

**I. OPENING**

**CALL TO ORDER:** The Environmental Advisory Council (EAC) meeting of Lower Saucon Township was called to order on Tuesday, April 12, 2022 at 6:35 p.m., with Sandra Yerger, presiding.

**ROLL CALL**

**Members:** Sandra Yerger, Dru Germanoski, Allan Johnson, Ann Spirk, and Laura Ray; **Associate Member:** Kaitlyn O'Connor Sommer; **Jr. Council Member:** Bela Silverman; **Staff:** Stacy Werkheiser and Carol Schneider.

**Absent: Members:** Michael Boyle and Cindy Oatis; **Associate Members:** Nicholas Lynn, Glenn Kaye and Tom Carocci.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION** – None

**II. OPEN SPACE SUB-COMMITTEE**

A. **PROPERTY DISCUSSION #2022-1**— Dru has been in contact with the landowners and two dates were proposed for visitation dates of Monday (4/25) and Thursday (4/28) in the evening. He will send an email to the Open Space Committee so they can check their calendars if these dates are good. Dru said he has the soils and geology material and it is quite similar to an adjacent property they did a previous review.

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

A. **PICK A DATE FOR ADOPT-A-ROAD PROGRAM** — Sandy said the program is officially open from April 23<sup>rd</sup> to June 12<sup>th</sup>. Kaitlyn offered to pick up the items and said she felt it was better to do it earlier than later. She proposed the date of May 7<sup>th</sup>, and she said she will bring her crew to cover one side of the road. Ann is able to attend that date as well. Sandy added that since they have been doing the road, the amount of trash has decreased over the years. They will meet at 9 a.m. at the bridge. Sandy asked staff to send email to EAC that this is the date.

B. **KECK MINOR SUBDIVISION** — Sandy asked if there were any questions/concerns after their review of the information provided in their packet. Dru said he would like to note that the engineers mention that in the drainage swale is wetland but there is not plan to develop in the wetland. The site check revealed no flood plain exists within the proposed development area. Sandy noted the subdivision is dividing 7-1/2 acres into 2 lots so a minimum of around 3 acres per lot. Allan asked about zoning if it was zones for storage or offices or if there may be a zoning change, and Sandy was not aware of any zoning changes. Sandy asked if there were any other questions, and she confirmed with them there is no action on this one.

**IV. DEVELOPER ITEMS** – None

**V. UPDATES/REPORTS**

A. **ELECTRONIC RECYCLING FOR FALL 2022 UPDATE** – Sandy does not have any new updates. The one item she wanted to revisit was reaching out the some of the high school students. The plan is that we will reach out to the rising class of seniors who will need service hours. Bela confirmed that reaching out to Mr. Marcozzi and Ms. Sams for students is a good start. Stacy will do this in September and reach out to teachers, and it will also be on the September agenda.

B. **LAND CONSERVATION MAILING AND WORKSHOP FOR 2022 DISCUSSION** – Sandy said she has not heard back from Chris yet, and she knows they are in the process of hiring a replacement and this is the person the Township will work with on the event. Sandy will follow-up with her before the next meeting and start to move forward with this.

C. **HELLERTOWN BOROUGH AUTHORITY** – Dru gave an update that he and Laura Ray attended the last meeting and the previous meeting. Dru gave a summary from the first meeting they

attended. They identified the number of parcels, number of trees, species, etc. Dru raised the concern at that meeting that this sounded more like a logging plan than a forest management plan. He said they told him that a year prior, they had a hydrologist come to their meeting, and they recommended they speak with a forest manager. Dru said he again raised his concern at the last meeting, that it was a linear disconnected plan in the sense that there was a hydrologic plan developed by a hydrologist, and then a logging plan by loggers but there was no interaction, and the logger clearly was not trained in hydrology. At the last meeting, Frank Pazzaglia who is on the Borough Authority and the geomorphologist at Lehigh gave a very comprehensive presentation to the Borough Authority and that is where the linkage was made between forest management and hydrology. After he reviewed the regulations that were provided via email, and also the updated Chapter 180 that they just received today, it seemed to Dru, that the preamble statement says they want to manage these forests properly, and in fact, forest management logging seems to be encouraged. He feels a prudent thing to do is to wait until they develop a plan because there is nothing at this time to review. He suggests that when a plan is submitted to the Township, that he asks Frank Pazzaglia to come to an EAC meeting to present what their plan is and to contextualize it within the framework of wise land management, water resource protection, etc. He thinks they will then have a better opportunity to review it. He said it will still be up to the water authority to decide what to do by way of developing an actual plan of logging with actual locations within the watershed planned as target areas for logging. He said the watershed authority are clearly still in conversation about what they are going to do. Laura added that they had mentioned at the last meeting that they wished they would have asked the logger to look at lots in a different order. She said they do have it on their agenda again tomorrow evening at 6:00 p.m. to address the logging plan at the Borough Authority Building. Laura said she reached out to Durham Township's EAC because she read something the Buck County Herald about a recent change they did and they told her that long ago, the EAC used to review logging plans when they came in and that went away, sort of like LST. She said EAC in LST used to see them all the time, and she has not seen plans come through EAC. She said Durham made a change so they have a chance to review. She said they also said they have a difference in their ordinance that they require a plan to be made a by a certified forester, not a logger. She said they saw a logger's plan, and they will make money cutting the good trees as opposed to a forester who is more for forest management. Laura reviewed our ordinance and said there is not a whole lot in there, and she didn't see that we require a permit. She said it seems they can submit their plan and do whatever it says. Sandy said there is no permit fee to her understanding, but the Zoning Officer does go out and make sure they comply. Sandy said most of the ordinance is dealing with water protection. Laura said it seems like it is the state standard, and Sandy said it is. Sandy said that the state advises. She said Laura can review it online. Kaitlyn added that she likes the idea of them coming through EAC if that is something.....Sandy said they do submit a plan to the Zoning Officer, and she said she does not see a problem with that. Sandy said she is not aware that they have submitted anything yet. Allan referenced about the Erosion and Sedimentation Pollution Control Plan and referenced PA Code Chapter 102 shall also satisfy the requirements for the logging plan. He asked about when a house is built, there is a Northampton County agency that has to come out and inspect it to make sure that any soil movements they made.....is that organization going to have to come out and review the roads that they build? Sandy asked if he was referring to the Northampton County Conservation District (NCCD)? Allan said yes. Sandy was not sure as that would not be in our ordinance. Allan said if PA has the higher authority, usually everything in the state develops from their rules. Sandy said that is why when ours was too strict according to their timbering ordinances, ours was struck down. Allan said you would think the NCCD would be part of this PA law. Sandy said they do go by the Conservation District and state so it would have to comply with both. Laura asked if they review it? Sandy said our Zoning Officer would have to make sure it is in compliance. Allan asked what his experience is with timbering and logging, and Sandy said it is more with sediment and erosion that they are worried about, and that is predominately what is in both the state and county as they do not want any runoff or issues. Allan asked Dru when he attended the meeting if it was the water authority's idea to do this to raise money or did the timbering company show up to offer money? Dru said he believed they were interested in managing the watershed for long-term forest health and watershed protection, water resource protection. Frank Pazzaglia has had some students

work on the property evaluating spring flow. He said his personal take that came from the meeting, was that they are firmly interested in forest management and water resource protection as opposed as an opportunity to raise money. Dru asked Laura her opinion, and she agreed. Dru said, and Laura agreed, that they felt they would use the money raised from the logging of one parcel to pay for the pine area logged where there would not be a financial benefit. They are using the funds to address problem areas. They both felt it was not being done to raise funds. Allan asked is they discussed possible fire hazards from all the pine trees that are close to one another? Dru said they mentioned this and are aware of this. Dru also added again that he felt strongly that this is a desire to try to manage the whole watershed that feeds their water supply. Laura agreed - this was for long term - 100 years from now would like it to stay healthy. Dru added that the one area of their forest that was in a healthy condition with diversity of species, was one that has been logged 60-80 years ago. This area was one of the higher quality areas in the watershed from an ecosystem forest system perspective. Allan added that he has had conversations about our deer population and young trees are getting eaten by the deer. He isn't sure there was a deer population that many years ago like we have today. Dru added there is an issue with deer feeding on the young plants they would like to see in the system. Oak trees are a classic example. Oak tree regeneration is a statewide issue. Allan added the oak trees are the one trees that support most of the life. Dru said at this point, we have to wait until they have a plan.

**VI. OLD/MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**

- A. 5-YEAR GOALS AND PROJECTS** – Sandy reviewed some projects they discussed in the past. Sandy had a few programs that she had done at the school and then COVID came along. The detention basin topic went away at the school – she said they can suggest it to the school only. She would like to see the school initiate it, or even if anyone has a contact. Terry Boos and Sandy went out years ago, and the school never went forward on it. Plastic Bags: She said in her opinion, she felt like this has died away. Laura said they did get that out of the budget where they had it wormed in where they prevented people from having bans, so that went away. She said it seems like the other states do it at the state level. Sandy said to write your state representative.
- B. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 8, 2022 MINUTES** - Stacy pointed out a typo to be corrected.

**MOTION BY:** Sandra Yerger with corrections.  
**SECOND BY:** Dru Germanoski  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0 (Michael Boyle and Cindy Oatis absent)

- C. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MARCH 8, 2022 MINUTES** - Dru and Kaitlyn noted one typo and a name spelling correction needed.

**MOTION BY:** Dru Germanoski with corrections.  
**SECOND BY:** Sandra Yerger  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0 (Michael Boyle and Cindy Oatis absent)

**VII. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS** – None

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY:** Dru Germanoski moved for adjournment. The time was 7:12 p.m.  
**SECOND BY:** Ann Spirk  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0 (Michael Boyle and Cindy Oatis absent)

---

Sandra B. Yerger, Chair