

WARRINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 16, 2010

A special meeting of the Warrington Township Board of Supervisors was held on February 16, 2010, 7:30 p.m., at the Mill Creek Elementary School, located at 638 Bellflower Boulevard, Warrington, PA 18976. The members present were as follows:

ATTENDANCE:

Rebecca A. Kiefer, Chairman; John Paul, Vice Chairman; Marianne Achenbach, Secretary; Michael W. Lamond, Jr., Assistant Secretary; Paul Plotnick, Member; Timothy J. Tieperman, Township Manager; William R. Casey, Esq., Township Solicitor; Richard Wieland, Township Engineer; Andrew Brown, P.E., Traffic Engineer, Carroll Engineering Corporation; Michael Mrozinski, Director of Planning and Economic Development; and Carolyn Hanel, Director of Administrative Services/Parks and Recreation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting opened with a pledge to the flag.

Continuation of Discussion on Proposed Sketch Plan for TEVA Pharmaceuticals, a proposed major land development project for a tract located between Limekiln Pike and Lower State Roads, south of the Eureka Stone Quarry.

Mrs. Kiefer said that this is the second meeting for the TEVA Proposal. She introduced the members of the Board of Supervisors and the Staff from Warrington Township. She introduced Bruce Murray, Vice President of Facilities, TEVA Pharmaceuticals; Robert Gundlach, Attorney-at-Law, TEVA Pharmaceuticals; Edmund Klimek, Architect and Land Planner for KSS Architects; and Karl Pehnke, Transportation Engineer with CMX Engineers.

Mrs. Kiefer said at the last meeting held on February 2, 2010 there were so many people here and we wanted to make sure that everyone had an opportunity to come up to the microphone and make their statement or ask their questions. She said we have a list of those questions, which we are going to address to the TEVA Team and expect answers and/or clarification from them. She reminded the audience that this is just the beginning of our discussions and there will be many more meetings with TEVA. She said there are issues that must be addressed regarding comments made by attendees at the last meeting, February 2, 2010 as well as a flyer that was distributed to residents. This unsigned flyer was distributed to residents indicating that "TEVA has been working behind closed doors with some supervisors to try and slide this proposal through..." The truth is quite to the contrary. The very first presentation to this Board of Supervisors was held on February 2, 2010. All of our meetings are public and there are no back door or secret meetings concerning this matter. We go to great lengths to make sure that the public is notified, invited, and encouraged to attend and express their concerns and opinions. Mrs. Kiefer asked if the person who has such knowledge would please come forward and inform all of us.

Mrs. Kiefer said the supervisor's yielded their time to ask questions at the last meeting to allow the residents ample opportunity to ask questions. As a result we have actually been accused of being partisan. She doesn't believe that anyone here is partisan in any aspect. Everyone who wished to be heard was given an opportunity to be heard and we will continue to do so. She said we have re-located this special meeting to a larger facility to afford all of the residents the ability to attend and be heard. As supervisors we must permit TEVA to make their presentation and give the residents ample opportunity to respond and ask questions. All questions will be answered. Nothing is pre-determined. She said there

are no “done deals”. I promise you that this Board is very concerned with the quality of your life, your health, safety and welfare, and we are here to listen and question TEVA as well. We answer your emails and inquiries; I have personally answered 75 emails.

Mrs. Kiefer said “rest assured that no decision will be made lightly and definitely will be made in a public meeting”. She said she is concerned about unsubstantiated accusations against supervisors who are just trying to do due-diligence. We value our integrity. Personally she has not had any back door meetings or any negotiations on any plans with TEVA and she wanted to ask the members of the Board if they can answer if they have had any negotiations with TEVA.

Mr. Paul said the first time he saw the proposal was at the planning commission meeting because he attended that meeting. He said it was an advertised meeting and it was a public meeting. He said other than that all of the meetings he attended were public meetings.

Mrs. Achenbach said the first time she saw the proposal and heard about TEVA was at the February 2, 2010. She was sworn in as a supervisor on January 4, 2010.

Mr. Plotnick said he had spoken to some TEVA people a few times with questions to clarify some situations. He first met the TEVA representatives at the planning commission meeting.

Mr. Lamond said on February 2, 2010 was the first time he heard anything about TEVA. Before that he found out that the agenda for the TEVA meeting with Warrington Township Staff was held with TEVA and two members of the Board of Supervisors was on January 15, 2010. He said this was a closed meeting and he is very much against that. Mrs. Kiefer said TEVA asked Staff to sit down and meet with them and explain zoning issues and other issues concerning the property. Mr. Paul and I attended that meeting specifically to inform TEVA that they would have to present all of their information at a public meeting. She said there were no negotiations and no discussions and she informed Staff that every meeting that we plan would be done in a public meeting. Mrs. Kiefer said she would like to give the person who claims there was a back door deal an opportunity to come forward because if there was any backdoor deal she would like to know about it. She and the other Board members value their integrity.

Mr. Christopher McDemus residing at 1007 Linden Way, Chalfont said he didn’t make that comment but the perception that was presented had the appearance of a backdoor meeting. He said that he would consider any meeting that is not held in a public forum to be a secret meeting.

Mrs. Kiefer said we have had the questions and comments raised by residents compiled under individual categories and we’re going to give TEVA an opportunity to answer our questions. She said she wanted to start with questions raised in regards to traffic issues. The first questions she raised had to do with the traffic study presented to us. She said there were a list of intersections in the traffic study and would like to know what intersections are included in the traffic study and who did the traffic study and when was it done. Mr. Pehnke said the preliminary transportation impact study that was submitted was dated 1/19/10. The study was predicated upon data provided by the township and its consultants. The preliminary traffic study intersections immediately surrounding the TEVA site including the traffic signal at County Line Road with Lower State Road and Limekiln Pike and several intersections to the north including Street Road, Pickertown Road, and Lower State Road. He said the more detailed study, which is in the process of being addressed, has a greater study area, based upon additional intersections that the township’s traffic consultant has asked us to look at. Currently we’re waiting for feedback from PennDOT in regards to those intersections to make sure that they are some of the intersections they want us to look at.

Liem Nguyen, who resides at 204 Rebecca Court, Chalfont, wanted to know the volume that he got from PennDOT for that intersection. He wanted to know peak hour volume and peak hour per day. Mr. Pehnke said the peak hour volume on Street, Lower State & County Line Roads is generally between 5-6 p.m. and said 2,500 vehicles/hour travel through that intersection.

Mrs. Kiefer asked for clarification on when was the study done and who did that study or were those counts from PennDOT. Mr. Pehnke said the traffic study was actually conducted by the township's previous traffic consultant, which was provided to us for a preliminary study. Mrs. Kiefer asked then you didn't do any traffic study on your own. He said as we move forward with a more comprehensive study there will be an official independent data. The data that was available for the preliminary transportation impact study came from the township's traffic consultant.

Mr. Gundlach summarized the first three questions on the list that he said obviously deal with the car traffic. He responded to the following three questions: 1) How much more traffic will be added to the surrounding roadways? 2) What is the number of trucks on a daily basis? and (3) What kind of impact will this additional traffic including the trucks have on the surrounding roadways? We need to look at afternoon peak and total and the data as well as over the 24-hour period. The afternoon peak and the evening peak represent the greatest amount of flow of traffic through these particular intersections. This gentleman emphasized that he wanted to have the two companies that do the 24-hour analysis and provide the accurate and true numbers. He said the figure is 17,000 according to PennDOT. Mr. Klimek said these figures represent the best most accurate data that we have now. He said we do have to do all of these studies and have the most current data, which includes 24 hour as well as peak traffic volumes. He said what happens over a period of time the current traffic moving through those intersections grows even without TEVA. He said you have to account for the natural growth that happens from the community as well as what's going on with TEVA. This represents the percentage of growth that is going on in each of those intersections for the future. The one increase is growth represents 23% and it is projected out to 2017 is when it will be possible for our facility to be fully operational. He said TEVA represents approximately 6.4% of the growth that will happen to those intersections at the peak hours.

Mr. Klimek addressed the question raised by Mr. Joel Shoberg, who resides at 125 Statesman Road, Chalfont, about the difference between car and truck traffic and we've actually did look down at the breakdown of that. Mr. Klimek explained said this graph shows a comparison of the amount of car traffic that is generated by TEVA versus the amount of truck traffic that is generated by TEVA. Truck traffic is considered at that intersection at peak.

Mr. Plotnick asked out of 100 trucks how many are tractor trailers and how many are FedEx trucks. Mr. Klimek said almost all of our trucks are tractor trailers.

Mr. Mike Kelly, who resides at 135 Deerfield Lane, Chalfont said he is skeptical if these figures are based on people per shift.

Mr. Gundlach explained that TEVA has no immediate plans for the use of the additional site. If and when we do, TEVA has to go through the same process that we're going through now so that means the same kind of public meetings, same kind of traffic studies, the same kind of application, and we have to proof that they work. He said TEVA is only purchasing 156 acres, which includes all of the industrial zoned ground. It doesn't need all of the industrial zoned ground now and a portion of that ground is located on the other side of that environmentally sensitive area. He said TEVA is not purchasing or looking to acquire or develop that 10 or 20 acres of commercial ground located on the corner of the property. That commercial property is not part of the package that TEVA is presenting.

Mrs. Kiefer said a lot of the questions have to do with the number of trucks and that has not been determined as yet. She said one of the issues concerns phases. She is looking for a real count for the amount of truck traffic TEVA is expecting within the next ten years. Mr. Gundlach said he would have Mr. Murray explain what is proposed here at this site and address Mr. Kelly's question about the comments he made at a Whipain hearing that may have been allegedly inconsistent with what he has presented here at the last meeting and reconcile that as well.

Mrs. Kiefer asked for information on the proposed routes for truck movement.

Mr. Murray responded to the question in terms of phasing. He said all along the plans that we've discussed have been from construction beginning in 2012 to fully built-out in 2015. He said when we talk about phasing we're talking about developing the site, construction, and increasing the activity. You've heard all the numbers. When you hear the number 200 for tractor trailer trucks, your hearing the full built-out in 2015. At the last meeting we said 150-200 tractor trailer trucks that full build-out in 2015. He said the phasing that we've been talking about, which can be one or two phases, construction and moving activity and operations into the two buildings that you've seen would be happening during that period between 2012 and 2015. At full build-out 150-200 tractor trailer trucks per day will be generated at that site by 2015.

Mrs. Kiefer said at the planning commission meeting someone said that the plan was for a good portion of the traffic to go via County Line Road to Route 611, and County Line Road to Route 202 because it would head toward the turnpike. Mr. Murray said that is not our plan. What we've looked at on this site is to determine the least impact onto and off of the site. The main route to use would be Route 202 to Route 309 and from there to the turnpike. Most of the tractor trailer traffic would be coming from and to Rt. 276 (PA Turnpike).

Mr. Michael Starner residing at 3429 County Line Road, Chalfont, asked about the traffic pattern to be used to get to the site. He said how can you force the traffic to use the routes previously mentioned. Mr. Murray said he didn't say they could force the traffic. It is clear that the traffic pattern that was mentioned is the logical route for most of the carriers to use for the kind of traffic that we generate and the business that we generate.

Mr. Harry Faust, who resides at 3636 Limekiln Pike, said in your previous conversations I listened to you and your colleagues talked last time and felt they were sarcastic with the way you talked about how much money TEVA had and how much money you could make, and the properties that you were going to dismantle due to the fact that they were only rentals. In your last conversation you were going to have your truckers come across Route 202 Parkway to Limekiln Pike to County Line Road. My issue is that I hear a lot of truck brakes going off prior to Stump Road and my other concern are the amount of traffic that turns onto Mill Creek Road. He said he used to drive semi trailers for 13 years cross country and trying to enter the intersection of Limekiln Pike and County Line Road your looking at 1 ½ semis at that intersection to make a left hand turn back onto Lower State Road. He said this is going to force traffic further back and back. He said safety is very important to him and you need to pay attention to the area that you're trying to infiltrate into. You need to look around at your surroundings, which are houses and not an industrial park. He said it's a high industrial park where TEVA is located now on Route 309. You haven't told us how you're going to enhance us you've only told us how you're going to hinder us and cause more problems.

Mr. Murray said he wanted to say something about the last gentleman's comments. He said we're very sympathetic with the concern that you made about the traffic having to do with all of these intersections. He said as the Site Manager for what is going to be built at this site he is going to have to deal with it as well. There is no doubt that it is a problem. He said as we are given an opportunity to give back more information to the community it will become clear that our intentions are not to make these intersections worse as is your fear understandably; but, in fact, to make them better even with TEVA's traffic added. That is our intention and it's a work in progress. We're working actively with PennDOT and with the Governor. They are aware of what we're trying to do and they are cooperating with us. We are not in a position yet to say how this is going to turn out. It's a work in progress and there will be more information to follow.

Mr. George Niblock, who resides at 1059 Upper State Road, Chalfont, had a question about the 3,000 cars on a peak hour base. Do you have any information relative to how many cars are going north and south at that time? What is the cue on the most active side and how long does it take to clear that intersection at that peak hour base. Mr. Pehnke said as he had indicated the traffic study is predicated, as traffic engineers, we focus on the peak hour analysis on this roadway system. The base traffic counts to

put together a traffic study include traffic counts at each of the intersections, which give you the directional movements that you just spoke about so we know whose turning right and who's turning left and who's going through on each of the intersections. He said we were also able to estimate where our traffic will flow to and from on the regional roadway system. When all that is combined, there is a detailed modeling effort that is undertaken for each of the peak hours for various scenarios; existing conditions, future conditions without TEVA, future conditions with TEVA, for the initial year and five years beyond that. All of that data is made available to both the township traffic consultant as well as PennDOT. He said the requirement under the Land Development process, particularly with PennDOT, since we do front on state roads that we do need to meet some very exact standards that the state sets in terms of what will service impact, which is the control that you experience on roadways; i.e., cues. All of that is subject to the detailed traffic study that is in progress. At this point in time we have already received feedback from the township's previous traffic consultant. We have submitted to PennDOT what the township has recommended and we're waiting at this time for feedback from PennDOT that they concur with the study locations with the traffic volumes that are utilized so that we can complete that analysis and have all that information that you are requesting available for the township and the professionals at PennDOT to review.

Mr. Murray said we're looking for significant improvements but as you look at these graphics you'll see that it's a phased approach and it is one of the things that would happen at the beginning. We are looking at all of the segments that have been proposed; the funded and unfunded parts of it and we've started an active discussion with PennDOT about those things. Mrs. Kiefer said she would like to attend that meeting when it's scheduled.

Mr. George Niblock said he would like at the conclusion of whatever PennDOT has to offer relative to improvements of this intersection a statement from PennDOT that this intersection does not have to be rebuilt in order to handle the traffic that is going to be generated by future construction built within the area.

Mr. Paul Fricker residing at 2486 Orchard Place in Warrington asked where the TEVA's trucks are going to go when one of their trucks breaks down on any of these roads. He said these trucks will be using the roads in our neighborhoods.

Mr. John Heenan residing at 1202 Quentin Court said the residents do not want this pharmaceutical operation at this Warrington site.

Mr. Gundlach responded to the comment about this area being zoned residential. He said the 136 acre site that is being proposed to be developed by TEVA is zoned industrial. He said that land is described in the township's comprehensive plan as planned for industrial activity. It is the largest area within Warrington Township that is zoned industrial. In addition, the additional 22 acres that is being proposed to be purchased by TEVA, is zoned PRD (Planned Residential Development), which is high density residential housing. He said that is the area that TEVA is asking to be considered to be rezoned to industrial to get a better layout that would less adversely impact the surrounding area, with greater setbacks than would otherwise be permitted by right under current zoning. He showed under Slide 10 what is permitted. It is the TEVA facility that is proposed 1,500,000 sq. ft. facility can be designed in current compliance with the township ordinances without any rezoning whatsoever. It can be built on 136 acres with a future development area up top available for any other development that is permitted in the industrial district under the ordinances. In addition, you would end up with 30 acres of PRD zoning and which would mean residential, which is what can be built by right under township ordinances in accordance with the comprehensive plan and that would involve single-family homes and apartments and then on the corner would be additional commercial. This land is for sale and it is not open space.

Mr. Klimek said the important thing is that this type of development is exactly what it's anticipated by the plan of the township. This plan is completely compliant with current zoning regulations and it doesn't change the density of the plan. If we were to continue the process and we did not use the entire site what

that results in lesser setbacks, less buffers, and on top of that, additional land can be developed. If that land was to be developed with multi-users, it would generate considerably more traffic.

A gentleman by the name of Bob, who resides at Rebecca Court, said TEVA is not comparing apples to oranges. This pharmaceutical company is in the business of making money and maxing out their facility by making sure that they are running 24-hour a day and 7 days a week. They are a company that wants to continue to grow. He said they can't guarantee the amount of traffic that will be generated on these roadways.

Mr. Klimek referenced Slide 30 and said the gentleman's question was what TEVA is going to do. Mr. Klimek said we are going through the beginning of a process and we have not made formal lifeline commitments. We are already talking about improvements that we are going to make to local intersections because we know we need to do that. We also know we need to hear from the township's traffic consultant and PennDOT about other intersections that we need to look at to study and improve. We're making those improvements. We have already dedicated as part of this site plan and the reason that it has the shape that it does is that we know that the ultimate solution to any intersection here comes from a realignment of that intersection. We're giving that land to PennDOT to be able to accomplish that. TEVA is part of the solution to that intersection and any intersections that we will effect. He said that take times to work through – the township's traffic consultant, PennDOT, and through the public process. He said TEVA will become the largest single taxpayer in Warrington Township. He showed the fiscal impact graphic, which reflected the breakdown of fees. The total one time fees to Warrington Township amount of \$2,482,139 and the annual taxes figure would be \$1,381,119. He said just to build this facility and get through the approval process is a contribution of almost \$2.5 million in order to get us to the point of actually beginning construction. Those are the fees associated with land use, recreation funds, occupancy permits, and even our connection fees; improvements that we need to make to the utilities that surround the site. In addition to that, on an annual basis we will contribute just over \$1 million to the Central Bucks School District every year without the addition of any students. In addition to that, to the County \$204,000 and to the Township \$107,000 on an annual basis.

Mr. Todd Pierzchala residing at 25 Kulp Road East, (lives in Warrington Hunt development) feels that TEVA would be better located along a major road; i.e., Pennsylvania Turnpike or Route 309 and not at this site location.

Mr. Terry Formica residing at 1312 Fernwood Court feels that this location is not the best one to build a facility of this size and should not be built in a residential area.

Mr. Morrison, who resides at 12 Langhorne Road, Chalfont, a former councilman in Chalfont Borough, said it is interesting that the gentleman who did the traffic study doesn't realize that PennDOT is not building the 202 Bypass; but, in fact, the 202 Parkway. As far as the tax issue is concerned, the amount of money that the township will have to pay for police services and other needs for road structures will make an impact. The police will be needed to provide for other commercial businesses as well; i.e., Lowes, Target, etc. The TEVA site will have sanitation needs. When push comes to shove PennDOT will just ask the township to study that immediate area and will not be asking you to come up to the Chalfont area.

Mr. Klimek said it is our intention and we've said it already to include in contracts to direct traffic to the 202 Parkway and that is the intention of this application. It is the most logical route and by the time this facility comes on line that will be constructed. Another issue concerning sanitation and police actually as TEVA has as part of its on-site security so there should not be a need for additional police force to work at the site. We have a very advanced fire protection system that will be located inside this building and that should minimize any impact as well. There is very little impact to this type of facility on the services that are provided by the township. Mr. Christopher Beaulieu residing at 52 Kulp Road East, Chalfont asked the questions of why this facility needs to be located at this site. Mr. Klimek responded by saying

that we are already here and TEVA is not that far away and we are part of the community. Most of our workforce lives here.

A gentleman by the name of Bruce said he has been a resident of Warrington for 49 years and said he has attended numerous meetings and has been to the planning commission meetings. He said the State requires the township to put certain things in certain areas and certain sizes in the township. He said years ago this parcel that we have right now we didn't want the quarry to expand all the way down to Route 152, which it could have so it was made industrial. A lot of residents would be surprised that we have a trailer park zoning in the township, which the State law requires. He said if we don't somebody reputable on this site we could get 20 machine shops running 24-hours a day, and don't think they could cause traffic too.

Mr. Tom Inglese residing at 3211 Riding Court, Chalfont said he felt it would be beneficial to have a copy of the minutes from the last meeting so those who weren't able to attend would know exactly what was said. He asked also if the graphics from TEVA could be put on the website.

Mr. John Ciavola residing at 204 Shepherd Lane, Chalfont said the 202 Parkway is being built to alleviate the current traffic problems on our existing roads and not the impending traffic that will be generated from the TEVA trucks. Mr. Klimek responded to the question about how the improvement to the 202 Parkway happens. He said when that design for the road systems happens it not only accounts for the present traffic but it accounts for projected traffic and it accounts for the zoning that happens around the area that contributes to it. He said the question as far as the improvements TEVA is making. He said this is the beginning of a process. We know that right off the bat that we do need to make an improvement directly to that intersection and that is something we could look at right away and figure out how to improve it. There are two ways to improve it: 1) Improve behind how it behaves today even with our additional traffic; and 2) Identify other surrounding areas and intersections that we impact and will be required to be studied and eventually make improvements to them. That is a process that is going to take the next several months to work its way through.

Mrs. Kiefer said we are talking about a massive effort at improving the infrastructure of these roads and that is one of the issues that have to be understood. Mr. Klimek said we recognize that we need to participate in that process. He said it is important that TEVA act as an advocate with Warrington Township so much more mutual improvements can be made.

Ms. Beverly Watts residing at 521 Oak Avenue said she doesn't care what any traffic study says it is ridiculous to add additional traffic. It is very clear what the residents want. They are not against TEVA, which seems like a great company, but this is not the proper location for this kind of operation. She said if this development is approved then the present Board of Supervisors should not count on getting re-elected.

A gentleman by the name of Bruce, who resides at 1608 County Line Road (Lower Moreland Township), said he wanted to follow up on the other gentleman's question about the improvements to County Line Road. He wants to know what impact these road improvements will have on his property. Mr. Gundlach said we are not proposing to take any land along County Line Road. We understand that PennDOT is studying the improvement to County Line Road between Stump Road and Kulp Road as far as widening that roadway into 4-5 lanes to allow for greater traffic circulation from Lower State Road and Kulp Road up to the new parkway.

Ms. Christine Donahue residing at 605 Musket Court (Warrington Hunt development), had two comments to make. Regarding the WAWA that was built at the corner of Limekiln Pike and Horsham Road the trip that used to take her 9 minutes from Warrington Hunt to Horsham on Route 152 now takes her 26 minutes. She said there have been a lot of pleas tonight for TEVA to reconsider not locating their facility at this site. She further suggested that TEVA make a plea to the Morrissey family to do whatever they can in their power to reconsider not selling this land to TEVA.

A woman by the name of Connie, landowner, and who resides in Blue Bell, said TEVA has been a tenant of ours for approximately 20 years. She said a lot of the same issues were raised when TEVA built their facility on Horsham Road. Once the facility was built the local community was happy. TEVA occupies in excess of ½ million sq. ft. on Horsham Road. They occupy another 230,000 sq. ft. right up the street on County Line Road. A lot of these trucks are already on the roads. They are a good company and a good neighbor. She said if the industrial facilities are built by rights you would have a lot more traffic and a lot more construction. With TEVA you would have construction one time. We only wish that we had the type of ground that is necessary to build a building for TEVA but we don't and that is the problem that TEVA is facing. There aren't that many large parcels of ground around for them to build on. TEVA is a very responsible and professional pharmaceutical company. Any time there is a problem TEVA takes care of it immediately. Any time someone needs help TEVA is the one who comes to their aid.

A woman named Arlene, who resides on Mill Creek Road, talked about the proposed building that is planned. What road is the traffic going to feed out from? Is it going to be Mill Creek Road? If so, are you planning to widen that road? We are a little country road and part of the Bucks County heritage. Mr. Klimek said we have no development planned on that side of the site. We don't know how we would develop that piece of ground. If we did, we would have to come back to the township and go through the same process we're doing right now.

A woman said she has been circulating an on-line petition to give people who live in this area. She said as far as township codes are concerned there is one township code that she is really is not sure of. In regards to planned industrial development for PI-1 and PI-2 under township code 1203 says "it will only allow for a truck terminal transfer station that is given access on Route 611 on Titus Drive." She wondered how that township code transferred to this facility that is not in this specific area. According to the 2006 plan for roads, the township saw that whole area as being turned from industrial to multi-use village-style dwellings. She said that is the kind of atmosphere that we were promised when we moved to this area and that is the flavor of Bucks County. It is a rural and country flavor. This facility does not belong at this location.

Mr. Mike Mrozinski, Director of Planning and Economic Development for Warrington Township was asked about how Teva's proposed use is classified within the zoning ordinance. He replied that he saw the proposal as a distribution facility and not as a truck transfer facility, such as the Roadway Trucking site near County Line Rd and Rt. 309.

Ms. Joan Jackson, who resides at 227 Pointer Court, said this community cannot handle this traffic now. She said this company is a great company but it doesn't belong in a community setting but in an industrial park.

Mr. Lee Feinstein, who resides at 2060 Dapple Drive, said this site has been zoned industrial for at least twenty years. He said it make sense to have quarries in an industrial district. This site borders three state highways. Maybe what we need to do is to see if we can get the Governor to stop building better roads in Altoona and spend some of that money on County Line Road, Lower State Road, and Limekiln Pike. He said the last time we tried to manipulate the zoning and this was years ago the township got sued and we went to court and we lost the lawsuit. He has lived in the township for 32 years and has enjoyed a good quality of life in Central Bucks County that exceeds most of our surrounding neighbors. His concern here is he sees an industrial budget and industrial zoning. A couple of years ago Morrissey came to the township and asked for the quarry to be reconfigured to make it into a quarry; and, therefore, give up the right to acquire that piece of land.

Mr. Tom Balkir residing at 402 Parkview Circle requested that the slides be updated to reflect the return traffic of tractor trailers. Is question is about personal safety. He is a former employee of TEVA. He asked what is being done as part of these plans to protect TEVA employees and their families and the residents in the immediate area. Mr. Murray said this is a secure site as all our sites are. The site will be

fenced and will be secured with security forces on site 24/7. We follow all the standard practices that are required for us to do what needs to be done. In terms of terrorism it is not something that we've ever faced not even in our own territory in Israel. We keep apprised of whatever concerns there may be at various levels – State, National. It simply hasn't been a problem.

Comments from Township Board of Supervisors

Mr. Plotnick said he had received 50 emails concerning TEVA, which he responded to. Ten (10%) were pro and 90 (90%) were con. He said he appreciated all the concerns and had some information that he passed along to the township manager. He feels there is some potential with this project.

Mr. Lamond said he had a couple of issues that he wanted to get some information on. His question was what does TEVA do with expired drugs? Is there anything stored within the building? Mr. Murray said expired drugs are watched as an integral part of our inventory. When they expire, they are incinerated in appropriate ways off-site. Mr. Lamond's other issue was that 202 originally was supposed to be an Expressway and it has been changed to a Parkway, which is now only 2 lanes. It is no different than Limekiln Pike and he said that scares him because part of it is going to be overloaded before it's built. Through the township's study the intersections are going to be impacted. He said we have \$41.6 million for improvements that we have already recognized. With the taxes that the township will receive it would take us approximately 400 years to get any money back that would cost to do those improvements and that is at today's prices, which is going to increase every year. He is very concerned and there are a lot of improvements to be done and he hasn't seen anything yet that shows any promise here. You say we're speaking to PennDOT but speaking is cheap and action is what he needs to see.

Mrs. Achenbach said she has received a lot of emails and she is trying to respond to all of them. She said she shares the same concerns that the residents have expressed. She asked if the plan for the Horsham Plant employees to relocate to this proposed site. Mr. Murray said it is not something that is completely settled. If the company does continue to grow we have not excluded the possibility that we might occupy this site and continue to occupy some of the sites that we're in now. We have talked in general about consolidation because from a business philosophy we like to keep our businesses close, hands on as we possibly can. When we talk about consolidation, it certainly includes the possibility that we would do some and possibly all sites eventually but it does not exclude the possibility that we might occupy the Eureka Site and maintain some of the existing sites.

Mrs. Achenbach said she shares many of the same concerns as the residents and she said if TEVA continues to grow she has concerns with that as well. The space is configured to TEVA's unique specifications and if they've acquired all of the other pharmaceutical companies, who would move into the building if TEVA were to leave. She feels there are still many issues to be looked at.

Mr. Paul said obviously the Board has a lot of the same concerns as the residents do. A lot of the traffic issues that we discussed before really need to be addressed.

Mrs. Kiefer said in her experience with handling traffic issues, is that a tremendous amount of work, research and study needs to be done to come up with something that would even come close to addressing the traffic issues.

Mrs. Kiefer said TEVA has a list of questions from Township residents and the Board and a combination of questions that have been compiled from both meetings that need to be addressed. When TEVA is ready to present further information, another meeting will be scheduled. Notices will be sent to residents notifying them when and where this meeting will be held.

Mr. Paul said he wanted to talk about the buy right program. He said that means that any person could come into the township and built a house, factory, etc. on that site as long as it meets the township code regulations. What he would like to see is a sketch plan of what that buy right process would be; i.e.,

setbacks and those types of things. That is something that the township does not totally control. He asked TEVA to put together a sketch plan to show what can and cannot happen by law in a buy right process.

Someone asked why TEVA didn't acquire the Willow Grove Naval Air Station site. Mr. Murray said this site in Horsham Township did not work out for TEVA because the timing that had to do with issues regarding nothing whatsoever to do with TEVA came to the fore having to do with Horsham Township's concerns about the site, the Navy, and the Commonwealth. He said the timing was such that we had to pull up stakes and walk away. That site was potentially useful and it was similar in size to the Eureka Site and were interested in it right to the last and the timing with the other three parties; Horsham Township, the Navy, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania were such that things were not going to resolve themselves fast enough for us to move forward with the project.

Mr. Murray said in Whitpain Township we were interested in what is called the Unisys Site in Blue Bell. We had that property brought to us and we were very interested in it. It was a similar size, lots of opportunity for us. We had one public meeting and several other staff meetings similar to the ones we've had here with Warrington Township. Everything was open and above board, and there were no secret deals. When we had the public meeting with Whitpain Township and this was referenced at the previous meeting here in Warrington, he said he wanted to set the record straight based on several things that were said. He said it was suggested that, and this has to do with the buy right plan, which was possible with Whitpain Township. We had a public meeting and there was a transcript created and it was suggested at this meeting that there was an inconsistency in what was said by me at that meeting and what was said at the Warrington meetings. The comment was made that TEVA suggested that we could put 11,000 employees on the Unisys site and that that had changed. The question was raised why that would be. In fact, we went back and looked at the transcript of that meeting, which occurred two years ago; and, in fact, we studied it very carefully line by line and it was absolutely consistent with what we said here at the Warrington meetings and any meetings that we've had with your municipal government. In fact, if you look at the transcript carefully you will find that comment that was made about 11,000 employees landing at Whitpain had absolutely nothing to do with TEVA. The statement was made by Joe Palmer, Chairman of the Whitpain Township Board who was stating what the buy right zoning would permit at the Unisys Site in the event that TEVA did not end up there. Point of fact TEVA doesn't have 11,000 employees to put on any single site anywhere. We never said it and the transcript is going to be made available to your Township Board of Supervisors so they can see what it exactly said.

Mr. Murray said he values his personal integrity and when it's challenged he likes the opportunity and appreciate the opportunity to state on the record and make corrections to things that have been said previously in this meeting. He feels it is important for his company to be understood, to be a good company with a very strong story to tell. He's proud of it and has been there for a long time. We've been good neighbors every place we're located and it would absolutely be our intention to remain so when we arrive in Warrington.

Mrs. Kiefer thanked the residents for coming out to tonight's meeting. She said if there are any other questions that the residents have they can either email the township or members of the Board of Supervisors. There will be another meeting with TEVA so the residents will have another opportunity to ask any questions that have not already been asked.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion – It was moved by Mr. Plotnick, seconded by Mr. Lamond, that the Board of Supervisors moved that the meeting be adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

