

MINUTES
MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
DECEMBER 17, 2015
MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Members

Dan Dunmire
Tyler Gum
Kent Spicher
Jim Spendiff
Thomas Lake
Neal Shawver

Staff

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

Other

Lauren Kershner, The Sentinel
Lucas Parkes, The EADS Group

Call to Order

Dan Dunmire, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

Record of Public Attendance

Dan reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Jim Spendiff made a motion to approve the minutes from November's meeting. The motion was seconded by Tom Lake. All members voted aye.

Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report

Six plans were presented to the committee for review. There were two (2) plans under county ordinance (Marian Stimely, Bratton Township and Juniata Terrace Borough subdivision, Juniata Terrace Borough) and four (4) under municipal ordinance (Samuel and Sara Hostetler, Armagh Township; Jacquelyn Fisher, Lewistown Borough; Stephen Weaver, Union Township and William Kline, Union Township). Three plans were reviewed in fuller detail, including Marian Stimely in Bratton Township, Juniata Terrace Borough subdivision in Juniata Terrace Borough and William Kline in Union Township. There were no major issues with any plan. No questions or comments were raised on any of the six plans.

Tyler Gum made a motion to conditionally approve the two plans under county ordinance. Jim Spendiff seconded the motion. All members voted aye. Tom Lake motioned to accept the comments of the four plans under municipal ordinance. Kent Spicher seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Jim noted that revised plans for the Central PA Clinic and the Belleville Storage area were submitted at last month's meeting. He sent revised comments, which are included in November's minutes. A transportation analysis letter was provided for both projects and there are still unresolved issues with water and sewer. Jim will have a final review of the plans before they go to Union Township in January.

Subdivision and Land Development Municipal Reports

Armagh Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Hostetler, Samuel Y. & Sara N.
File Number: 2015-12-004

Tax Map #: 12-06-0101A
Municipality: Armagh Township
Applicant Name: Hostetler, Samuel Y. & Sara N.
Land Owner Name: Hostetler, Samuel Y. & Sara N.
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, privy and private well. The residual tract, Lot 1, has an existing residence and is farmland with no development proposed.

Administrative

This plan was last reviewed in October of 2008 to create a Lot 2, which is similar to this proposal. It is not clear whether the 2008 was ever recorded.

Subdivision Information

The frontage for street access to Lot 1 has been drastically decreased by the creation of Lot 2. What will the frontage for Lot 1 be since the driveway appears to now be the frontage. Lot 1 is now becoming a flag lot and the width of the lot becomes important for access.

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property (Lot 1). If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Article 6 Sections 6.302.a.5., 7., 9. and 12.)

Clean & Green / Agriculture

The property is in an Agricultural Security Area and should be noted on the plan.
The Township may want to consider if lot 2 should continue in the agricultural security area program.

Soils

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

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for Church Lane is substandard (Table 1).

Cartway Widths

Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width for Church Lane is substandard (Table 1).

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

Note #5 calls for a driveway permit.

Private Street / Shared Driveway

Will Lot 2 have access to the existing driveway? If so, a shared driveway agreement should be in place.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

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

Water Service

The plan states there will be a well and shows a pre-existing well on the site, which we assume will serve Lot 2. Please confirm.

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, Article 6 Section 6.202. a.10.) The buildings associated with Lot 1 should be shown on the plan.

Bratton Township (County Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Stimely, Marian J.
File Number: 2015-12-005
Tax Map #: 13-05-0124A
Municipality: Bratton Township
Applicant Name: Stimely, Marian J.
Land Owner Name: Stimely, Marian J.
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Plan Summary:

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 for existing agricultural use and Lot Addition A to be added onto the lands of Earl M. Harshbarger. The residual tract, Lot 1, has an existing residence with no new development proposed.

Clean & Green / Agriculture

The parcel is enrolled in the Clean and Green program as noted in Note #6. 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 for the Residue 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, and noted in Note #2, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands.

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths for Ridge Road and Horningford Road are substandard (Article 4, Section 4.204.F).

Cartway Widths

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway widths for Ridge Road and Horningford Road are substandard (Article 4, Section 4.204 F).

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Article 7 Sections 7.302.A.6. and 7.302.B.7. of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

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

Sewage Service

On-lot water and sewer service for the residue (Lot 1) should be shown on the inset plan (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 7, Section 7.302.A.20.).

Lot Addition

A "z" symbol lot combination symbol should be on the plan connecting Lot A with the Harshbarger Property (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 7 Section 7.302.A.21.).

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. (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 7 Section 7.302.A.20.) The existing residence for Lot 1 should be shown on the inset map.

Juniata Terrace Borough (County Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Juniata Terrace Borough
File Number: 2015-12-006
Tax Map #: 17A-00-0810

Municipality: Juniata Terrace Borough
Applicant Name: Juniata Terrace Borough
Land Owner Name: Juniata Terrace Borough
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Plan Summary:

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 for existing use served by public sewer and public water. The residual tract, Lot 1, has no new development proposed.

Basic Plan Information

A North Arrow is missing from the plan. (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 7, Section 7.302.A.2.)

Setback Lines

Unless the proposal involves multi-family structures, the setback should be 25' front, 10' side, and 15' rear.

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for Viaduct Way is substandard (Article 4 Section 4.204.F.).

Caraway Widths

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width for Viaduct Way is substandard (Section 4.204 F).

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Article 7 Sections 7.302.A.6. and 7.302.B.7. of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

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

Sewage Service

The property is 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. (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 7, Section 7.302.A.20.) If there are buildings on Lot 1, they should be shown on the plan.

Lewistown Borough (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Fisher, Jacquelyn D.
File Number: 2015-12-003
Tax Map #: 01-05-0200/0400A
Municipality: Lewistown Borough
Applicant Name: Wible, Adam J.
Land Owner Name: Fisher, Jacquelyn D.
Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and Surveying

Plan Summary:

The purpose of this plan is to add Lot A, of 0.060 acres, and Lot B, of 0.078 acres, to the land of Adam J. and Sarah M. Wible, Tax Parcel 01-05-400A, from the land of Jacquelyn D. Fisher, Tax Parcel 01-05-0200.

Basic Plan Information

The property fronts along an unnamed alley instead of a public street. However, with the Lot B addition, the Wible Property (T.M. 01-05-0400A) will have direct access to Rosewood Avenue.

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 the parent site and development in these should be discouraged.

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

As Note #6 mentions, there is a pre-existing non-conformity with the building front setback.

Right-of Way Widths

There is an unnamed alley with a 30' right-of-way and 14 foot cartway. The alley should have a name since it has served as the access to the Wible Property.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

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

Sewage Service

The property is served by public sewer and water.

Signature Blocks on Plan

The County Signature Block is not correct and needs to have the correct version. It should include a line for plan tracking number and a line for Chairman or designated representative.

Other Comments:

1. Based on a review of GIS aerial photos of the Fisher Property (T.M. 01-05-0200) there appears to be a paper street that is not shown on the plan.

Union Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Weaver, Stephen K.

File Number: 2015-12-001

Tax Map #: 20-01-0112/0113

Municipality: Union Township

Applicant Name: Weaver, Stephen K.

Land Owner Name: Weaver, Stephen K.

Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Plan Summary:

This project involves the subdivision of one (1) lot from the lands of Samuel A. and Bethsheba Wengerd. Lot #1 is intended to be a non-building lot addition to the adjacent lands of Stephen K. and Cynthia A. Weaver. Lot #1 is currently vacant. There are no improvements proposed to Lot #1 at this time. Access to Lot #1 will be via West Back Mountain Road. There are no improvements proposed to the Residue at this time.

Administrative

The County's subdivision application form was modified in September 2015 and sent to all surveyors. It is also on line. It provides for a signature block for lot additions whereby the parent and recipient landowners sign the application.

The landowner's signature needs to be on the subdivision application form.

Subdivision Information

The acreage for Lot 1 has two different figures. One figure for Lot 1 is 0.3855 acres while the other indicates Lot 1 has 0.3854 acres.

Clean & Green / Agriculture

The parcel 20-01-0113 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

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article IV, Section 402.1.g.).

Soils

Soil information is not on the plan.

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.

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

Setback Lines

The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 402.2.g.).

Note #4 lists setback lines but references the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance instead of the Union Township Zoning Ordinance.

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for West Back Mountain Road is substandard (Article V, Section 501.2).

Cartway Widths

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width for West Back Mountain Road is substandard (Article V, Section 501.2).

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Section 402.2b of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

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

The plan should show on-site sewer and water service for the Weaver property (T.M. 20-01-0112). (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article IV, Section 402.1.d.)

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 Wengerd Property (T.M. 20-01-0113). If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Section 402.1a) 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. (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article IV, Section 402.1.d.) If there is a residence on the Wengerd Property, it should also be shown on an inset map.

Zoning

Zoning information (Residential Agriculture) should be stated on the plan.

Other Comments:

- 1. The Wengerd Property was last subdivided in May of 2011.

Union Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Kline, William F.
File Number: 2015-12-002
Tax Map #: 20-16-388/389
Municipality: Union Township
Applicant Name: Kline, William F.
Land Owner Name: Kline, William F.
Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Plan Summary:

This project involves the subdivision of three (3) lots from the lands of William F. Kline. Lot #1 is intended to be a stand alone building lot, that will be served with public water and is currently served with public sewer. Lot #2 is intended to be a stand alone building lot, that will be served with public

water and is currently served with public sewer. Lot #3 is intended to be non-building lot addition to the adjacent lands of Irvin S. and Sara E. Hartzler. There are no improvements proposed to Lot #3 at this time. Access to all three lots will be via Poe Street.

Administrative

The owner signed the application as the applicant rather than the landowner.

Basic Plan Information

The tax parcel numbers on the application and the labels on the plan are missing the zero digit before the last three numbers. Please add these digits to the tax parcel numbers. The absence of the zeros creates inaccuracies within our plan tracking software.

The tax parcel number for the property being subdivided (T.M. 20-16-0388) should be listed on the subdivision plan.

Subdivision Information

The total acreage for the Kline Property (T.M. 20-16-0388) and the Hartzler Property (T.M. 20-16-0389) should be on the plan (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article IV, Section 402.2.h.).

Topographic information

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article IV, Section 402.1.g.).

Soils

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. Soil information is not on the plan.

Setback Lines

Although Note #4 lists the setback for the parcel, it should make reference to the Union Township Zoning Ordinance instead of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

Right-of Way Widths

There is an unnamed alley behind the Kline Property and right-of-way and cartway information should be on the plan. (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article IV Section 402.2.a.)

Cartway Widths

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width for Poe Street is substandard (Article V, Section 501.2).

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

The subdivision plan shows two proposed driveways. Have they been reviewed by the Roadmaster? A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Union Township Planning Commission.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Article IV, Section 402.2.b. of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

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.

Sewage Service

A letter from the municipality acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Union Township Planning Commission.

Water Service

A letter from the municipal water authority acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Union Township Planning Commission.

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."

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 the Hartzler Property (T.M 20-16-0389). If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could

be shown on an inset map. (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Article IV Sections 402.1.a.)

What will the total acreage for the new Hartzler Property be after the lot addition is added? Also an inset map would be helpful.

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. (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article IV Section 402.1.e.) There is a house on the Hartzler Property.

Zoning

Zoning information should be stated on the plan. The parcel is zoned Residential Suburban.

Public Comment

None

Housing Summit Report and Comprehensive Plan Implementation

The draft Housing Summit Report was reviewed. The Housing Summit was held October 29th. Bill received comments from four or five people on the draft summary report, which were minor. There was a positive response from those who attended. We are now left with the question of where to go from here. Dan questioned if Lewistown Borough is actively pursuing the request with the flood plain issue. Rex Fink has been working to get many properties out of the flood plain. The Borough is eligible for PEMA review next year. Dan noted that property owners need an elevation certificate to prove they are above the 100-year base flood elevation.

The summary report identified three housing issues and three non-housing issues. The three housing issues that came up were addressing poor housing conditions, rehabilitating older homes and the flood zone designation. Senior housing was not listed as was originally thought as a priority. The purpose of the housing summit was to determine what the housing needs are and where we need to go from here. Other non-housing issues that came up were perception of the school district (whether valid or not, there are negative perceptions of the school that need to be addressed), lack of amenities to attract people to the area, and training for different professions. It was noted that a representative from the school district attended the summit, Steve Schaaf. Bill is trying to outreach to the school in order to achieve more communication between the county and school district. The issues of the school district kept coming up as the biggest issue.

The summit triggered a lot of discussion and many attendees wanted to do it again, possibly on an annual basis. Only two major employers came to the summit, the hospital and school district. It would have been nice to have more employers in attendance. Bill noted again that senior housing did not come up as an issue.

Bill asked Michelle Brummer from Gannet Flemming to review the comprehensive plan and look for other things we could consider. She broke down the choices into three categories with several different projects under each category. The categories include economic development, land use and transportation. The first suggestion under economic development was to conduct a 2-part community audit of the local workforce development system, look at labor analysis and employer analysis. The next was to facilitate dialogue with the school district as far as looking at highest employment and job security opportunities. Another area was to develop and maintain a prioritized inventory of sites that are underutilized, vacant and in need of redevelopment. The next one was to develop a strategy to undertake projects in recreation that utilize heritage and natural resources to advance tourism for both local and distance travelers. The last one in economic development was to identify and prioritize sites for new industrial/commerce parks. Bill asked Rob Postal a long time ago if he wanted to develop an economic plan and he did not really see a need to.

Under land use, the Commission talked about three options including about developing a model zoning ordinance, strengthening the Subdivision Ordinance and sponsoring seminars on a variety of topics. The last

time the Subdivision Ordinance was reviewed was in 2006. There are some things that need to be updated in the ordinance.

The last one was on transportation, such as to assist SEDA-COG and PennDOT on their data collection for local roadways, bridges and local assets; consult with PennDOT, SEDA-COG and CATA about the feasibility of construction of park and ride lots at strategic locations; and a cooperative effort with SEDA-COG and PennDOT to coordinate between Amtrak, Greyhound and Trailways Bus Lines to improve connecting services for people commuting between Lewistown and State College.

Our goal when we adopted the Comprehensive Plan was to keep it active and viable and to help implement features of the plan and never let them sit. This is more of a coordinated effort to implement the Plan. We spoke in the past with the County Commissioners to set aside funds each year to help implement the Plan.

Jim Lettiere then noted a recent Supreme Court case in California regarding looking into the likelihood of an inclusionary zoning ordinance. The Supreme Court ruling upheld an inclusionary zoning ordinance that required a percentage to be set aside for affordable housing units in a subdivision. For example, a zoning ordinance could say 15% of housing in a subdivision must be affordable. Municipalities who have zoning would be able to pass a similar ordinance. He feels that this would be in some type of model ordinance for townships that have zoning. Bill feels this could be considered if we develop a model zoning ordinance.

Jim next mentioned the recent newspaper article about Penn State discontinuing credit courses here in Lewistown. Bill is also concerned about the Penn State issue. He would like to hear from Tom Walker. Tom is the local coordinator for the Penn State system and could hopefully provide insight into what is going on and whether there is something else we can do. The Penn State decision is something the school district should be concerned about as well.

Jim Spendiff asked about the community college concept and where things stand now. Lucas Parkes thinks University Park did not have all of the facts when the decision was made. He does not think enrollment is down. Neal asked why the instructors are not stepping up. Lauren Kershner thinks the school was setting up a meeting for December 16th, but it was cancelled. Tom questioned whether another school could come into the area to fill the void. Bill noted that South Hills is still there and is expanding. He feels that we should talk to Tom Walker. Classes are scheduled to end in the spring of 2017.

Bill resumed the discussion on the direction following the Housing Summit. Tyler concurred we need direction. Bill said we had two projects last year. One was the trail and the other was the senior housing study. The trail study did get done and we have an application in and are waiting to see if it gets funded. It has been delayed three times because of the budget process. Bill asked for more thoughts or priorities to pursue.

Neal felt we should focus on the area with the biggest bang for the buck, where we can take on one or two things at the same time. He was concerned with the specific focus of senior housing. It did not deal with the workforce and growing families. He noted that change takes years, but could create a snowball effect. We need someone within to reinvest in the county.

Dan noted that we can't do this ourselves and it requires participation of the community. He can see doing something like the Housing Summit annually. Bill suggested we would measure whether we have had any changes each year.

Bill said he was disappointed in the lack of major employer participation at the summit as well as not receiving much response to the draft report. The last housing study that was done did not have the response we did. He feels that the school district should have interest, but noted that several of their administrators don't live in this county including State College. While we will not have everything State College has, what

can we do to make people want to live here? Neal noted the Derry Heights project in Burnham has not moved. Everyone was excited about a water park, new hotel and movie theatre when it was proposed.

Jim Spendiff noted that there are going to be 40 more cottages at Valley View. He said that it will cost people more money who want to down size because the average cost of a home in the county is around \$90,000. To build a cottage at Valley View is probably double that. Bill noted that the same issue arose at Blossom Hill. He says housing is still an issue, but the question is whether senior housing is still an issue. Lucas thinks that people thought the senior housing problem was solved with Mann Edge, but the waiting list is long.

Bill is leaving this as an open agenda item for next month for further consideration and discussion as to how to approach this. Jim Spendiff noted that we will not be able to grow downtown without the infrastructure. It becomes a concern of striking a balance of taking care of the aging community and attracting the younger generation to fill the ranks of the former workers as they retire. Bill would like the school district to be a better partner than they are. He has heard that Career Link has a subcommittee that works with The Academy to link up employers with people from that school.

Bill asked to keep the discussion in mind for the meeting next month.

Other Business or Comments

Lucas Parkes noted that a multimodal grant was considered, which came out in November, and would have been for Armagh Township to improve the roadway corridor of Old Route 322 at Milroy towards the Naginey Quarry. With Hawbaker purchasing the Naginey Quarry, he feels there will be an increase in truck traffic. There are some pinchpoints in the roadway. With the tight time crunch and requirement for dedicated funding sources of a 30% match, they decided not to submit the application at this time, but will entertain it at a later date. Jim Spendiff questioned if it would keep traffic off of Honey Creek Road. Lucas said it would alleviate the traffic. Jim noted that Honey Creek Road is close to the creek with tight turns and felt trucks should not be allowed on that road. Lucas also noted that on Sigler Street that a truck and car cannot pass. He said there are currently weight restrictions in place to limit truck traffic. They want to widen the road within boundaries and improve sidewalks for pedestrian traffic. Lucas said that with all of the pallet shops, saw mills and logging operations in rural Armagh, as well as Overhead Door and the entire county going to that area for stone, the traffic is nonstop. Dan shared as a side note that DCNR recently did a statewide survey on lumbar-related industries, such as saw mills, pallet shops and any kind of lumbering services. Mifflin County ranked number one in sheer number.

Bill shared that the County was applying for more money to expand the streetscape project in downtown Lewistown. This project would continue down South Main Street onto Water Street and connect with Mann Edge Terrace. The survey of the properties was finished Monday. Lewistown Borough met on December 14th and approved the direction of the project as well as committing 2016 CDBG money toward the project. The application is due January 8th. The estimated cost is between \$500,000 and \$550,000. The Borough asked for the project to come in closer to \$500,000 because they are paying the engineering costs.

Two trail projects are currently in talks with the Parks and Recreation Council. These tie into the Comprehensive Plan as well as the Open Space Plan.

The natural gas study committee needs the three counties to adopt a resolution to develop the nonprofit cooperative. Bill is hoping the Commissioners sign the resolution.

Bill reminded everyone that the election for officers will be held at next month's meeting.

The CDBG Home application was submitted last Friday, December 11.

Dan noted that there is reorganization about to take place at DEP with the water deputate (new division) coming up and many things will change. This is due to EPA pressure on DEP and the Chesapeake Bay. Nothing is official yet.

Dan wished everyone a wonderful holiday, Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m. upon a motion by Tyler Gum, which was seconded by Neal Shawver.