

**I. OPENING**

**CALL TO ORDER:** The Planning Commission of Lower Saucon Township was called to order on Thursday, May 23, 2019 at (time not noted), at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. Tom Carocci, presiding as acting Chair.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: Craig Kologie, Chair; Tom Carocci, Vice Chair; Sandy Yerger; Kathy McGovern, John Noble and Scott Kennedy members; Jim Young, Zoning Officer; Linc Treadwell, Solicitor; Kevin Chimics, Engineer; & Judy Stern-Goldstein, Consultant. Absent: Haz Hijazi, Secretary

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS – None**

**III. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. ARIA-BETHLEHEM LANDFILL – RENEWABLE NATURAL GAS FACILITY SITE PLAN #SP 02-19 – ARIA ENERGY EAST LLC – 2335 APPLEBUTTER ROAD - EXP. 08/21/19**

Judy Stern-Goldstein explained that tonight Aria Bethlehem is here for a renewable gas facility site plan. The reason they're required to do a site plan is because they're asking for a special exception and variances in order to do the renewable gas project. The reason why they have to do a site plan is just because it's a requirement of Zoning Hearing Board application for special exception requirements. So tonight after their presentation, you'll need to make a motion to recommend approval or denial of the site plan. Part of the site plan requirements gives the Planning Commission the ability to waive some items required as part of the site plan.

The applicant is asking for that tonight and will explain why. I just want you to know that this is the first step in a multi step process. They're coming before you tonight, you'll make the recommendation yes or no on the site plan, they'll go to Council who will decide whether to let them go to the Zoning Hearing Board as it is, to oppose or to send Linc to be in favor of the project at the Zoning Hearing Board. At that time, then they will go to the Zoning Hearing Board.

If they're successful at the Zoning Hearing Board, they'll come back and submit a land development plan for the renewable gas facility and that will come to the Planning Commission and to Council again. Then they will need building permits and grading permits and all of the regulatory permits from DEP also. So this is the first step, but is a very important step in the process. So, with that, I will turn it over to Ed Murphy who will introduce the group and start their presentation.

Ed Murphy state that he is local counsel to Aria Energy East LLC which is the applicant before you this evening. We initially met with staff in April to map out the procedural steps that we need to take to pursue the approvals that Ms. Stern-Goldstein made reference to. We subsequently submitted a formal application to the Zoning Hearing Board which is going to be heard by your Zoning Hearing Board on June 17<sup>th</sup> and we're scheduled to meet with Council on June 5<sup>th</sup> to take their temperature about the merit of the Special Exception which is a principal part of the Zoning Hearing Board application.

Ed Murphy stated that the application also included three potential waivers dealing with site plan scaling and contours that we'll talk about more in the course of the presentation. As part of the Zoning Hearing Board application, we did submit a site plan. That site plan was the subject of an initial review by Judy Stern-Goldstein's office and Kevin Chimics' office and in response to that we submitted a revised plan which is the subject of Judy Stern-Goldstein's May 16<sup>th</sup> review which is the most current and is probably going to be the one we'll address after the presentation is concluded.

Ed Murphy stated that to his immediate left is Steve Smith, Senior Vice President for Aria, and to Mr. Smith's left is Matt Harnesh, general counsel for Aria. All three of us participated in the prior staff meeting that gave rise to the submission of the Zoning Hearing Board application and site plan; and, we've had ongoing dialog with Ms. Stern-Goldstein's and Mr. Chimics' offices in response to various review letters we received to date.

Steve Smith stated that we're very excited about being located in the Bethlehem area. Aria Energy East is the applicant and is the subsidiary of the company, Aria Energy. We are headquartered in Novi, Michigan; and, we do have offices in Oakfield, New York, Frederick, Colorado and my office in Gilbert, Arizona. We have developed, owned and operated gas and energy projects since 1986. We are experts in the production and sales of renewable gas and electrical power. There's only one other company that produces more electrical power from landfill gas than we do and that's Waste Management. We are the largest market share on the renewable natural gas side and we produce the most of anybody in the country.

We have 43 projects that we own and operate, located in 17 states across the United States. We have around 14 others that we contract to operate for municipalities or for joint ventures or for other types of business setups. We do process about 53 billion cubic feet of landfill gas a year. We are generating about 1.4 million mega watts of green power. We produce about 4.4 million mmbtu's of RNG. One of the key elements to this type of process is that by taking this landfill gas and using it beneficially, last year in 2018, we removed over 7 million tons of carbon monoxide being emitted into the atmosphere.

The proposed Bethlehem project, does continuously generate landfill gas which is a mixture of methane and carbon dioxide. There is a normal decay process, is the materials decay and the bugs eat the trash and produce methane carbon dioxide. EPA regulations for clean air act required larger landfills, which Bethlehem qualifies, to collect and control that landfill gas. And, currently it is burned; but, at this time the BRE plant is not operational. So, right now, it is going up in a flare. Our facility will take that gas, refine it and actually produce high pliant standard gas which will be injected into the UGI utilities pipeline and be used for vehicle fuel and various other resources as a fossil fuel replacement.

Some items that are of importance as well is that we do have a letter of commitment and we do have a service contract from both UGI to inject gas into their pipeline system as well as the Pennsylvania Power and Light to provide the power to the plant that's coming from the substation located on Applebutter Road. There is adequate capacity on the full line to bring dedicated 20.7 kv power line to the facility so the flicker and all those different issues in the local community are avoided. We'll have our own dedicated power. On the stormwater control side for the RNG facility, this is provided by the Landfill's modified basin 1.

The lighter green area on this slide is the project area where we will be building the RNG plant. There will be no expansion to the landfill. All the boundaries as they exist now and are permitted for now are what they have. So, the landfill itself and the RNG facility are located within the zone and permitted special use exception for the landfill. It is not inside the waste footprint which is the darker green line and is where all the waste materials are located. Also, there's a purple line that goes south out of the green area and is parallel to Applebutter Road and down Ringhoffer Road to a teal line. The teal line is the main gas line that feeds the Calpine plant and is a UGI utilities pipeline. Our interconnect there will go from the plant, which is the purple line, to a gate station located at that location there on Ringhoffer Road.

One of the nice things about this is that UGI owns all of the property south of Applebutter Road; so, there's no additional easements or those types of issues to do. The pipeline itself will be 4 inches or smaller, very similar to the size of a pipeline that feeds into a good size subdivision.

Near the Calpine plant where the teal line ends, there's a PRV (pressure reducing valve) station there and it feeds a local line that goes north to the south side of Applebutter Road and then runs west all the way into Lehigh Valley; and, that is the local distribution line from this main transmission. If for any reason the Calpine plant goes down for maintenance or any issues, there's still adequate demand by the Lehigh Valley to accept all of our renewable natural gas.

Steve Smith stated that this slide is a blow up of the facility; and, one of the things we're asking a variance for is the scale. As you can see when you're trying to show 214 acres and the requirement is a 1:50 scale. The scale you're looking at here is 1:200; so, you can see it would take 4 or 5 sheets and then you would get confused looking at the sheets. We think it's better, particularly on site layouts, to have one big view like this. Similarly on these sheets here, because of the contours, we're redoing basin 1 that's off to the left, there's a lot of lines where that basin is going to be deepened. It's not enlarged, it's actually reduced in size, but the volume is maintained by deepening. That also supplies us any rainfall that occurs on our facility goes into that pond and is stored there under the permits of the landfill.

All the riparian, wetlands, and setbacks are shown on this. We do not have, to date, any comments on the environmental protection standards; but, we have been able to meet every single one of them at the County.

Judy Stern-Goldstein state that when they come for their land development and they have their final grading, they will just have to demonstrate again that they're meeting all of the environmental protection standards. But at this point, it looks like they are.

Steve Smith state on the south side of this facility there is a retaining wall, this is required to get the space for a portion of the existing basin 1 and will be filled in to make use of this area for the RNG facility. The processing building is the larger sized building on the facility and is about 7000 square feet. That's where all the equipment that removes the CO<sub>2</sub>, nitrogen, oxygen and those types of things in order to produce the pipeline standard gas. The smaller building is a control room and electrical room building; all of the controls, the operators, the washrooms and all the handicap, etc. To the left of the smaller building is the substation, that's where PPL's power line will come in and reduce that power from 12.7 kb to the 41.60 power source for use of the plant. All the other smaller equipment around the plant would be chillers and chiller equipment used for cooling the gas from moisture and those types of things.

All of the noise bearing equipment is located inside of the building, the compressors, etc. There will be as a part of the LVPC noise study submitted, but we're not expecting that to be an issue. Typically the noise levels are 42 dbas. We do have to redo one of the stormwater drainage for the landfill in order to get it to basin 1. That's about all on the site plan.

Craig Kologie questioned the process – what kind of by-products are there as a result of the process?

Steve Smith answered there's basically 2 different by-products. One is what we call tail gas or waste gas. We do have our own thermal oxidizer on this plant site and is located towards the pond just inside that ring road. That thermal oxidizer is relatively similar to the flare that's on the site now; however, it has higher combustion and structure efficiencies so we'll actually have less emissions.

The only other item that we have is a by product of condensate. This condensate is treated through a water-oil separator and will actually be discharged back into that fire station yard just down stream to where we connect to pull the gas out and put that water back in and it will be combined with their condensate and their leachate. And it will be discharged under a permit; and, they have 2 permits, but one permit is the City of Bethlehem and we've never had any issues with the condensate.

Craig Kologie stated correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought the condensate discharge was an issue with the prior facility.

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that on the BRE proposal and when it was functioning they had a significantly sized tank and their condensate was a whole type of issue. The actually had to haul that away. They had a lot of issues with the condensate to start with. But, I asked the same question when they first came in. What's the difference with the condensate and this is a whole different process.

Steve Smith stated that this is a very different process. We're not near the pressures that are required to operate the turbine plant, the maximum operating pressure here is about 150 psi. The condensate does go through an oil-water separator which is a processing step that they did not choose to go through and I don't know why. The oil-water separator will remove any of the floating items from the water, and the condensate comes out the bottom and can be discharged.

Craig Kologie asked that water is burned off through that flare process?

Steve Smith answered no, the oil is barreled and it's not a lot. It's typically, in this size of plant, probably 2 or 3 55 gallon drums per month. It is handled; and, it is handled through an oil burner and we don't do that on site because we're not permitted for that. But there are companies that we have national contracts with and they come and pick up the waste oil.

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that the condensate was a totally different animal in the BRE process. It was a significant part of the process with a lot of waste associated with condensate.

Kathy McGovern asked the PennEast pipeline has a 2 mile lateral line that's going to the same destination, do you know where the PennEast pipeline is going to be exactly?

Judy Stern-Goldstein answered I know in general where the PennEast pipeline is going to be. I don't think anyone can tell us exactly right now. Everything is approximate.

Kathy McGovern stated that it is approximate; but, we've already negotiated with them because they're going right through my farm. And, I know they're ending up right by Calpine.

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that Mr. Smith can probably tell you that it's going to come into UGI and they are going to connect to it. But, this connection from the landfill to UGI is a relatively straight connection. The pipeline is not connecting directly into this facility, from my understanding.

Steve Smith stated that's correct. UGI will build the pipeline from that corner there on that teal line and put a gate station there and they will build the pipeline all the way into our facility and they will also build the interconnect on our facility. They have to monitor the gas to verify that it in fact meets pipeline standards. They will own and operate the plant lines. So, it's a totally independent pipeline from point A to point B.

Judy Stern-Goldstein asked when you say pipeline, it's the pipe from your facility to the UGI facility?

Steve Smith answered that's correct.

Kathy McGovern asked where is the holding facility for PennEast going to be on Ringhoffer Road?

Sandra Yerger asked are you talking about the big storage tanks? That's further down.

Steve Smith stated that one of the key elements to understand how this teal pipeline operates, it's actually connected to the south about 4 miles to the Columbia pipeline and that's at 900 psi and this pipeline is at 400 psi. So, there's physically no way it can go south; it's got to go to Calpine or go into the local distribution line.

Kathy McGovern asked do we know how long the life span of the landfill is? Have we ever figured that out?

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that we know that based on their estimates and the last estimates that came to us, it's like 5 years before they stop accepting trash. But then they will still be producing methane in a curve for quite awhile. The methane that's being produced increases for several years.

Steve Smith stated it increases for about 2 to 4 years and then it starts slowly declining. The gas in the reserves and the plant that we're building meets our 20 year curve. We do have generation facilities located at landfills for over 15 years and they're still operational.

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that the one good thing from the Township's perspective is that we wouldn't have to have a flare burning all the time. The flare will occasionally burn if they have to take their facility off line for short periods.

Steve Smith stated that we also have a flare on our facility; so, if it's a short time duration, we have the capability to take the gas and put it to a flare which is solely separate from the thermal

oxinator. Typically, that's 15 to 30 minutes and then we're back on line and producing gas. Also, that flare is required during start up. It will be required because as you start pulling the gas out and your compressor starts up, it has to be a sequence start for this process. So during that time which is typically a 20 to 30 minute time frame, the flare will be used and as our flare shuts off. At that point their flare is not operational, because we're pulling all the gas. The landfill is required under the Clean Air Act is required to maintain that flare; so, they're not going to get rid of it. They must have that in order to compliant.

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that she believes that they must test the flare at certain periods and intervals also.

Steve Smith stated that's an EPA requirement. This is a view of the inside of a plant that we just developed and is now running and operational in southeast of the Oklahoma City landfill. This will give you a view down on the process floor. All of these are process vessels, there is no storage. It takes up to somewhere between 11 minutes to 20 minutes for the molecule to enter the plant. The tent in the picture will not be there; it was put up for the ribbon cutting ceremony and on that day they were calling for rain.

The smaller building in the foreground is that control building; and, the larger, taller building in the background is the processing building. Everything on our site is less than 50 feet tall. The buildings are not metal; they are split face block and are nice looking.

One of the nice things about this specific plant is this is a source that provides renewable natural gas gas to your community here locally. So that diminishes the need to have people build pipelines all over the place. The RNG facility will reduce the CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent emissions in your local air shed by over 70% than what's being done now. The RNG facility does supply enough gas in this local area that we can run 6,250 homes per year. If this area in Lower Saucon Township were to develop vehicle fueling which is the primary real use of this renewable natural gas due to the renewable fuel standard, we would fuel about 12,000 cars per year. There are a number of cities across the United States, for instance, if you travel, most airports now, 38 of them, all have renewable natural gas running buses, etc. that take you to the rental cars, that's our fuel. A lot of the transit buses, San Diego, LA, Phoenix, etc., all use the renewable natural gas. As a fossil fuel replacement, it has a very good and very low level of carbon being emitted into the air compared to fossil fuel.

Craig Kologie asked that 70% reduction, is that compared to the flare on site?

Steve Smith answered yes. We expect that number to be higher, most of our facilities are higher than that. That's a very good conservative number.

The final slide for tonight, the variances requested, we've already gone through these items. One is the scale on the larger scale drawings, going from 1:50 to 1:200; the contour intervals of 2 feet, we'd like to use 10 feet and on all the other drawings, we'd would go to the 5 feet contours.

We do have and have submitted on May 9<sup>th</sup> complete and revised set of site plans; and, we've had subsequent reviews, one dated May 16<sup>th</sup> and one dated May 17<sup>th</sup>. I believe there was just one issue that we were debating back and forth with the staff and I think that is resolved.

Ed Murphy stated that it might be just as easy to talk about Judy's letter of May 16<sup>th</sup>.

Sandy Yerger stated that she would like to hear what Hanover has to say.

Ed Murphy stated right. We have 2 review letters one the 16<sup>th</sup> from Judy's office and one of May 17<sup>th</sup> from Hanover. In the 16<sup>th</sup> letter from Judy, we did item 1 on page 2, we applied for the Special Exception and are scheduled for a hearing before the Zoning Hearing Board on June 17<sup>th</sup>. Under the site plan requirements, Steve mentioned items A & B, they're the several variances on this page that are dealing with the scale and the contours. Item 2C talks about revising the plan to comply with stormwater management and that's a will comply and will be handled at the land development stage.

Item 2 D, Steve has already talked about generally how the plant's going to function and operate and this will be a greater discussion during the land development process.

Item 2 D I, is the 3<sup>rd</sup> variance that we requested and is included in our Zoning Hearing Board application. The reason we did that even though I think the staff thought that all of these would qualify as site plan waivers, is because we learned back in 2016 when the landfill itself made an application to the Zoning Hearing Board for a special exception. Linc provided us with a copy of the decision and variances were granted for those 3 sections per which we sought site plan waivers. So, in the abundance of precaution, we've asked as part of our Zoning Hearing Board application for variances from those 3 sections, because it seemed like the precedent has been set in 2016.

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that is correct. Maryanne Garber is the attorney for the landfill at that point. And, she was very cautious because she had been involved in the landfill for quite a number of years and was not very trusting that the relief was granted by Planning Commission during the site plan approval would hold in the end; so, she insisted on asking for them in variances and they were granted.

Ed Murphy stated Item 3 in Judy's letter deals with the environmental protection standards that we've touched on earlier. We believe that we've fully complied. But again to the extent that there's more information requested during the course of the land development process, we'll provide it. The same thing with parking, loading and lighting, all that will be covered as part of the land development application. The last section in Judy's letter, paragraph 5, that goes from the bottom of page 3 to the top of page 4, we have no issue with providing the appropriate plantings for the buffers that your ordinance requires.

The last item that Steve made reference to and that was a conversation I had with Linc and thereafter with Judy about whether or not the 100 foot setback applied in this case. The answer is that it does not because we're not doing any surface mining, we're not part of the landfill, we are not a waste disposal facility, a waste transfer facility or a recycling facility. All of those activities are what is intended to be controlled by a 100 foot setback. So, I indicated to Linc earlier today and Judy tonight, that we would at least refer to that conversation to confirm that's the approach we're taking.

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that the reason why it's in the letter and the reason why I want them to state it tonight is I want them to unequivocally state that on record that they are not any one of those specific activities. So, they don't need a setback for this activity; but, if this activity involved any of the activities listed in the ordinance, surface mine, landfill, waste disposal facility, a waste transfer facility or a recycling facility activities, they would apply.

Steve Smith stated correct.

Ed Murphy state that's accurate. If you like we can run through the May 17<sup>th</sup> Hanover letter. Most of the items that are highlighted are those that we would typically cover during the land development submission and review process.

Kevin Chimics stated that our review letter are items that are going to be needed during the land development process. For special exception, a site plan is required & Judy's office did a detailed review of that, so we weren't going to duplicate her work. So, ours are more general comments that as they move through the process are going to need to be addressed when we meet for the land development.

Kathy McGovern asked there is no water and sewer on Applebutter Road? It's well and septic.

Kevin Chimics stated that the landfill itself is connected to public water and sewer.

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that BRE is also connected.

Ed Murphy stated that is it City of Bethlehem. There is a 12 inch water line that actually runs in Applebutter Road.

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that all those little out parcels they purchased were not; but, the landfill itself and that area is connected.

Ed Murphy stated that last week we had a preliminary meeting with building permits and Jim. We discussed the fire department connection in a lot more details than what we're doing here and we are going to have an 8 inch water line off of the 12 inch line up to the plant. That will serve the City fire department connection as well as provide us with a 2 inch water tap. The sewer is already in existence.

What is the front yard setback for this property? You said it's a 100 foot setback for the landfill and waste disposal. But, what is the front yard setback for the zoning area for industrial?

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that this is in the L-I district, but it is the overall landfill use which is 100 foot and there are buffer requirements. It's a series of layers and it's 100 foot to the activities and then there is a 50 foot perimeter buffer.

Ed Murphy stated that most properties have a front yard setback for any development. What is that setback?

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that for the general industrial uses, the front yard is 50 feet for the building setback.

Kathy McGovern asked just looking at number 6, there's not going to be any hauling?

Matt Harnesh answered no. We have 2 employees and a half time manager at the plant.

Craig Kologie asked what types of emergency incidents have you had at your other facilities?



Steve Smith answered we have a significant amount of what you call life, health and safety monitoring in this plant. One of the uniquenesses about these types of facilities, there's methane monitoring, oxygen monitoring, fire monitoring and various different monitors inside this building. When this plant is designed is that if any of those monitors go off, the plant shuts down, depressurizes and it goes to flare.

Matt Harnesh stated that as a company we were accident free as of 2019, plus about 200 straight days that were accident free in 2018. Our worst incident in the last 3 years, we had a dude hit himself in the face with a wrench. I also had somebody pull a shoulder from lifting, that's literally the universe of what would happen across 43 states.

Craig Kologie asked what's the staffing of a facility like this?

Steve Smith stated typically we're talking 2 with an operations manager.

Kathy McGovern asked the facility runs 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, correct?

Steve Smith answered it does. I can actually access the plants, I do not do it; but, I can change valves and shut the plant down.

Judy Stern-Goldstein asked can you explain what happens during the over night hours when somebody is not on site?

Steve Smith stated that somebody is on call 24/7. Anything that goes wrong whether it's a pressure sensor or a temperature sensor, various items not just life/health safety. There's a lot of different things that we're monitoring at this plant. If anything goes out of a range, there's a call made to the on-call person.

Judy Stern-Goldstein asked how close does the on-call person live near the facility?

Steve Smith answered typically our operators are within 20 minutes. There's a multitude of people that get on that call. In other words, whoever's on call gets a text and there's 5 additional people that gets texts. If there's not a text back from that person, the next person in line needs to respond, etc.

Ed Murphy asked if there is an automatic shutdown? When is the last time there was one of those?

Steve Smith answered yes. We had an automatic shutdown at our southeast Oklahoma City plant in February.

Ed Murphy asked what was the cause of that?

Steve Smith answered it was a bad temperature gauge. It was not monitoring the temperature correctly. The temperature gauge was replaced in about 3 minutes; we do carry a significant amount of spare parts at the plant and the plant was up and running in about 30 minutes.

Kathy McGovern asked number 2 site plan requirements B – the slope does exceed 20% back there, where they're going to be putting their facility.

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated in the area where the basin berm is for their enlarging the berm is what exceeds 20%. The actual area of the facility does not exceed 20%.

Kathy McGovern stated I understand that; but, there's no concern there for the slope going into the berm?

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that they will have to address all of that at land development. If they cannot comply with our regulations, then they won't get approval. This was just a site plan requirement to deal with the contour interval based on the slope. And the contour interval, the one they're proposing is actually appropriate so that you can read the plan for the site plan on one sheet. But, at land development, they have to comply with all of the detailed grading and they will.

Steve Smith stated that there is a significant retaining wall here, so there won't be a hole. Once that plant side itself is in, there won't be a slope because it's within concrete. I guarantee that we don't want it to fail.

Craig Kologie asked what do we need to do here?

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that you need to make a recommendation with respect to the site plan. And, if it were to be a recommendation for approval of the site plan, you would need to also address any comments you have, and I would suggest that they would be that during the land development phase that the applicant comply with all outstanding items in the Boucher & James planning letter of May 16<sup>th</sup> and the Hanover Engineering letter of May 17<sup>th</sup> in addition to all appropriate Zoning and Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements. And, a site meeting with respect to the landscaping buffer for the residents of the site along Applebutter Road.

Craig Kologie asked before we do a motion, do we need to deal with any waivers of the site plan that they're asking for?

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that if you choose to, you can make a recommendation with respect to the waivers on the site plan; but, they're actually asking for variances. So, if they're asking for a variance, I would suggest you let the Zoning Hearing Board deal with that.

Craig Kologie asked it's both your's and Kevin's opinion that there is adequate information on the site plan to allow the Zoning Hearing Board to make an informed decision on the variances and special exception?

Judy Stern-Goldstein stated that with respect to the special exception and variances, yes I do, with the condition that everything is complied with at land development.

**MOTION BY:** A motion was made by Craig Kologie to recommend approval of the Aria-Bethlehem Landfill Site Plan #SP 02-19 with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the Boucher & James, Inc. review letter dated 05/16/19.
2. Compliance with the Hanover Engineering, Inc. review letter dated 05/17/19.
3. The improvements will require Land Development approval and shall comply with the Lower Saucon Township Subdivision and Land Development ordinance regulations and Zoning Ordinance regulations.

4. The applicant agrees to have a site meeting with adjacent property owners during the Land Development process and to address their concerns regarding buffering of the proposed improvements.

**SECOND BY:** Scott Kennedy

**ROLL CALL:** 6-0 (Absent: Mr. Hijazi)

**IV. MICELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 28, 2019**

**MOTION BY:** Sandy Yerger moved for approval of the March 28, 2019 Planning Commission minutes as corrected.

**SECOND BY:** Tom Carocci

**ROLL CALL:** 6-0 (Absent: Mr. Hijazi)

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

**MOTION BY:**

**SECOND BY:**

**ROLL CALL:**

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY:** Kathy McGovern motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:05p.m.

**SECOND BY:** Tom Carocci

**ROLL CALL:** 6-0 (Absent: Mr. Hijazi)

Submitted by:

---

Craig Kologie, Chair