN THE
MEADOWS SUBDIVISION FOR DECEMBER 21, 2011 LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP
COUNCIL MEETING**

The Lower Saucon Township Staff recommends that the Township Council approve the acceptance of the roadways within the Meadows Subdivision, and to release the improvements security currently held in the amount of \$55,253.14.

Subject, however, to the following conditions:

1. Maintenance security in the amount of \$254,689.74 shall be provided in a form acceptable to the Township.
2. Approval of acceptance of utilities shall be received from Lower Saucon Township Authority.
3. The ponding near the Stover Road gate, as outlined in the December 16, 2011 letter from Hanover Engineering Associates, Inc., shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Township Engineer.
4. A payment of \$3,258.14 (the estimated liquid fuels funds for one year at) shall be provided to the Township.
5. The Applicant shall pay any outstanding bills due to the Township and replenish escrow balance related to the review of improvements and the preparation of legal documents.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of the staff recommendation dated 12/21/2011.
SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
Mr. Kern asked if anyone had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

V. TOWNSHIP BUSINESS ITEMS

A. ORDINANCE NO. 2011-05 – RESTATING AND AMENDING THE EARNED INCOME TAX ORDINANCE

Mr. Kern said Ordinance No. 2011-05 has been prepared which re-enacts, restates and amends our Earned Income Tax ordinance to establish conformity with the Local Enabling Tax as amended by Act 32.

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

Attorney Treadwell said this is the ordinance that provides for the County collection under Act 32. You will have one collector now and that is the County. It's a County-wide collector and this is the recommendation of the Tax Collection Committee that this ordinance be adopted. It also includes your one-quarter of one percent for open space.

Mrs. deLeon said she doesn't know if there are any other employers in the Township, but her husband's business didn't get anything from Keystone. She had to personally go on the website to register their company. She checked with Cathy Gorman and they are on the list. She hopes that's not an indication for lack of detail with Keystone. She's hoping that all the employers that pay into this are aware.

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for approval of Ordinance No. 2011-05.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Mr. Maxfield said do we have an amended calendar with this new tax collector? Do we receive monies into the Township at a different time than before? Are we going to waiting for this? Mr. Cahalan said he doesn't think there is going to be a change in that as far as the receipt. We believe Keystone will be more aggressive as far as collection. Mr. Horiszny said did we need to do a hearing for this? Attorney Treadwell said he doesn't think we do them for tax ordinances. You have to do them for zoning and subdivision.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

B. ORDINANCE NO. 2011-09 – FIXING GENERAL PURPOSE TAX LEVY

Mr. Kern said Ordinance No. 2011-09 has been advertised for adoption to fix the 2012 Tax Levy at 4.14%.

Mr. Cahalan said under the provisions of the Local Enabling Act, Council is required to adopt an ordinance each year that sets the tax rate for the upcoming year. As it indicates, the tax levy will remain at 4.14% mills on each dollar of assessed valuation. In addition, Council must also set by resolution the enabling taxes such as earned income tax, real estate transfer tax, and the local services tax, which is next on the agenda.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of Ordinance No. 2011-09.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Mr. Horiszny said Section 1, we may need the word "of" inserted. Mr. Cahalan said in the second sentence it says "tax rate for general purposes: the sum of 4.14 each dollar. Mr. Horiszny thought it should read "of each dollar". Ms. Huhn said she will check on it.

ROLL CALL:

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved to amend her previous motion of approval of Ordinance No. 2011-09, with the one correction.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield amended his second

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

C. RESOLUTION #65-2011 – FIXING EIT, REAL ESTATE TAX & LOCAL SERVICES TAX FOR GENERAL PURPOSE

Mr. Kern said Resolution #65-2011 has been prepared setting the Earned Income Tax, the Real Estate Transfer Tax and Local Services Tax for General Purpose.

WHEREAS, by Ordinance No. 98-15 adopted May 20, 1998, as amended by Ordinance No. 2011-05 adopted December 21, 2011, the Township of Lower Saucon enacted by Ordinance by its Council imposing a one and one-quarter percent tax on salaries, wages, commissions,

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

compensation and earned income and providing for levying and collection of same and imposing penalties for violation thereof; and

WHEREAS, by Ordinance No. 98-16, adopted May 20, 1998, the Township of Lower Saucon enacted an Ordinance by its Council providing revenue for general Township purposes, providing for the levy and assessment of a tax payable by the transferor or the transferee upon transfer by deed of lands, tenements hereditaments or any interest therein, situate wholly or partly within the Township of Lower Saucon, Northampton County, Pennsylvania, prescribing the rate, method and manner of collecting said tax; and providing certain exemptions and imposing penalties, at the rate of \$1.00 on every \$100.00 of the total value; and

WHEREAS, by Ordinance 70-05, adopted June 23, 1970, as amended by Ordinance No. 2005-14, adopted December 21, 2005, and as amended by Ordinance No. 2007-15, adopted December 5, 2007, the Township of Lower Saucon enacted an Ordinance by its Council imposing a \$25.00 Local Services Tax upon the privilege of engaging in an occupation within the boundaries of the Township of Lower Saucon, Northampton County, Pennsylvania for, and for providing for the levying and collection of the same and imposing penalties for the violation thereof; and

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the Council of the Township of Lower Saucon to reenact the said Ordinances, as amended, without substantial change:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that in accordance with the foregoing Ordinance No. 98-15, as amended by Ordinance No. 2011-05, Ordinance No. 98-16, and Ordinance No. 70-05, as amended by Ordinance 2005-14 and Ordinance 2006-11, be and the same are hereby reenacted for the year 2012 to be effective January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012 at the same rate as set forth in said Ordinances.

And that the Secretary be directed to send notice of the reenactment to the Department of Community and Economic Development, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Cahalan said that is in the resolution, those taxes are as follows. It's 1-1/4% for the earned income tax. The real estate transfer tax is a tax of \$1.00 on every \$100.00 total value of land that's transferring and the local services tax is \$25.00 for the privilege of engaging of an occupation within the Township.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of Resolution #65-2011.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny

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

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

D. 2012 BUDGET – FINAL ADOPTION – RESOLUTION #66-2011

Mr. Kern said the 2012 final budget has been prepared and advertised for final adoption. Prior to budget adoption, Council will need to approve Resolution #66-2011 based on prior discussions.

Mr. Cahalan said the 2012 budget was advertised for the 20-day public review period. It's before Council this evening for final adoption. The amount of the budget is \$6,765,734.00. There's no tax increase as we had indicated previously and the millage remains at 4.14 mills.

Mrs. deLeon said she's going to ask Council to take out another line item for the donation for the Lehigh Valley Miracle League. She'd like this to be in the 2012 budget, and we can do this if it's within a certain percent. This has been talked about with Tom Harp at their Saucon Valley Partnership meetings, and also at the Northampton COG meetings that are held quarterly. It was recommended at our last Partnership meeting that we consider a donation to this worthy program. There are children in our community that cannot participate in sports events because of their

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

limitations, and she personally feels this is a wonderful project for special needs children and it needs funding from the Township. We really don't have programs for them to participate in and enjoy. She'd like to come up with a sum of money. She doesn't know what that amount should be, but she was thinking in the range of \$2,000.00.

Mr. Cahalan said he did some research on both what the Miracle League was looking for and also what some of the other municipalities are contributing. The Miracle League looks like it's looking for an annual contribution each year. If we make one for 2012, they are looking for it to be each year, and that could be included in the contributions that Council authorizes in the budget. He also checked some of the other Township's and it's in the \$1,000.00 to \$2,000.00 range. That looks like what everyone else is considering if their budget permits. Mrs. deLeon said she did speak with Ms. Gorman and that amount would be okay in that line item. Mr. Cahalan said what they would do was just amend the budget you are ready to adopt in the line item for contributions to increase it by this amount that you are recommending and then they would take it out of the contingency line item. The budget amount would still remain the same. That would be included in staff recommendations to you for this contribution.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval to amend the 2012 preliminary budget and add this line item in Council contributions and add \$2,000.00.

Mr. Maxfield said are we okay with \$2,000.00? Mr. Kern said he's just thinking of what we are giving our Youth sports organizations and we don't give them that much. Some we only give \$1,500.00. He definitely feels we should contribute, but does not know what everyone's thoughts are on this. Mr. Maxfield said with times like they are now, he'd be comfortable with \$1,000.00. Mrs. deLeon said how many different sports areas do we donate to? She'd like to know what the total of that amount is. Mr. Cahalan said we have the line item for contributions, grants and gifts. There are several other things in here besides the sports group. Saucon Valley football is \$2,500.00; Saucon Valley soccer, \$2,000.00; \$2,000.00 for basketball; \$1,000.00 for cheerleading; \$1,500.00 for wrestling; \$1,000.00 for Lacrosse; and \$2,000.00 for baseball. The trend there is the ones that are around the longest get the bigger amount and the newcomers like Lacrosse, are getting the smaller amount. The rest of the line items are for the Coalition for Affordable Housing \$2,000.00; the Saucon Valley Halloween Parade \$400.00; the Saucon Valley Partnership \$1,000.00 dues; Lehigh Valley VNA \$1,000.00; Saucon Rail Oversight Commission \$1,000.00 for dues; and then we normally give \$500.00 for the Volunteer Appreciation dinner and unexpected contributions is \$1,000.00. Mrs. deLeon said she doesn't think \$2,000.00 is out of line considering the amounts for the different sports that we contribute to. Attorney Treadwell said that's to amend the final budget. He said approve the final with the amendment. Mrs. deLeon said we can't vote on the final budget yet. We need two separate motions before we can do the final budget. Attorney Treadwell said if you amend the already approved preliminary to include your number, then you can do the final.

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

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

Mr. Cahalan said he has a recommendation on salaries for the following employees for 2012: The Manager, Jack Cahalan \$84,387.34; Chief of Police, Guy Lesser \$83,641.32; Zoning Officer, Chris Garges \$65,666.70; Director of Finances, Cathy Gorman \$54,480.71; Assistant Manager, Leslie Huhn \$60,203.73; Administrative Assistant, Diane Palik \$32,463.54; and Public Works Director, Roger Rasich \$61,316.07.

Mrs. deLeon said that will come out of contingencies for these line items and the individuals will be changed to reflect this higher amount. Everything will still be the same.

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to approve the amendment to the budget to support the increases to the staff.

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

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for the final adoption of the 2012 budget to the amount of \$6,765,734.00.

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

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

Mrs. deLeon said when she first started, the contingency for the whole budget was \$17,000.00. We've come a long way.

E. REVIEW OF REVISED FINANCE CLERK JOB DESCRIPTION

Mr. Kern said after conducting a job analysis study this fall, we have been working to revise, if necessary, staff job descriptions. Since we will be advertising to fill the Finance Clerk's position due to the previous clerk retiring, we would like to have Council review the job description prior to filling the position.

Ms. Huhn said we are in the process of revising and updating all our employee job descriptions based on a job analysis study we conducted this summer. We'll be bringing all the updated descriptions to Council in the near future for review and approval. The job description for the Finance Clerk is before you tonight for review. We'd like to fill the vacant position due to the retirement of Michele Hirner. This description has been provided to the UAW and they have approved the description. It's for your review right now. They are looking at revising them all and combining some things that certain staff members are doing. You will see some things in here that have been added to the Finance Clerk descriptions and which may be done by someone else right now. Mrs. deLeon said are these job descriptions on our website? Mr. Cahalan said no. This also updates certain things that are needed in job descriptions today like the working environment information. It indicates the conditions that people have to work under such as sitting, standing, walking, and ability to handle lifting up to 10 lbs. The previous ones go back to the 1970's when it was all typewriters. Mrs. deLeon said she thinks there were changes made to them in the 90's for the ADA. Mr. Horiszny says in the fifth bullet, it says "pay fro" and it should be "pay from".

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for approval of the revised Finance Clerk job description.

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

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

F. APPROVAL OF 2012 CONTRACT WITH CENTER FOR ANIMAL HEALTH & WELFARE

Mr. Kern said absent other alternatives, the Manager is recommending that Council approve the proposed 2012 contract for animal control services with the Center for Animal Health & Welfare in Williams Township.

Mr. Cahalan said he's given you a previous report on this situation and indicated he did send a letter to the Center asking for a modification of the terms that are in this agreement. Unfortunately, he did not receive a response to that letter. The agreement is increasing costs which he stated is understandable in this economy, but it contains two provisions which we are really uncomfortable

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

with and that is we have had a policy with the center since 2007 where only Police Officer's drop off animals, and we have also had an understanding with them that only stray dogs are picked up and dropped off at the center. This agreement mandates that all companionable animals which include cats can be dropped off at the center and we'll be charged for them. It also allows both Police Officers and residents to drop off stray animals. The cost for each animal that will be dropped off is increasing from \$100.00 to \$150.00 per animal. The cost of Pit Bulls, which have started to show up in the Township is also increasing. The agreement said for the first ten that are dropped off it will be \$150.00 each and after that, they will cost \$300.00 per animal. Up until now with the restrictions on just dogs and Police Officers dropping off stray animals, we've been able to keep the cost of this service to about \$1,400.00 a year. These provisions in this agreement have the potential for tripling that cost to probably \$7,000.00 to \$8,000.00 a year. It also has a provision he's concerned about that says the center can suspend the acceptance of animals if there are space limitations. From what he's reading in the paper, the facility is bursting at the seams already.

Mr. Kern said what would happen if an animal is delivered by a Police Officer and they were full? Mr. Cahalan said we'd have to call the State Dog Warden. He did write to several kennels, but did not hear back from them. We are kind of between a rock and a hard place. Hopefully that will not happen during the agreement. We are searching for some other animal control alternatives. If we do find them, we'll bring them back and discuss them with Council. This agreement can be cancelled with 30 days notice. If something better comes along, we'll be sure and bring that back to you.

Mrs. deLeon said in the dog world, they have rescues. It would be impossible to get in touch with all of them, but she wonders if there is a way to somehow put out a plea to these people that if a situation does occur, what do you do with this animal? She'd rather see it go to a rescue. Mr. Cahalan said that's a good idea. The only problem is the first 48 hours as far as housing the dog. We currently don't have a facility where we can do that. We are searching. Unfortunately, it's the only game in town and it has some issues, but he's recommending the Township approve the 2012 contract with the Center for Animal Health & Welfare located at 1165 Island Park Road, Easton, PA.

Mr. Kern said he was very uncomfortable in signing an agreement that was open ended because there's no limit on the number of animals. He liked the 30 day renege on the contract, so if things do get out of hand, we do have an out. Mr. Maxfield said have they provided any process for determining the residency of people dropping the animals off? Mr. Cahalan said that's a good question. He read in the paper one of the municipalities up north was contending that they have a situation where they share a zip code with a couple of municipalities and they were concerned. In our Township with our two zip codes, it could be another municipality. What they have been doing with each bill, we scrutinize where it is and if it coincided with a police report, but this will be more difficult. They give us the resident's address, so we do have that. We have to be on top of that.

Mr. Horiszny said in reading through the agreement, to the signing page, it doesn't say anything about private citizens dropping off. After the addendum, and the signing, it does say private citizens. Is that dated and included with the agreement or is that just their suggestions? Mr. Cahalan said under the first page, definitions, it says that an authorized representative is an agent of the LGB or a citizen of the LGB. They use the acronym, LGB, but they talked about the citizens meaning the residents. They have the companion animals as dogs and cats. It is in the agreement. He doesn't have any other alternatives for dealing with stray animals.

Mr. Kern said with the 30 day agreement, you can opt out and he's comfortable with that. Mr. Cahalan said the municipalities that are opting to run this themselves, they are setting up a kennel at the municipality and after 48 hours they are calling the State Dog Warden. The 48 hours is the period when if it's a registered licensed dog, you contact the owner and the owner would pick the

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

dog up. It's just the remaining ones after 48 hours. That does fall under the responsibility of the State Dog Warden, according to the PA dog law.

Mr. Maxfield said the thing that bothers him the most is the potential for people who don't like their neighbor's animal, to just pick it up and take it over to the Center.

Mrs. deLeon said we are going to get the device that checks for those chips? Mr. Cahalan said yes, they will bring it back to Council. Mrs. deLeon said she was thinking of discussing this at the SVP meeting. Is Hellertown is going through the same thing as we are? Mr. Cahalan said he thinks from what he read, Hellertown is going to try to run it locally and not use the center, but he doesn't know that officially. They would have to set up some kind of a holding pen in the municipality. They have an Animal Control Officer, we do not. Mrs. deLeon asked that this be put on the next SVP agenda.

- MOTION BY:** Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of the 2012 contract with Center for Animal Health & Welfare.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

G. REVIEW OF DRAFT SAUCON VALLEY RECREATION PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

Mr. Kern said the Saucon Valley Recreation Partnership, which was formed with representatives from the Township, Borough and school district to explore joint recreation opportunities is currently working with the DCNR Peer Consultant and has drafted an agreement that formally establishes the Partnership and sets down by-laws for its operation.

Mr. Cahalan said this came from the group that's been meeting since last September. It is representatives from here, the Borough and the school district. We are looking at all kinds of joint recreation opportunities. We are working with Samantha Holbert who is a recreational professional that was assigned to us. We did receive a grant from DCNR and she's been meeting with us on a monthly basis. He and Glenn attend these meetings. John Landis is there for the Township. The one thing they discussed was formalizing the relationship they have with the three public bodies. This is a basic type of agreement. It doesn't obligate them to do a lot of things other than to continue to meet on a regular basis to discuss these items. This is basically a draft that came out of the last meeting. There is no action required on it. If you have any recommendations or comments, they would bring them back to the next meeting in January and after the Solicitor's look at it, he will bring it back for final adoption.

Mrs. deLeon said she doesn't have a problem with the concept, but she thinks "will" should be "shall". It should be consistent. They go through this with the SVP sometimes regarding the quorum. All three bodies have to be there in order for us to have a quorum. For six people in having three entities involved and having a quorum, she doesn't know if all have to be present. She's bothered by that. The SVP is the school district, Lower Saucon and Hellertown. One of us from each group has to be there for a quorum. Her dilemma is if all six people come, and then there's 3 no's and 3 yes's. If she and Glenn disagree at the Partnership, what is the vote of the Township? How do we do that? Mr. Maxfield said we can say the quorum consists of the majority of the six members with the caveat that all of the bodies are represented at the meeting. Mrs. deLeon said it should say each of the three groups should be represented. Mr. Maxfield said the issue is quorum. They are talking about the ability to hold the meeting. Mrs. deLeon said there's the quorum issue and then there's a voting issue. Mr. Kern said the way this is written, you don't have to have one member from each. Mr. Maxfield said what we are talking about is the constituency of the quorum itself. The quorum is the point and the members who make up the quorum is the secondary. Mr. Kern said the quorum should consist of at least one person from

each government body. Mrs. deLeon said it's usually consistent at the SVP. No. 4, a public body may contribute funds. Should it be "shall" contribute funds. Are they going to have their own funds to spend? Mr. Cahalan said it's not envisioned here. They tried to keep this as light as possible. That's why there is a lot of the word "may" in there. They don't want to make it imperative that this group has to carry out certain things. Right now the commitment is to keep meeting and discussing it. They aren't going to be running any programs. We are going to focus on joint scheduling and may go back and look at some maintenance issues. Mr. Kern said an example of No. 4 is coming up on the next agenda item. The point being, the group can't spend money on its own, it has to get approval. Mrs. deLeon said that's why she wants to make it clear. Mr. Kern said a public body "may" contribute, not "shall" contribute. Mr. Maxfield said he's thinking this board is a recommending board to the municipalities. No. 3 it says "the Saucon Valley Recreation group may advise the governing bodies of the public bodies". He thinks that word there should be "shall" because nothing happens until you are advising the public bodies. This is making recommendations to the public bodies. They get the final decision. You can't run a program until you get the okay from a public body. It needs to be clear as it's a recommending body. Mrs. deLeon said per the Ethics Commission, if you are in charge of money and spending money you have to fill out ethics forms. You don't want to complicate this either. Mr. Maxfield said the way they did it with the SVP is come back and ask the boards for contribution to the project is the best thing to do. Mr. Kern said that's what this is saying. Mr. Horiszny said No. 6 might be the solution that it's got to come back through the Council. Mr. Maxfield said it reinforces the idea that the SVP is a recommending body and it should be clear that is the case. Mr. Horiszny asked if we were going to get a report? Mr. Cahalan said we have had some general discussions at meetings about direction and where we want to go. We've also brought in the folks from the SV Community Center and they've been participating in the last four meetings sitting at the table discussing mutual recreational issues.

H. APPROVAL OF SAUCON VALLEY PARTNERSHIP PURCHASE OF SURVEYMONKEY PLAN SUBSCRIPTION

Mr. Kern said at the last meeting of the Saucon Valley Partnership, the representatives voted to recommend to the member bodies the approval to purchase a \$204 annual membership subscription for SurveyMonkey, an on-line survey site that can be utilized by various organizations to conduct surveys.

Mr. Cahalan said this came out of the Saucon Valley Recreation Partnership meeting. Tom Rieger and Bob Frey were at the meeting. They gave a really nice presentation on this SurveyMonkey program. One of the next things the group wants to do is a survey of recreation needs in the Saucon Valley. This SurveyMonkey will be a real easy way to get the survey out there, collect the data, analyze it and put it into some sort of a report so that the Partnership can look at that. The membership that Tom Rieger and Bob Frey recommended is the select membership which has some basic features, which they ran over with us. It's a \$204 annual membership subscription. This is something which can be used by a variety of groups. The Saucon Valley Library Task Force is getting ready to do a survey and this would be perfect for the Library Task Force to get out a list of questions to the people of Lower Saucon and Hellertown about what we are doing with the Task Force, looking at the feasibility of consolidating library services at the HAL. He's sure there are other organizations which would like to do surveys from time to time. Mr. Maxfield said non-Township organizations? Mr. Cahalan said he's talking about school district, Township and Borough organizations. Mr. Maxfield said that's really cheap. Mr. Kern said it will be 1/3rd of that, \$66.67. Mr. Kern said Bob Frey uses this SurveyMonkey for a lot of surveys and so does Tom Rieger. You can design questions however you want. It's an incredible tool. It's all internet based. The responses come to you. Mr. Cahalan said all the representatives can go on the internet and see the responses. Mr. Kern said it's an inexpensive way to get it out to everyone. It can also be posted in the Valley Voice and the PATCH. It's going to be good and used quite a bit. It's very cheap. Mr. Maxfield said Mr. Cahalan had mentioned the Library Task Force wanted to do a survey, he's guessing that any representing organizations can use the SurveyMonkey. If other

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

organizations want to use it, he doesn't know how to handle that. Mr. Cahalan said the SVP can set some parameters and handle that pretty well. Mr. Maxfield said like an agreement for users.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Horiszny moved for approval of Saucon Valley Partnership purchase of SurveyMonkey plan subscription.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield
Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

I. IESI BETHLEHEM LANDFILL – DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR JANUARY 19, 2012 PRESENTATION

Mr. Kern said IESI will be presenting their long-range plans for the landfill at the Planning Commission meeting on January 19, 2012. Council will be preparing a list of information items that they would like IESI to provide at this public meeting.

Attorney Treadwell said he asked for this to be placed on tonight's agenda so we could discuss it briefly. Can everyone make it on January 19th? Council said yes. Attorney Treadwell said the landfill would like to come to the January 19th Planning Commission meeting and present their expansion plans. He does not expect them to have a lot of detail. They haven't engineered anything, although they may have ideas in their head how to do it. He doesn't think they will have a traffic study done, but the reason to discuss it tonight is what, as a Council, would we like to see in their presentation so he can make sure they know what we'd like to see. The idea is that hopefully we can get Council, the Planning Commission, and EAC members to attend. We will notify surrounding residents of the meeting date and time, and the idea is to get as many people there to participate in and see their presentation about their expansion plans for the future. Is there anything specific that we'd like to see? He told them already we'd like to see the properties they acquired over the last couple of years so we know the extent of their ownership and any they have under agreement that they haven't purchased yet. Is there anything specific we'd like to see in their presentation?

Mr. Maxfield said he has a little problem in that it's a Planning Commission meeting and you're almost asking Council to set the agenda for the Planning Commission. Attorney Treadwell said it's a regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting. The idea was to try and get a presentation on a night when we could get the most people there. It was going to be very difficult to schedule a separate meeting outside of a Council or Planning Commission meeting night and get everybody there. The Planning Commission, being the largest group, he thought that scheduling it on this night, not necessarily as a formal presentation to the Planning Commission, but to everybody who is in attendance. You will have one item on your Planning Commission agenda separate from this. At the time we scheduled this for the 19th, you didn't have anything on your agenda.

Mrs. deLeon said maybe we should have two separate meetings so the Planning Commission can take care of their business first, adjourn the meeting, then open it up as a special meeting with both groups. Mr. Maxfield said that's the problem and this was called a presentation to the Planning Commission. If Council has questions of the landfill, he'd rather have Council attend the meeting, not as an overriding body for the meeting, and ask their questions like anyone in the public would. You want to get a lot of people there to listen to the points, but make it an official EAC meeting, an official Council meeting, an official Planning Commission meeting. You are basically setting the agenda for the kinds of questions that the Planning Commission should ask IESI and that is Planning Commission's job to plan and you are taking some of the planning out of its hands. He's not in favor of the whole concept.

Attorney Treadwell said it's not his intention to take anything out of the Planning Commission's hands. The intention was since they will be there and they will be making this comprehensive

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

presentation, he's not trying to have Council set the agenda, but if there's any items Council would like to discuss then he can advise them ahead of time as opposed to getting to a meeting and having a question and them saying they weren't ready for that one, and they will have to come back again. He's trying to get as much information out there in this first meeting as we can. Mrs. deLeon said why don't we have the Planning Commission meet, and then when their meeting is over, we'll hold a joint Council meeting with the Planning Commission and if the Planning Commission wants to stay, they do. If they don't, at least we are trying to accommodate an information session.

Mr. Maxfield said he does not support this. Normally when IESI has come to us in the past, it started with the Planning Commission, then eventually it makes it down to Council. The Planning Commission's job is to advise its Council. This seems to be we are trying to cram into all one big thing. He can't even imagine the benefit of having a joint Council, Planning Commission meeting. It makes no sense at all. There are many issues to be discussed and we don't even know what the issues are yet. Why don't you just let Planning Commission do its business?

Mr. Kern said he understands Attorney Treadwell's attempt here to gather any information and any concerns Council has. The point is information we may have so IESI can have a response for the Planning Commission. Mr. Maxfield said any time we have any development of any kind come before us, it goes through the Planning Commission process. The Planning Commission weeds out a lot of things that it knows the Council isn't going to like and we get tons of advice from the Planners and Engineer in the Planning Commission stage. That's where this is at. If you want to sit out there and ask questions, that's fine, but to push yourself and disrupt the normal process that we give any other applicant that comes in here, it's not right.

Mrs. deLeon said this is a process for a rezoning because the land they want to expand to is currently not zoned to allow landfill, so how we've handled other applicants is it really didn't go to the Planning Commission first. There's several ways we can do this. Mr. Maxfield said it's not going to be rezoned. Attorney Treadwell said they will be asking for a rezoning of the property. Mrs. deLeon said there is no more room in the area they currently zoned for landfill expansion. Attorney Treadwell said there are a couple different layers if the expansion is going to proceed if the Township wants it to proceed, there is a zoning layer, a host agreement layer, a Zoning Hearing Board layer, so there are various different layers. What he was trying to accomplish with this meeting was to get as much information out as possible and what he was trying to avoid was the landfill coming in with a three minute presentation saying here's what we own, please rezone it so we can expand. That's not going to help anything. He understands that it is a Planning Commission meeting and there is a planning process. This is a little bit of a different animal as it involves a host agreement amendment, it involves a zoning change, it involves a potential Zoning Hearing Board hearing, and there are various different layers that are operating at the same time. If the Planning Commission were to recommend that the zoning be changed, but Council were to say we aren't going to amend the host agreement, then there's no extension. That's why it's a little bit different and he's trying to get as much information up front as he can and at some point, if the Township feels that going through the rezoning process would be beneficial to the Township, there will be a formal Planning Commission review of the zoning amendment process.

Mr. Maxfield said he doesn't really think they would be brash enough to come to Planning Commission and give a three minute presentation and recommend a zoning change. Attorney Treadwell said keep in mind you, as a Planning Commission, as a Township, there is no application in front of us. They haven't submitted anything. They have asked to come in to get as many people in the room as possible so they don't have to make six or seven presentations. Mr. Kern said they could have come here tonight, but this is an opportunity for us to ask questions prior to the Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Maxfield said it doesn't seem like a process that's going to resolve anything. It's going to be an opportunity for some people. Mrs. deLeon said she has some questions as they don't know the status of Form D is. We don't know how big of an area they are looking at. It expands into the LM and RA zone. This is the fourth time they came for an expansion. It's very expensive and they need to change this and that. There's a harms benefit

analysis that needs to be done. Mr. Maxfield said none of what has anything to do with Planning Commission. We're trying to throw it into one big ball and it's not going to make sense.

Mrs. deLeon said then we have to pick a meeting for them to come to Council. We have January 18th and then we meet on February 1st and 15th. Our meetings have been kind of light, and she can't imagine them doing a three hour presentation. Maybe we can tell them that they should just come to Council and make their presentation. Mr. Maxfield said he didn't say it should start at Planning Commission. Mrs. deLeon said they don't have plans to go before you. Mr. Maxfield said they have a lot of people that come before them to talk just about concept. Mrs. deLeon said this is rezoning. Mr. Maxfield said it's a concept. Rezoning is a concept. You have to have a plan to talk about rezoning. Attorney Treadwell said he can tell them to come the 18th and the 19th, two nights in a row. One in front of the Council and one in front of the Planning Commission. He will guess it's the same presentation. Planning doesn't care about the host agreement or the Plan D. They can discuss those things here with us and the planning issues with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Maxfield said since he's on the Planning Commission, ask the Chairman what he thinks it would be a better situation to just have the Planning Commission or everybody. If he says it's okay, he won't argue with that as he's been on the Planning Commission a long time.

Mrs. deLeon said if this on the Council for the 18th, and they show up on the 19th for Planning, she as a Council member would like to go to the Planning Council meeting, and she knows if there is a quorum of Council members, it has to be advertised. Attorney Treadwell said we will ask Mr. Landis what his opinion is. If he agrees and would rather have the Planning Commission discuss the planning issues, should he ask them to come to the 18th as well? He'll just come back on January 3rd and try to resolve it.

Mrs. deLeon said they talked about this at the last quarterly landfill meeting, an official list could be forthcoming on the issues. That way it's not coming from her.

Mr. Kern said we'll wait to hear from Attorney Treadwell on January 3rd.

J. CONSIDERATION OF A DONATION TO THE LEHIGH VALLEY MIRACLE LEAGUE

Mr. Kern said at the last meeting of the Saucon Valley Partnership, the representatives voted to recommend to the member bodies that a donation be made to the Miracle League of Northampton County. This was covered above.

K. ANNOUNCEMENT OF DCNR APPROVAL OF GRANTS FOR PARK COMPOSTING TOILETS & FOR ACQUISITION OF SAUCON RAIL TRAIL TRAILHEAD PROPERTY

Mr. Kern said the Manager will review with Council the DCNR funding award for composting toilets at Polk Valley Park, Steel City, and Kingston Parks and to defray the cost for acquisition of the trailhead property on Reading Drive.

Mr. Cahalan said he's very pleased to report that the Township was awarded two grants by DCNR and it totals over \$119,000.00 for our parks and rail trail project. The first grant was for composting toilets in three of our parks. DCNR awarded us \$90,000.00 to help defray the costs of installing the composting toilets in those parks and that will replace the portable toilets we are now using with permanent structures that will be ADA accessible. They will be working with the Planner and Director of Public Works on a schedule for these installations and will keep you posted on that. The second grant was for \$29,700.00 and that will cover more than half of the cost of acquiring the 2.2 acre property on Reading Road that we have been targeting for a trailhead for the Saucon Rail Trail. As we previously discussed, the seller is interested in reaching an agreement with us and once the property is acquired, the Planner went over a concept to provide parking,

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

restroom facilities, benches, picnic tables, and an information kiosk for users of the rail trail. Council said congratulations and thank you.

VI. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

A. APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 7, 2011 MINUTES

Mr. Kern said the minutes of the December 7, 2011 Council meeting have been prepared and are ready for Council's review and approval.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of the December 7, 2011 minutes.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

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

ROLL CALL: 3-1 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent; Mr. Horiszny – No)

B. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 2011 FINANCIAL REPORTS

Mr. Kern said the November 2011 Financial Reports have been prepared and are ready for Council's review and approval.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval of the November 2011 financial reports.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

Mr. Kern asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? Mr. Horiszny said he noticed the donations of Mr. Kern's and his Council stipends into the Open Space and Fire equipment funds have not been made yet. Will Cathy do that by the end of the year? Mr. Cahalan said yes, Cathy will get to those before the end of the year.

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

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

VI. COUNCIL AND STAFF REPORTS

A. TOWNSHIP MANAGER

➤ Mr. Cahalan said we have a faulty boiler system in Seidersville Hall. It's been acting up for awhile. It's a system that has two boilers. One is primary and one is secondary. It was installed back in 1995. It provides heat and hot water for the building. The primary furnace went down earlier this year and we've been getting along with the secondary furnace, and now that has been having problems where it kicks off at various time and that requires someone to go over and hit the reset button. The other problem is the secondary furnace cannot make the building real warm on real cold days. At one point we were talking about the Sr. center relocating their activities to another building. They spoke to another group that had a meeting there. The Historical Society was also concerned about holding their annual Christmas event there. They had someone look at it, and are recommending that the system be replaced. He gave you some information in your red folder. The current furnace is oil-fired. The tank is in the ground on the north side of Seidersville Hall. That is also causing a problem as the feed of the fuel from that tank is not the best that can be and that is the cause of some of the shutdowns of the furnace. They are recommending a new gas system with two boilers. It's a good unit. They would be able to hook up the furnace to the gas lines that run up Old Philadelphia Pike. UGI will just run a service line in for us and it will be much more economical to heat that building now with the oil furnace. Because this came upon us suddenly, it's an emergency situation that is a problem for the health and safety of the individuals in the building, so the Solicitor advised we can proceed without bidding. They will obtain three estimates for a replacement system. The cost that they are looking at is approximately \$27,000.00. We do

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

have funds for that. They went over this briefly in the budget presentation. They have a low interest loan that they received from the State and they also have additional funds in the capital account to replace this furnace. They knew it was going to have to be done at some point, but it came on sooner than expected and should be done quickly as possible. He is recommending replacement of the system and Council approval to do that at a cost of not over \$27,000.00.

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for approval as stated above.
SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny
ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

- Mr. Cahalan said one of our Public Works crewman, Kevin Yeakel, was in a serious accident on his off duty hours over the Thanksgiving weekend with an ATV. He badly injured his leg and he'll be out on temporary disability until June. Public Works does need a replacement with the winter time and snow plowing. We'd like to fill his absence with a temporary employee and we've discussed this with the UAW representative and they have no problem with that.
- Mr. Cahalan said there's a request that came in from the Center of Independent Living in Lehigh Valley for a support letter. They are submitting a grant to the State Disabilities Council for funding to promote train and offer technical assistance to a variety of community entities on how they can increase inclusion on community life for our residents with disabilities. He drafted a letter of support and indicated our only obligation would be to receive information from the organization and distribute it to our residents. He'd like a vote on sending the letter.

MOTION BY: Mr. Horiszny moved for approval to send the letter that Mr. Cahalan drafted.
SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield
ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

- Mr. Cahalan said he has an update on Steel City Park construction. They had a meeting recently with the staff and consultants trying to get ready for projects next year. On the Steel City Park project, that's going to require a little more work by the Solicitor and Engineer. There are some paper streets involved and some properties that Attorney Treadwell has to look into. The Engineer needs some of that property to put parking spaces in and an infiltration system, a rain garden type of system. In addition, Mr. Kocher has to put together a NPDES permit and submit it to DEP, which will probably take about six months to get a response. Roger is doing the majority of this work and his schedule has been pushed back drastically because of the Halloween snow event. His crew has been out there just about every day since that snow event trying to whittle down the 70 some roads that we had trees come down and have to be cleared. He's moving along on that pretty rapidly. Everybody is pretty satisfied with the progress we made. Unfortunately, that bumped some projects that he had for this fall like the connector trail at Saucon Valley School district and Polk Valley Park and Kingston Park. He knows the Historical Society is disappointed about that, but he hasn't been able to get up there and do the paving of the parking lots and the trails. That's being pushed back and is first on his list on 2012. That is also delaying the Steel City Park construction. We are going to have to push off this project until 2013. Council had asked that the Parks & Recreation Board have a public meeting up there because of this delay, we will be scheduling a public meeting at Steel Park in June, July or August. The P&R board usually holds a meeting at one of the parks. They can hold a meeting there and have the Planner up there and give them an update of the projects. Mrs. deLeon said explain to her about the paper street? Mr. Cahalan said part of the eastern side of the park property, which they are moving into with the improvements, involves a paper street that goes between Schwab and Riverside, plus there's a paper alley that runs horizontal. Attorney Treadwell said the other issues is that Riverside Drive shown on the 1901 subdivision plan is an extremely wide road.

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

PennDOT's position is they only own 33'. Between the 33' boundary and where it's shown as the road ending on the plan, nobody owns it. We're trying to figure out how we're going to acquire or even if we need to acquire title to that piece as it is essential for some of the storm water facilities. Mrs. deLeon said that would mean that from the entrance of Steel City all the way to the Hill Climb, that problem exists. Attorney Treadwell said probably. He thinks it's at its widest point by the fire company and then it tapers down as it goes further back.

B. COUNCIL

Mr. Maxfield – No report

Mrs. Yerger – Absent

Mr. Horiszny

- He said the Lower Saucon Authority met last night and approved their budget. One thing that didn't get included for next year that they hoped to have in next year was an emergency generator. His question is whether any of the emergency generating equipment here at the Township would be large enough to help the Authority next year? Mr. Cahalan said the generation system here runs the PD. It would probably be expensive to link up with that. We did get the generator from Se-Wy-Co which will run everything at Public Works. They can talk to Roger about any access. Mr. Horiszny asked if there are any grants available that the Township knows about that the Authority could look into. Mr. Cahalan said he can check with Northampton County Emergency Management Division. Everyone is looking for generators. He'll provide that information to Gar.

Mr. Kern

- He said he'd like to acknowledge David Willard this evening. He's been attending our meetings for many, many months and is willing to come and join us at our next meeting.
- He'd like to make a suggestion at our next meeting to have a minor seating change. He's noticed that it would be helpful for whoever becomes President in January to have the Solicitor closer by then down at the other end. If the Solicitor is willing to do that, he'd suggest him to the seat next to the President.

Mrs. deLeon

- She said the Gaming Authority met on December 12th and are scheduling a meeting to the municipalities on Monday, January 9th to go over the new grant process. They did change the grant process and it's going to be split on some of the documents that are required and some will be reviewed internally and the other part will be reviewed by the Authority members at a meeting. The new application date starts January 1st.
- She said regarding the impact, you are really are going to have to explain this project if it wasn't for the casino, would you still need it. She's not pleased with the way the process went, and she voted no. Mr. Cahalan said we will be bringing each of those projects to Council with a resolution for the Gaming Authority, which we do for all grants. Mrs. deLeon said she appreciates that. She is amazed at the different people she sits on that board with that have carte blanche to apply for grants with no concept of telling their boards that they do that. There are always consequences to grants and a budgetary line item that it has to fit in somewhere. Is it funded? Is it going to be a surprise event? Is it an annual event down the road? She was not happy about that. She appreciates the fact that the Township does that.
- She said January 4th or 5th at 3 pm, Andy DeGruchy is available. She has to check with Tom Harp to see what dates are available for him, and then we're going to meet at the Meadows Road Bridge on the way to preserve old bridges. She will be there as a Council person. The County owns it and they've talked about it at the SVP. Tom Koehler came and talked to them and they told him how important it was not to use Portland cement, so

**General Business & Developer Meeting
December 21, 2011**

now they are going to meet with the County and introduce that concept. She will report back on January 3rd what date they selected.

JR. COUNCIL PERSON – No report

C. SOLICITOR

➤ Attorney Treadwell said every year when we do the ordinance fixing, the General Purpose tax fixing and the resolution for all the other taxes, he and Ms. Huhn discussed that they really need to be updated as you are using documents back from 1960. With your permission, he and Leslie will update the documents for next year so they'll be clearer to read.

D. ENGINEER – No report

E. PLANNER – No report

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY: Mrs. deLeon moved for adjournment. The time was 8:37 PM.

SECOND BY: Mr. Horiszny

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

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mrs. Yerger – Absent)

Submitted by:

Jack Cahalan
Township Manager

Glenn C. Kern
President of Council