

MINUTES
MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
DECEMBER 22, 2016
MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Members

Dan Dunmire
Dave Pennebaker
Kent Spicher
Neal Shawver
Jim Spendiff
Kay Semler
Tom Lake

Other

Julianne Cahill, The Sentinel
Cyle Vogt

Staff

Bill Gomes, Director
James Lettiere, CD Administrator/Assistant
Director
Chastity Fultz, Office/Grants Manager

Call to Order

Dan Dunmire, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

Record of Public Attendance

Dan reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

Dan introduced Cyle Vogt as the new alternate member. Cyle works as an engineer at Penn State and is in the process of moving to Ferguson Valley. Jason Cunningham was approved as a permanent member, but was unable to attend.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Kay Semler made a motion to approve the minutes from November's meeting. The motion was seconded by Neal Shawver. All members voted aye.

Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report

Five plans were submitted to the committee for review, all under Municipal Ordinance. The plans included Farmer's Choice Tire Service (*Armagh Township*); Fred A. Adams (*Derry Township*); David & Marsha Maines (*Derry Township*); J. Richard & Susan Henry (*Granville Township*); and Frank Dingianni (*Lewistown Borough*).

Jim Lettiere reviewed two plans in further detail, which were the Fred Adams plan in Derry Township and the Richard and Susan Henry plan in Granville Township.

The Fred Adams plan involves the subdivision of four lots. This parcel was previously received four (4) different times. Jim did not receive revised plans from Mr. Taptich based on preliminary comments. He feels the comments will be addressed at the Derry Township Planning Commission. There was no further discussion of the plan.

The second plan reviewed was Richard and Susan Henry. The plan proposes to create Lot Addition A to be added onto Lot A. The residual tract, Lot 1, has an existing residence with no new development proposed.

Jim has not received revised plans from Mr. Wright based on preliminary comments. There was no further discussion of this plan.

Jim Spendiff motioned to accept the comments of the five plans under municipal ordinance. Kay Semler seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Armagh Township (*Municipal Ordinance*)

Name of Plan: Farmer's Choice Tire Service, LLC Kenneth Reisinger

File Number: 2016-12-005

Tax Map #: 12-06-0300/12/06/0302

Municipality: Armagh Township

Applicant Name: Farmer's Choice Tire Service, LLC Kenneth Reisinger

Land Owner Name: Farmer's Choice Tire Service, LLC Kenneth Reisinger

Plan Preparer: Thomas H. Metz Engineering, Inc.

Plan Summary:

The project will involve the demolition of the 1,623 S.F. canopy and the construction of a 40x80' storage building at same location. All utilities (water, elec., sewer) will be provided to the new building additions, being supplied from the existing building. Conduits shall be installed per the plan to transport runoff via downspouts to existing inlet boxes.

Administrative

A plan for the property was last reviewed in August 2015 and some of those comments are still applicable (as noted) to this plan. The difference between the two is the current plan includes the demolition of a 1,623 square foot canopy and the new 40'x80' building will be used as storage only and not a repair garage.

Subdivision Information

The plan shows the lot dimensions but not the total acreage for the two lots proposed. This should be shown on the plan. Are there any plans to merge the two lots?

*The Metz Engineering representative indicated not at this time.

Soils

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils.

Setback Lines

Setbacks shown are tied to residential property with both public water and sewer.

Cartway Widths

What is the cartway width for access easements from Old Route 322? (See Section 6.202.a.11. of the Armagh Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

*The Metz Engineering representative indicated there is no cartway only a paper easement.

Does the utility easement coming from Trails End Steakhouse serve as a point of access? What is the cartway width?

Private Street / Shared Driveway

There appears to be a shared access with Trails End Steakhouse. All private drives that are used by more than one party should have a shared driveway agreement in place. An agreement for the private right-of-way should be noted on the plan stating: "The owners of lots ____, which have a common driveway, agree and understand this is a shared driveway, and as such as responsible for maintenance, care, improvements, and snow removal at their own diligence and expense. The maintenance and use of said shared driveways shall be included in the deeds as said lots are sold."

*The Metz Engineering representative indicated there is no shared driveway.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Easement information for the driveway and stormwater arrangements need to be provided to the Armagh Township Engineer.

*The Metz Engineering representative stated he discussed with Lucas Parkes regarding the stormwater.

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 6.302.a.6. and 6.302.b.7. of the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

*The Metz Engineering representative indicated there are only utility and access easements.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

If the project is to utilize public sewer, a DEP Component 3, or Exemption from Sewage Planning (Mailer), should be provided to the Armagh Township Supervisors.

*The Metz Engineering representative indicated there is no additional sewer flow since this is storage only.

Water & Sewage Service

There should be a plan note that the property is served by public water and sewer.

Features

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan. Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 6.202 a.10.)

Land Development

How many parking spaces are there for this project?

Other Comments:

1. The plan appears to show gravel parking and one handicap spot, but it is not clear how accessible it is to the front of the office. In accordance with the Federal Property Management regulation sub part 101-19.6 Appendix A, parking spaces for disabled people shall be located on the shortest possible circulation route to an accessible pedestrian entrance of the parking facility. Can the handicapped space be located adjacent to the existing office?

*The Metz Engineering representative indicated Commonwealth Code approved the location of the handicapped space.

2. The plan should clearly note area to be demolished on the plan.

3. At the previous plan review, a question was raised about potential stormwater drainage onto tax parcel 12-06-0326 owned by the Beers. Can this be clarified?

*The Metz Engineering representative indicated that a drainage trench is in place which will prevent any stormwater drainage onto adjoining properties.

4. What is the height of the addition?

Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Adams, Fred A.

File Number: 2016-12-001

Tax Map #: 16-03-0102

Municipality: Derry Township

Applicant Name: Adams, Fred A.

Land Owner Name: Adams, Fred A.

Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Plan Summary:

This project involves the subdivision of four (4) lots from the lands of Fred A. and Beverly K. Adams.

Parcel A, containing 5.5631 Acres, is intended to be a non-building lot addition to the adjacent lands of Joseph P. and Shannon M. Hackenberg. Access to Parcel A will be via the existing lands of Hackenberg.

Parcel B, containing 2.9677 Acres, is intended to be a stand-alone lot. Parcel B will be served with an on-lot water source as well as an on-lot sewage disposal system. Access to Parcel B will be via the 25' Right-of-way off of Old Park Road.

Parcel C, containing 1.8817 Acres, is intended to be a stand-alone lot. Parcel C will be served with the on-lot water source as well as an on-lot sewage disposal system. Access to Parcel C will be via Ewardtown Road.

Parcel D, containing 1.8817 Acres, is intended to be a stand-alone lot. Parcel D will be served with an on-lot water source as well as an on-lot sewage disposal system. Access to Parcel D will be via Ewardtown Road.

The Residue (1.2153 Acres), located East of Ewardtown Road, has had a suitable primary and secondary percolation site identified (as shown). Based on the "minimum lot size" identified by the Hydrogeologist (1.2153 Acres), this lot is intended to be a stand-alone lot. The Residue will be served with the on-lot water source as well as an on-lot sewage disposal system. Access to the Residue will be via Ewardtown Road.

The Total Project Area is: 11.6267 Acres. The proposed Total Disturbed Area is: ~2.5 Acres.

Basic Plan Information

The abutter Tax Parcel 16, 32-0101A Joseph and Eva Barger is not identified on the plan and should be in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Sections 402.2 2.0 and 403. 2 2.S.)

Administrative

Subdivision plans for this same parcel were previously reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission on September 19, 2002, January 1, 2015, May 28, 2015 and October 22, 2015. Based on the Recorder of Deeds Records, two of these subdivisions are recorded. The first one was in 2002 and the other was June 30, 2015. The recorded plan dated June 30, 2015 involved the subdivision of six (6) lots of Fred Adams. This subdivision creates Parcels A, B, C and D and a residual. The difference between this subdivision and the June 30, 2015 recorded plan is the residual is now being subdivided into Parcels A, as a Lot Addition to former Lot #1, and the creation of lots B, C and D and a residual, while former Lots 2 - 6 remain as recorded in 2015. Why isn't Lot 6 depicted on the plan? This is a 78 acre parcel which was part of the June 2015 recorded plan. The June 30, 2015 recorded plan shows Lot 6 which is north of Ewardtown Road. This lot should be identified on the plan.

The subdivision plan reviewed October 22, 2015, indicated the residual containing 1.2153 acres was unsuitable for development as a single-family home based on a Hydrogeologist. Please confirm that this will not be developed as a single-family home, but only as a stand alone lot.

Subdivision Information

Property boundary information for Lot 6 should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Derry Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Sections 403.2 F., H., J.).

Topographic information

Suitability considerations should be made for this plan. It appears, according to County GIS information, that there are steep slopes (grades over 15%) on this site and development in these should be discouraged.

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Derry Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths for Old Park Road and Ewardtown Road are substandard (Section 504.2).

Cartway Widths

Based upon the Derry Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway widths for Old Park Road and Ewardtown Road are substandard (Section 504.2).

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Derry Planning Commission. Has the driveway openings from Ewardtown Road been approved by the Township Roadmaster?

Private Street / Shared Driveway

Note 12 indicates the existing 25' right-of-way off Old Park Road is intended to serve lot #2 and Parcel B only. Please confirm if access to Parcel A is from Ewardtown Road and Lot # 1 is from Old Park Road.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 403.2G and 403.7 of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

A copy of the DEP Component 1 Sewage Facilities Planning Module should be submitted to the Derry Township Planning Commission.

Sewage Service

Is there on-lot sewer and water information for former Lot #1, Lot #2, Lot #3, Lot #4, Lot #5 and Lot #6?

Lot Addition

A lot addition statement should be noted on the plan stating the following on the plan:

"Lot # ___ consisting of ___ acres is to be added onto land owned by _____. Lot # ___ is a lot addition and shall become an integral part of the property owned by _____. Lot # ___ is not a building lot and cannot be maintained or developed as a separate individual lot."

Features

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan. (Derry Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402.2.J.)

Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Maines, David M. & Marsha A.
File Number: 2016-12-003
Tax Map #: 16-01-0109A
Municipality: Derry Township
Applicant Name: Maines, David M. & Marsha A.
Land Owner Name: Maines, David M. & Marsha A.
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Plan Summary:

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 for a single-family residence to be served by on-lot sewage disposal and private well. The residual tract, Lot 1, has an existing residence with no new development proposed.

Basic Plan Information

Based on tax records, T.M. 16-01-0122B is owned by Michael Tate and not Georgia Bilger. Please reconfirm this.

Administrative

The property was last reviewed in February of 2002.

Clean & Green / Agriculture

The parcel is enrolled in the Clean and Green program. The applicant or landowners should be aware rollback taxes can be applied in some subdivision situations, and if they have any questions, they should contact the Mifflin County Assessment Office for more information.

Topographic information

Suitability considerations should be made for this plan. It appears, according to County GIS information, that there are steep slopes (grades over 15%) on this site and development in these should be discouraged.

Soils

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

Setback Lines

There are 3 zoning districts for this parcel and the setbacks for the proposed house appear to be tied to the MDR Zoning District.

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths for Brown Farm Lane and Calvary Lane should be shown on the plan. (Section 403.1G).

Cartway Widths

The cartway width of the proposed fifty (50) foot right-of-way for Brown Farm Lane should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Part 4 Section 402.2 K.). Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 504.2) the cartway widths for Calvary Lane, Nolan Drive and Brown Farm Lane are substandard.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with (Sections 403.1G and 403.7.) of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

*The Wright Surveying representative indicated there are no deed restrictions or easements.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

A copy of the DEP Component 1 Sewage Facilities Planning Module should be submitted to the Derry Township Planning Commission.

Features

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 402.2.J.).

*The Wright Surveying representative indicated all man made features are shown on the plan.

Other Comments:

1. There appears to be the potential for additional development along Brown Farm Lane. Is additional right-of-way or cartway needed for potential expanded use of this road?

*The Wright Surveying representative indicated at this time there are no plans to further develop along Brown Farm Lane. In the event the current or potential future owner decides to further develop the property, the roadways will need to be constructed to Township specifications.

2. The frontage to Lot 2 is limited to the touching of Brown Farm Lane. Is that at least 50 feet and does this meet the requirements for the MDR Zoning District?

*The Wright Surveying representative indicated that a fifty (50) foot right-of-way is proposed for Brown Farm Lane.

Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Henry, J. Richard & Susan J. & Schooley, David E.

File Number: 2016-12-004

Tax Map #: 17-30-0100

Municipality: Granville Township

Applicant Name: Henry, J. Richard & Susan J. & Schooley, David E.

Land Owner Name: Henry, J. Richard & Susan J. & Schooley, David E.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Plan Summary:

This plan proposes to create Lot Addition A to be added onto Lot A. The residual tract, Lot 1, has an existing residence with no new development proposed.

Subdivision Information

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the Recipient property (Lot A). If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Sections 6.302.a.5., a.7. and a.9.)

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

Is there an existing HOP for Lot 1 and Lot A? If so, it should be noted on the plan. Is there an existing driveway shown on the inset plan tied to Lot A?

A notation should be on the plan about the HOP requirement stating: Any access via a State Highway to lots shown on this subdivision plan will require the issuance of a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP).

PennDOT regulations provide that a Highway Occupancy Permit is required prior to constructing, altering or exceeding the permitted capacity for any access connected onto a State Highway. A Highway Occupancy Permit is also required prior to altering the existing pattern or flow of surface drainage or directing additional surface drainage onto or into the highway right-of-way or highway facilities. Approval of this plan neither implies nor guarantees permit approval by PennDOT.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 6.302.a.6. and 6.302.b.7. of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

*The Wright Surveying representative indicated there are no deed restrictions or easements.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided.

Water & Sewage Service

There should be a note on the plan if Lot A is tied to the public sewer system and if there is on-lot water service, it should be depicted on the plan in accordance with (Section 6.302.a.10.) of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

*The Wright Surveying representative stated Lot A is not tied to the public sewer system and will check on the location of the on-lot sewer.

Lot Addition

A lot addition is considered a consolidation and therefore, results in the creation of two new lot configurations. Lot consolidation meets the definition of a subdivision according to the Municipalities Planning Code. Under these circumstances new deeds must be developed as part of the property transfer process and adequate information must be available in order to develop an accurate property description. The parent and recipient lots will still meet the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements. Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property. Currently, no boundary information is provided for Lot A. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Sections 6.302.a.5., a.7., a.9. and a.12.)

Features

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan. Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 6.302.a.10.)

Other Comments:

1. The AR Zone calls for a three quarter acre lot size since public sewer is available. In this case, Lot 1 shows three quarters of an acre and we want to confirm this lot size is the balance after lot addition A is removed.

*The Wright Surveying representative indicated the lot size meets the AR zoning requirements.

*There is a misspelled word under owner for the name Daved.

Lewistown Borough (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Dingianni, Frank
File Number: 2016-12-002
Tax Map #: 05, 03-0452
Municipality: Lewistown Borough
Applicant Name: Dingianni, Frank
Land Owner Name: Dingianni, Frank
Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and Surveying

Plan Summary:

The purpose of this plan is to subdivide the land of Frank Dingianni, Mifflin County Tax Parcel 05, 03-0452, into two lots. Lot 1, of 0.134 acres, contains an existing house and garage. Lot 2, of 0.076 acres contains an existing apartment over an existing four bay garage.

Soils

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils.

Setback Lines

As mentioned in Note #5 the existing buildings cannot meet the building setbacks, particularly the front setback. It appears that prior to the creation of Lot 2, a double frontage lot exists, which is normally prohibited under Part 4, Section 4.205 F. of the Borough's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. However, if this is not the considered a double frontage lot then the creation of Lot 2 appears to make additional non-conformity because without the subdivision, the existing building appears to meet the rear setback. Also, under Section 4.205 B of the Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, all lots shall front on a public street and it appears Lot 2 fronts on an alley which is not allowed. Please confirm this through the Borough. If correct, both of these issues would need to be resolved by the Zoning Hearing Board.

*The Sarge Surveying and Engineering representative submitted revised plans dated December 15, 2016, which shows a rear setback prior to the subdivision as being 3.4 feet. So it currently does not meet the rear setback.

Right-of Way Widths

If is unclear whether Church Lane or Logan Street meet the Borough's right-of-way and cartway width requirements.

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

The driveway access on Church Lane should be shown on the plan.

*The Sarge Surveying and Engineering representative submitted revised plans dated December 15, 2016 which shows the driveway access.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

According to the surveyor, there are no known deed restrictions or easements associated with the property.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

According to Plan Note #1, both lots are already served by public water and sewer.

Features

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan. (Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302 A.23.)

*The Sarge Surveying and Engineering representative indicated all man made features are shown.

Zoning

Is the existing apartment one unit or more than one unit? If the apartment is used as three or more dwelling units, this is considered a apartment house as defined in the Borough Zoning Ordinance (Part 2 § 201.2 (6)). In the R-2 Zoning District this use is allowed by Special Exception.

*The Sarge Surveying and Engineering representative indicated there is only one apartment unit with a four bay garage as indicated in the project narrative.

Other Comments:

1. Does the percentage of lot coverage for lots 1 and 2 meet the Borough requirements?

*The Sarge Survey and Engineering representative indicated the building area percentage coverage amounts are listed on the December 15, 2016 revised plans, and are compliant with the Borough requirements.

Public Comment

None

Other Business or Comments

Calendar: The 2017 calendar was presented and approved. The one difference for this year is to change the deadline for plan submissions to the first Monday of the month unless that is a holiday and then the submission will be the following business day. The annual dinner will be held April 6th at 5:45 p.m. The November meeting will be held on the fifth week and there will be a two-week interval between the Subdivision Committee meeting and the regular meeting.

Internet Update: The internet committee met on December 14th. There was an article in the Sentinel on the meeting, which unfortunately stated the next meeting was Christmas day. Eight members attended the meeting. Bill indicated some maps of internet coverage of different providers were still on display. The maps appear to show good internet coverage throughout the county, but in reality we do not have good coverage. There is not a good contact with Verizon, but there is good communication with Comcast. Walt Whitmer from Penn State attended the meeting and gave two suggestions of a survey, one for residential and one for commercial. A random sample will be sent to residents in each municipality and the committee will work with the Chamber of Commerce on the industrial/commercial side. The next meeting will be held January 25th.

Kay Semler stated that many of the active people on the committee are technical in nature. The survey will help to determine the next steps. Mark Critz of the Pennsylvania Rural Development Council attended the meeting as well. She feels EA Media would be a potential firm to work with as well.

Bill is trying to get a copy of survey results from a recent school district survey through Craig Bubb. He also noted that Ken Starner of Comcast attended the meeting and was interested in knowing how the committee

was started. Senator Corman's office attended the meeting as well. Bill noted that if we don't do anything, we get nothing. He is also looking at the County webpage to show updates for the committee as well as gather information on current issues with internet suppliers.

Dan Dunmire remembered when the closing of Penn State was discussed that they offered help with the survey and asked if this is how Walt Whitmer came to help with the meeting. Bill stated that he has not heard from the main campus contact at Penn State since the annual dinner and Walt's involvement came from our outreach.

Trail Update: Money was awarded this past summer for the Juniata River Trail. A survey of the area was completed. The next step is for the engineer to create a final design. However, EADS gave a price proposal that almost doubled anticipated costs. The initial anticipated cost was \$280,000 and is now \$450,000. The grant was approved for \$230,000. There are two alternatives. One is to go with what we have, \$230,000, and see how far the trail will go. The second is to piggyback to a DCNR grant application. The current grant agency (DCED) is receptive to this idea as long as we meet their criteria. This would delay the project by one year. The current map shows the trail to Crystal Springs Avenue, but with other funding, this could possibly extend further. YSM Landscape Architects gave the initial cost estimate and has also designed the dog park and boat launch. Most of her figures have been close. DCNR suggested not paving the Victory Park parking lot and eliminating a proposed guide rail as a cost savings measure. Another concern was who the applicant would be. Currently, the county is the applicant and with DCNR, the county may not be the applicant.

DCNR is planning a visit in early January to walk the site and meet with the borough. There was discussion of letting the engineering go forth, which puts us that much further ahead with DCNR. Dan emphasized that we have to keep the borough engaged so there are no surprises. The borough funds are part of the match to pay for the design work. Another consideration is that the further the trail goes, the possibility of needing an NPDES permit is increased. To avoid the permit, the project has to stay under 1 acre of disturbance.

Mill Road Update: Bill discussed a traffic issue at the intersection of Mill Road and Electric Avenue, which is also near an exit ramp of 322. Previously, a yield sign was at the end of the exit ramp, but this has been replaced with a stop sign with potential backup onto the ramp. A traffic study was conducted in 2012 and indicated the peak traffic time occurred at 3:00 p.m., which coincides with school dismissal and shift change at the hospital. A study of the area would be paid 80% by a PennDOT grant with a 20% match. Dave Pennebaker asked if the scope was large enough and whether Walnut Street could be included. Bill replied that it has to be a limited scope in order to be competitive. There is \$1 million in funding available across the state. An accident count indicates nine accidents in the past five years. Bill also noted that if a study is not done, the project will not likely be placed on the Transportation Improvement Plan.

Boat Launch Update: Bill indicated that we have been trying to get an extension on the National Park Service grant. A permit application was submitted in October for additional parking across the road. It sat for a month and he was told November 29th that it would be published in the PA Bulletin, which did not happen until December 10th. The permit will not be reviewed until the end of January since it is considered lower in importance. We are hoping to hear from NPS soon, but we need to show progress on the permit.

Yeagertown Bridge: There is a bridge in Yeagertown that we have received a notification of critical structural-related deficiency. This bridge is now a walking bridge. The county does not want to spend a lot of money on this bridge if it is going to be demolished in the next few years. A long-term concern is an existing gas line under the bridge. The county met with a UGI representative onsite several months ago who agreed to move the gas line. EADS provided options, which include repairs, both minimal and extensive, and completely closing the bridge. In order to make it a pedestrian bridge, we need to make sure people are using it. There is a concern that demolition would not occur until four years. The township does not have strong opinions on the bridge and this decision will be made by the Commissioners. Randy Albert of PennDOT estimates \$25,000 to address some concerns, which still does not allow vehicle access.

Annual Dinner: Bill was turned down by the Secretary of Transportation to be a speaker at the annual dinner. If anyone has any suggestions, please let Bill know. The Agriculture Department was given as a possibility, but Bill was not sure how interested people would be.

Adjournment

Upon no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m. upon a motion by Neal Shawver.