

MINUTES
MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 28, 2016
MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Members

Dan Dunmire
Michelle Bair
Dave Pennebaker
Kay Semler
Neal Shawver
Jim Spendiff
Kent Spicher

Other

Lauren Kershner, The Sentinel
Lucas Parkes, The EADS Group
Stephen Dunkle, Mifflin County Commissioner
Lisa Nancollas, Mifflin County Commissioner
Kevin Kodish, Mifflin County Commissioner

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 3:34 p.m.

Record of Public Attendance

Dan reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Neal Shawver made a motion to approve the minutes from March's meeting. The motion was seconded by Jim Spendiff. All members voted aye. Michelle Bair made a motion to approve the minutes from the Annual Dinner meeting on April 7, 2016. The motion was seconded by Dave Pennebaker. All members voted aye.

Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report

Jim Lettiere presented twelve plans to the committee for review. They were all under municipal ordinance (Noah R. J. and Elizabeth Hostetler, *Armagh Township*; Joseph Y. Peachey, *Brown Township*; Rose Romaine Carstetter, *Brown Township*; Walnut Springs Racquet Club, *Brown Township*; Blossom Hill Phases 2B and 2C, *Derry Township*; David C. Smith, *Derry Township*; Derry Heights-Burnham Properties LP, *Derry Township*; PHN Medical Office Complex, *Derry Township*; Donald T. Pierce, *Granville Township*; Steven R. and Juniata M. Byler, *Granville Township*; Toby L. Spigelmyer, *Granville Township*; and Bertha L. Peachey, *Menno Township*. Jim reviewed three plans in further detail.

The first plan reviewed was Derry Heights-Burnham Properties LP. Jim reviewed many comments on the plan. Hawbaker Engineering indicated revised plans would be submitted to the Planning and Development Office by May 2nd. Bill Gomes indicated that PennDOT is in the design phase to upgrade the ramps at the Burnham interchange. This project will require coordination between PennDOT, Derry Township and all entities involved. The adjoining section of Derry Heights was previously reviewed in 2007 when the subdivision was initially approved. Subsequent plans submitted were never finalized to be recorded. There are questions about what was approved versus what has taken place. The area proposed on the plan is near the section where a previously proposed movie theater would have been located. In this part, there has only been an informal authorization from the township to do certain improvements, including the road. The

existing roughed in road has been extended with a gravel road, which was not shown on earlier preliminary plans. This project has been ongoing for about ten years. It was originally presented as a medical facility and has evolved over time. PennDOT is paying for the ramp improvements as they have seen enough activity to elevate the priority of the work and place it back on their Transportation Improvement Plan. The interchange upgrade could be implemented within two years and is already a concern as there are back log issues now. Other improvements also need to be reviewed, such as a traffic signal at Ferguson Valley Road and Freedom Avenue as well as realignment of Calkin's driveway and a stability issue of a fill area nearby.

Jim did receive comments from the township engineer and they are fairly significant. There are also some very detailed legal issues to be worked out with the township solicitor. The township engineer is suggesting everyone get together to have a work session to discuss the project because of the time lag between when the plan was partially developed and the two new proposed plans for the subdivision and land development plan.

Bill noted the goal of the engineer was to have the revised subdivision plans to the Derry Township Planning Commission meeting of May 4th. They have not guaranteed when they will have the land development plan ready. Bill thinks the earliest they could get full approval would be July due to the issues that need to be worked out. Jim Spendiff thought the developer would like to start by July.

The second plan reviewed was the land development plan for PHN Medical Office Complex on the same site as the Derry Heights subdivision plan previously reviewed. Additional concerns noted included high tension wires near the proposed building. A plan submitted previously, Wray's Landscaping, a business near the area, also had to address issues with overhead wires. Wray's Landscaping learned from Penelec that they were limited in what they could do under the wires. Another issue is sewage planning, but the applicant had previously reserved capacity. Further, there is a height variance that will be required for the medical office through the Derry Zoning Hearing Board, as well as a special exception if the applicant goes forward with a proposed educational building on the site. The applicant was surprised at the need for a traffic study. A traffic study is usually good for about three years and the last one was performed six to seven years ago. A pre-meeting was held two months ago with the developer, but the plans were not available and many of these issues did not come up in discussion.

The third plan reviewed was Donald T. Pierce in Granville Township. Michelle Bair stated the plan had been seen by the Granville Township Planning Commission. She indicated changes needed to be made and Dan Taptich was at the meeting and is addressing them. Neal Shawver questioned how the recipient property would be impacted by accepting the lot addition area that is in a flood plain. The recipient may be required to have flood insurance on his home if he has a mortgage, even though his home is currently not in a flood plain.

Dave Pennebaker motioned to accept the comments of the twelve plans under municipal ordinance. Michelle Bair seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Subdivision and Land Development Municipal Reports

Armagh Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Hostetler, Noah R.J. & Elizabeth B.
File Number: 2016-04-008
Tax Map #: 12-09-0103
Municipality: Armagh Township
Applicant Name: Hostetler, Noah R.J. & Elizabeth B.
Land Owner Name: Hostetler, Noah R.J. & Elizabeth B.
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Plan Summary:

This plan proposes to create Lot 2. Lot 2 has an existing residence served by on-lot sewage disposal, privy and a spring. The residual tract, Lot 1, has had sewage testing for on-lot sewage for a proposed new house and privy.

Subdivision Information

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 Sections 6.302.a.5., 7. and 12.) This property was last subdivided in April of 2005.

Clean & Green / Agriculture

Note #4 states 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.

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.

Right-of Way Widths

There is a private driveway to serve lot 1 with a potential to serve future subdivision activity. If there are such plans, the applicant should be prepared to meet the township's private road standards.

Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for Siglerville Pike should be shown on the plan. (Section 6.302.a.6.). The plan only lists a variable right-of-way for Siglerville Pike that leads into Back Mountain Road and should list something.

Cartway Widths

What is the cartway width for the existing driveway serving lot 1 and will it be accessible for lot 2? If so, a shared driveway agreement should be in place.

*The Wright Surveying representative indicated this will not be a shared driveway as it serves only Lot 1.

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 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.

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.)

Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Peachey, Joseph Y.
File Number: 2016-04-004
Tax Map #: 14-09-0112L
Municipality: Brown Township
Applicant Name: Peachey, Joseph Y.
Land Owner Name: Peachey, Joseph Y.
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, is vacant farmland with no new development proposed.

Basic Plan Information

This property was last subdivided in August of 2003.

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 on the Brown Township Road Ordinance (Section 41) the right-of-way width for Green Lane is substandard.

Cartway Widths

Based on the Brown Township Road Ordinance (Section 41) the cartway width of Green Lane is substandard.

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

Although Note #4 calls for a municipal driveway permit, the township, at this time, does not have such a permit. However, coordination with the township roadmaster is recommended.

*The Wright Surveying representative stated he may modify the language regarding the driveway permit.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 7.302.A.6. and 7.307.B.7.of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

*The Wright Surveying representative stated 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 Brown 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. (Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.23.)

*The Wright Surveying representative stated the land is vacant open space.

Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Carstetter, Rose Romaine
File Number: 2016-04-005
Tax Map #: 14-01-0103
Municipality: Brown Township
Applicant Name: Carstetter, Rose Romaine
Land Owner Name: Carstetter, Rose Romaine
Plan Preparer: Thomas H. Metz Engineering, Inc.

Plan Summary:

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

Basic Plan Information

The subdivision application should also list tax map 14-01-0115EE.

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

Soil information is not on the plan. Since the plan involves a lot addition/merger, the applicant should request a waiver from the subdivision ordinance.

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

A notation about a PennDOT HOP should be on the plan.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 7.302.A6 and 7.302.B7 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

*The Wright Surveying representative stated there are no deed restriction or easements.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

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

Sewage Service

Where is the on-lot service for Lot A? (See Section 7.302 A.23. of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

Water Service

Where are the water lines that serve Lot 1 and Lot A?

Lot Addition

A lot addition plan should include an inset map. An inset map is a general location map of sufficient size and detail for the Commission to readily determine geographically where the subdivision, or lot addition, is proposed. (See Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.27.)

*The Wright Surveying representative stated he will request a waiver to this provision.

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. (Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.23.)

Other Comments:

1. Since Lot Addition A is in a different zoning district (R3) from Lot A (CH), are there plans to rezone Lot Addition A? Are there plans for Lot Addition A?
2. It should be noted that the lot width of Lot 1 is pre-existing and does not meet the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance requirements.

Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Walnut Springs Racquet Club
 File Number: 2016-04-009
 Tax Map #: 14,01-0104A/14,01-0104G
 Municipality: Brown Township
 Applicant Name: Walnut Springs Racquet Club
 Land Owner Name: Walnut Springs Racquet Club
 Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and Surveying

Plan Summary:

The purpose of this plan is to add Lot A, of 1.883 acres, to the land of Douglas K. and Rhonda K. Kerstetter, Tax Parcel 13, 01-104G, from the land of Walnut Springs Racquet Club, Tax Parcel 14, 01-104A.

Soils

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

Setback Lines

The sideyard setback listing for R-1 for residential and non-residential should be 25 feet and not 15 feet. The outdoor tennis court intrudes into the sideyard setback at the Walnut Springs Racquet Club, but is a preexisting condition.

Private Street / Shared Driveway

Plan Note #7 makes reference to a shared driveway agreement. Is this in reference to the 25 foot easement shown on the plan that crosses the Walnut Springs Racquet Club parcel (Lot 1)?

*The Sarge Surveying representative confirmed that it is.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

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

DEP Sewage Planning Module

A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form has been provided.

Sewage Service

Where is the on-lot sewer service for the Kerstetter properties?

Lot Addition

A lot addition plan should include an inset map. An inset map is a general location map of sufficient size and detail for the Commission to readily determine geographically where the subdivision, or lot addition, is proposed. (See Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.27.)

*The Sarge Surveying representative stated he will request a waiver to this provision.

Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Blossom Hill Phs 2B & 2C (Final)

File Number: 2016-04-001

Tax Map #: 16-11-0100E-,000

Municipality: Derry Township

Applicant Name: DGB Properties, LP *

Land Owner Name: DGB Properties, LP *

Plan Preparer: ELA Group, Inc.

Plan Summary:

Pursuant to the township granting tentative approval for the revised PRD master plan on February 23, 2015, with conditions, this plan is the final plan of the remaining phase 2, sections B and C as illustrated on the revised PRD master plan. This phase of the project entails an extension of Cambridge Lane, an extension of Exeter Lane to a cul-de-sac, and an extension of Geisinger Lane to a cul-de-sac, to accommodate 25 new single family lots and two open space/stormwater lots.

Subdivision Information

It appears based on the PA Engineer, Land Surveyor and Geologist Registration Law, Act of May 23, 1945 P.L. 913, No. 367 CL 63 Section 2. Definitions (d) (e) and (j) that a professional engineer may not practice land surveying unless licensed and registered as a professional land surveyor.

Do the newly created lots meet the minimum lot size of the setbacks established for this PRD?

*The ELA Group representative stated he will label the other areas of lot 62.

Floodplain / Wetlands

As noted in Note C. 2. the site does not lie within a 100 year floodplain or designated wetland.

Soils

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

Cartway Widths

Unless the PRD, revised master plan states otherwise, based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, section 504.2, the cartway width of Cambridge and Exeter Lanes are substandard.

*The ELA representative indicated a waiver was granted through the PRD process for the cart-way widths.

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

As noted in Note 11. A municipal driveway permit is required if access will be onto a Derry Township Road, and a copy should be provided to the Derry Township Planning Commission.

Other Comments:

1. All conditions of the revised master plan for Blossom Hill dated November 26, 2014, last revised June 2, 2015 and final subdivision plan Lot 79 at Blossom Hill, recorded instrument number 2015, Page 1409 remain in full force and effect.

2. The Township Engineer's comments if any should be incorporated in this subdivision.

*The ELA representative indicated the Township Engineer is currently reviewing the plan.

Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Smith, David C.
File Number: 2016-04-003
Tax Map #: 16-02-0102H/16-03-0102
Municipality: Derry Township
Applicant Name: Smith, David C.
Land Owner Name: Smith, David C.
Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Plan Summary:

This project involves the subdivision of one (1) lot from the lands of David C. and LaDonna S. Smith. Lot #1 is presently vacant and is intended to be a non-building lot addition to the adjacent lands of Fred A. and Beverly K. Adams (TM 16-03-0102). Access to Lot #1 will be via Ewardtown Road. The Residue currently houses a single family residential dwelling and associated outbuildings. There are no improvements proposed to the Residue at this time.

Basic Plan Information

The Fred Adams property, T.M. 16-03-0102, has been reviewed on January 22, 2015, May 28, 2015 and October 22, 2015.

A graphic scale bar is missing as provided for in Section 403.2.c. of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

Administrative

The signature of Fred Adams is not on the application and should be as the proposed recipient of the lot addition.

Subdivision Information

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual and recipient properties. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Sections 402.2 F., H. and J.)

Floodplain / Wetlands

The plan should note whether or not the site lies within the 100 year floodplain. (See Section 402.2.I. of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

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 hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

Setback Lines

Setbacks are listed in Note #5, but the demarcation between zoning districts is not shown.

The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 403.2.K.).

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Ewardtown Road is substandard (Section 504.2.).

Cartway Widths

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Ewardtown Road is substandard (Section 504.2.).

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

If a municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Derry Township Planning Commission.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

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

If there is on-lot water and sewer service for T.M. 16-02-0106H and T.M. 16-03-0102, this information should be provided. (See Section 402.2. J. and S. of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

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 plan should include an inset map. An inset map is a general location map of sufficient size and detail for the Commission to readily determine geographically where the subdivision, or lot addition, is proposed. (See Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 403.2H)

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 Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402.2.J.)

Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Derry Heights-Burnham Properties, LP

File Number: 2016-04-011

Tax Map #: 16-04-0105

Municipality: Derry Township

Applicant Name: Burnham Properties LP

Land Owner Name: Burnham Properties LP

Plan Preparer: Hawbaker Engineering, LLC

Plan Summary:

This plan subdivides Lot 5 from the residue of the northern tract (16-04-105). Lots 1 through 4 were previously subdivided out of the northern tract on September 27, 2007. See plan entitled "Final Subdivision plan for Burnham Heights, Phase 1, as recorded in Map Book 25, Page 6.

Basic Plan Information

All abutters should be shown on the plan, including tax map numbers. Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. (Part 4 Sections 402.2.0. and 403.2.5.) Since the eastern boundary abutting properties are numerous, an insert map listing the abutters by number, name and tax parcel number would be sufficient. The following tax parcels are not listed as abutters and they should: 16,04-0099 and 16,04-0113A

Subdivision Information

Based on the County GIS files, the extension of Moraitis Boulevard appears to be a paper street and is not a public right-of-way. This has created a concern that the subdivision of Lot 5 will create a land locked parcel, which is prohibited in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development ordinance (Part 5 Section 503.4.) However, based on a site visit on April 20, 2016, a roughed in gravel road has been developed that has not been approved by Derry Township. In fact, based on a review of County Assessment records, it is questionable if the entire road system was ever approved since there is no plan recorded.

Although there are proposed easements for access to this lot, what assurance will there be that these easements will be constructed to Township standards? Will the easements be public rights-of-ways and if so, will they be dedicated and accepted by the township? Have the existing base coated roads (still lacking a final coat) been approved by the Township, and will they be built to be dedicated to the Township?

Is there a sufficient developer's agreement for this extension and other work done to date?

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 403.2. G., H. and J). All of the property was fully surveyed in 2007/2008 and should be provided with this updated subdivision plan, particularly since the layout appears to have changed.

Floodplain / Wetlands

The plan should note whether or not the site lies within a 100 year floodplain or designated wetland in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 402.2.I. and Section 403.2.M.).

Topographic information

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 402.2.G.).

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. The steep slopes are not part of Lot 5.

Soils

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

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Ferguson Valley Road should be shown on the plan. (Part 4 Section 402.2.K and Sections 403.2.G.).

Cartway Widths

The cartway widths of Ferguson Valley Road and Moraitis Blvd. should be shown on the plan in accordance with Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 402.2.K. and Section 403.2.G.).

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

A municipal driveway permit is required for access onto Ferguson Valley Road, and a copy should be provided to the Derry Planning Commission. The ingress and egress will intersect with the municipal portion of Ferguson Valley Road.

Since a portion of Ferguson Valley Road is considered a state road, a notation should be on the plan about the 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.

Private Street / Shared Driveway

If a private street is proposed, the following note shall be included on the plan: "The owners of lots _____ agree and understand that " _____ Road" is a private road and as such are responsible for the maintenance, care, improvements, and snow removal at their own diligence and expense. Further, if at any time in the future, the property owners adjacent to this road desire to dedicate said road to Municipal ownership, then such owners shall be required at their own expense to improve said road to meet the public road and street specifications of the Municipality in case at such time. The maintenance and use of said private road shall be in accordance with the private road maintenance and use agreement recorded in Deed Book ____ Page ____ of the Mifflin County Recorder of Deeds Office."

DEP Sewage Planning Module

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

Sewage Service

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

Water Service

The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 402.2.J. and 403.2.X)). If the water source is off site, there should be evidence of an easement and right-of-way agreement on record and so noted on the plan. This information is particularly important if the water supply serves more than one household. The surveyor will note both are off site and make reference to easement/right-of-way agreements on record.

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

Signature Blocks on Plan

The Mifflin County review certificate is not accurate. There should be one line for the plan tracking number and one line for Chairman or designated representative.

Zoning Light Industrial

Zoning information should be stated on the plan.

Other Comments:

The Township Engineer should review this subdivision to comment on the access easement versus creating a public right-of-way in accordance to the Township Road Standards.

There should be road profiles as part of this subdivision for the Township Engineer to review.

*The Hawbaker Engineering representative indicated he will attempt to have revised plans back to the County Planning and Development Office by May 2, 2016.

Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: PHN Medical Office Complex-Burnham Properties, LP

File Number: 2016-04-012

Tax Map #: 16-04-0105

Municipality: Derry Township

Applicant Name: Pownell, Don

Land Owner Name: Burnham Properties LP

Plan Preparer: Hawbaker Engineering, LLC

Plan Summary:

The Keystone Healthcare Development Service (Keystone) is acquiring 6.074 acres from Burnham Properties "Northern Tract" to construct a 3-story medical office building for the Primary Health Network (PHN) during the initial phase. Phase 2 is currently proposed as an additional 3-story educational building and necessary parking. This area was previously approved as the theatre lot in the Final Land Development Plan for Derry Heights - Phase 1. Keystone will utilize the existing access, utilities and stormwater facilities for their project. Access will be provided by Moraitis Boulevard and Pastor Drive.

Basic Plan Information

All abutters should be shown on the plan, including tax map numbers in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Sections 402.2.0. and 403.2.5.). Since the eastern boundary abutting properties are numerous, an insert map listing the abutters by number, name and tax parcel number would be sufficient.

Floodplain / Wetlands

The plan should note whether or not the site lies within a 100 year floodplain or designated wetland in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 402.2.I. and Section 403.2.M.).

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. The steep slopes are not part of Lot 5, only part of the residual.

Soils

According to the County GIS files, some portion of the residual 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.

Right-of Way Widths

Moraitis Boulevard and Pastor Drive are not public right-of-ways. Pastor Drive is a paper street. The location of Pastor Drive is not identified on the plan. Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Ferguson Valley Road should be shown on the plan (Part 4 Section 402.2.K. and Sections 403.2.G.).

Cartway Widths

The cartway width of Ferguson valley Road should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 402.2.K. and Section 403.2.G.).

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

Unless municipal driveway permits were issued, a municipal driveway permit is required for access onto Ferguson Valley Road, and a copy should be provided to the Derry Planning Commission.

Private Street / Shared Driveway

If a private street is proposed, appropriate supporting information (i.e. the length(s), curve(s), tangent(s), angle(s), right of way width, cartway width, and if applicable, a road profile) should be provided on the plan.

If a private street is proposed, the plan should be reviewed by the Township Engineer.

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 are 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."

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with (Part 4 Section 403 2.L. and M.) of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

Although access and utility easement legal descriptions have been provided with the subdivision application, it should be part of the land development plan to show access.

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 Derry Township Sewer Authority acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Derry Township Planning Commission.

Water Service

A letter from the Municipal Authority of the Borough of Lewistown (MABL) acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Derry Township Planning Commission.

Signature Blocks on Plan

The Mifflin County review certificate is not accurate. There should be one line for plan tracking number and one line for Chairman or designated representative.

Land Development

The variance granted by the township on September 22, 2009 for a reduction of the parking stall length was based on a different use. Although a variance runs with the land, it would appear that this approval would not by default apply to the use for a medical and educational facilities. The parking space sizes as shown do not meet the requirements of the Derry Township Zoning Ordinance.

What is the driveway width beyond the entrance?

The applicant should consult the local Fire Marshall to see if new fire hydrants will be required and included with the plan submission.

A traffic circulation diagram should be included with this plan submission to verify adequate site circulation.

This plan proposal may require a traffic study, since the last one was in 2009. The traffic study should be updated and take into consideration a change of use from a movie theater to a medical facility.

E & S / Stormwater

Stormwater drainage provisions should be included with the plan submission. The stormwater plan should be reviewed by the Derry Township Engineer.

What is the status of the existing NPDES permit?

*The Mifflin County Conservation District, District Manager indicated the receiving waters designation has changed to a wild trout stream and this may impact the existing NPDES permit.

Other Comments:

1. Although there are proposed easements for access to this lot, what assurance will there be that these easements will be constructed.

2. Is there a developer's agreement with the township in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Section 612., completion of improvements or guarantee thereof prerequisite to final plan approval.

3. On earlier plans there was a proposed traffic light to be installed at the corner of Ferguson Valley Road and Freedom Avenue. Where does this stand in relation to this project?

4. One of the earlier plans called for the widening of Ferguson Valley Road. Where does this stand?

5. There are high voltage overhead wires above a large area of this lot. Has the utility company been contacted to make sure there is no issue with the parking lot and the high tension lines and their distance to the building?

6. The project narrative calls for a 3 story building and the project notes list 35 feet. It appears that there may be a discrepancy, since 3 stories will likely exceed the 35 feet maximum height allowed. Please clarify this.

7. Although the Light Industrial Zone does not specifically allow for health care facilities, it does allow for offices. In terms of the proposed educational facility, it will need to go through a conditional use hearing. Will the educational building use be brought back as another land development plan?
8. There is concern by the Code Officer regarding fire equipment accessibility to the rear of the building. Please clarify.

*The Hawbaker Engineering representative indicated he will attempt to have revised plans back to the County Planning and Development Office by May 2, 2016.

Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Pierce, Donald T.
File Number: 2016-04-002
Tax Map #: 17-22-0210
Municipality: Granville Township
Applicant Name: Pierce, Donald T.
Land Owner Name: Pierce, Donald T.
Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Plan Summary:

This project involves the subdivision of one (1) lot from the lands of Donald T. and Leota P. Pierce. Lot #1 is intended to be a non-building lot addition to the adjacent lands of Lorne Terrence and Rosemarie Hastings (TM 17-22-0210). Access to Lot #1 will be via the existing developed access to the Hastings property. The Residue is current vacant. There are no improvements proposed and no proposed changes to the access to the Residue at this time.

Basic Plan Information

The tax parcel number for Donald & Leota Pierce (T.M. 17-22-0200) that is part of Lot 1 should be labeled on the plan with the other residue information and listed in the project narrative. The tax parcel number for Donald Pierce should also be on the application.

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.

Floodplain / Wetlands

The plan should note whether or not the site lies within a 100 year floodplain or designated wetland. (See Section 6.202.a.14. of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

According to County GIS information, the property lies within the 100-year floodplain, and the flood plain should be delineated on the plan. Future development in this area should be discouraged.

Topographic information

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202 a.7.).

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

There is no soil information on the plan.

Right-of Way Widths

There are two unnamed private right-of-ways that appear to serve more than one resident and should be named.

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths for Aqueduct Drive and 2 unnamed roads should be shown on the plan. (Section 6.302.a.6.).

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for Middle Road is substandard (Table 1).

Cartway Widths

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway widths for Middle Road, Aqueduct Drive and 2 unnamed roads are substandard (Table 1).

Private Street / Shared Driveway

All private drives that are used by more than one party shall have a shared driveway agreement in place. An agreement for the private right-of-way should be noted on the plan. The agreement should include the following: "The owners of lots ____, which have a common driveway, agree and understand this is a shared driveway, and as such are 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."

Street Names

If multiple parties are to use a private drive, the roadway will need to be named. Street names are to be coordinated with the County GIS (Mapping) Department. There is a fee associated with the street naming.

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.a.7. of the Granville 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

On-lot water and sewer service for T.M. 17-22-0210 should be shown on the plan.

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 6.202.a.10.)

Other Comments:

1. Who owns Aqueduct Drive?
2. It appears that the balance of T.M. 17-22-0200 will be served by an 18 foot right-of-way.
3. It appears that the area beyond the 18 foot right-of-way going east, based on a GIS aerial map, is not shown on the plan since T.M. 17-22-0200 is mentioned near an existing building. The balance of T.M. 17-22-0200 should be on the plan.

Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Byler, Steven R. & Juanita M.
File Number: 2016-04-006
Tax Map #: 17-07-0115
Municipality: Granville Township
Applicant Name: Byler, Steven R. & Juanita M.
Land Owner Name: Byler, Steven R. & Juanita M.
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Plan Summary:

This plan proposes to create Lots 2 & 3. Lot 2 has an existing single family residence served by public sewer and water with no new development proposed. Lot 3 is vacant land with no new development proposed. The residual tract, Lot 1, is agricultural with no new development proposed.

Administrative

According to the Assessment records, the parcel is still listed as owned by David and Sandra Ellinger.

*The Wright Surveying representative stated Mr. Byler recently purchased the property from the Ellingers.

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.

The property is in an Agricultural Security Area and should be noted on the plan.

Floodplain / Wetlands

According to County GIS information, the property lies within the 100-year floodplain, and the flood plain should be delineated on the plan. Future development in this area 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.

*The Wright Surveying representative stated he will request a waiver to this provision.

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

Setback Lines

The plan lists setbacks, but no setback lines are shown on the plan.

Right-of Way Widths

GIS aerials show a Girl Scout Lane, but this is not shown on the plan. This should be noted on the plan and include right-of-way and cartway information.

*The Wright Surveying representative stated Girl Scout Lane is not on this property and he believes the tax parcel map is incorrect.

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for North River Road is substandard (Table 1).

Cartway Widths

The cartway width for North River Road should be shown on the plan (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.302. a.11.).

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 none.

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

Except for Lot 2, it is not clear from the plan whether public water and sewer is available for Lot 3 or the residual.

Signature Blocks on Plan

The township certification statement is not legible.

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 6.202.a.10.)

All significant natural features, including swales, ditches, trees, water courses, sinkholes, rock out-cropping, etc. should be shown on the plan. (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.9.)

Other Comments:

1. At this time no development is proposed for lot 3 or lot 1. If development is proposed, a land development plan needs to be prepared for lot 1 and lot 3.

Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Spigelmyer, Toby L.

File Number: 2016-04-010

Tax Map #: 17-16-100A1

Municipality: Granville Township

Applicant Name: Spigelmyer, Toby L.

Land Owner Name: Spigelmyer, Toby L.

Plan Preparer: Juniata Valley Land Surveying, Ron F. Booher, PLS

Plan Summary:

The purpose of this plan is a lot subdivision from T.M. 17, 16-0100AI of 4.0000 Acres to create a separate lot with existing single dwelling with existing well and septic system. Lot 2 is 20.8790 acres less 4.000 acres for a residue of T.M. 17 ,16-0100AI being 16.8790 acres.

Basic Plan Information

This property was previously subdivided in March 2008.

Floodplain / Wetlands

As noted in general notes #5, no portion of the site lies within a 100 year floodplain or designated wetland.

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.

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan not only on the insert map depicting the soil types in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.202 a.7.).

Soils

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

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

If any new access to State Route 333 is proposed, a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) is required as prescribed in the Municipalities Planning Code (Section 508 (6)). A copy of the permit should be provided to the Granville Township Planning Commission.

Street Names

Since lot 2 will be a separate deed after this subdivision, the parcel will need to be addressed and possibly the twenty (20') foot existing private driveway will need to be named by the GIS Department. Fees for these services will be increasing starting on or around June 2, 2016.

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 Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

* The Juniata Valley Land Surveying representative indicated there are none.

Other Comments

1. The plan should clearly indicate that lots 1 and 2 will access Route 333 by a shared driveway and the cartway width of the driveway should be placed on the plan.
2. There is enough property that additional development of the residue is possible. If additional development is anticipated, the applicant should know that road improvements may be required before additional lots will be approved.

Menno Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Peachey, Bertha L.
 File Number: 2016-04-007
 Tax Map #: 18-10-0126B
 Municipality: Menno Township
 Applicant Name: Peachey, Bertha L.
 Land Owner Name: Peachey, Bertha L.
 Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Plan Summary:

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

Basic Plan Information

The Plan has no north arrow and needs to be on the plan. (See Section 6.302 a.2. of the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

Administrative

The subdivision application form should be signed by the municipality.

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for Hickory Lane should be shown on the plan. (Section 6.302.a.6.).

Based upon the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for West Back Mountain Road is substandard (Table 1).

Cartway Widths

Hickory Lane is only 16 feet wide and is not adequate for two-way travel and could be a problem for emergency vehicles to use the road by adding another house on this private lane.

Based upon the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway widths for West Back Mountain Road and Hickory Lane are substandard (Table 1).

Private Street / Shared Driveway

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 are 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 Wright Surveying representative stated he will add this to the plan.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

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

*The Wright Surveying representative stated there are none.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

A copy of the DEP Component 1 Sewage Facilities Planning Module should be submitted to the Menno 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. (Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.10.)

Other Comments:

1. The proposed lot 2 has no direct road frontage except to a 16 foot private road, Hickory Lane. Who owns Hickory Lane and are there provisions for additional property owners to use this private lane? If provisions are not clear in the deeds to allow for additional users of this lane, then all property owners who use the road would willingly need to authorize the expanded use of Hickory Lane, before the subdivision can move forward.

*The Wright Surveying representative state he was unsure if there is a maintenance agreement for Hickory Lane.

Public Comment

None

Other Business or Comments

Subdivision Review Fees

Bill Gomes was asked by the County Commissioners several weeks ago to review the fee structure for subdivision review, which was last updated in December 2010 and implemented in January 2011. The Planning Office completed a comparison of various other counties' subdivision fees and discovered the fees are all over the place. Our fees are in the middle. Last year, the County collected \$11,418 in fees. A fee comparison worksheet was distributed to the Planning Commission members for review. Over the past few

weeks, several alternatives have been presented to the County Commissioners. Three fee versions were discussed, including a proposal supported by the County Commissioners.

Commissioner Lisa Nancollas said a meeting was held earlier today with three members of the Planning Commission to get input on the fee schedule. Dave Pennebaker provided input at that meeting and felt that the fees for 1-2 lots were high, so the Commissioners modified the fees for that category.

Commissioner Steve Dunkle shared that they are in the process of reviewing all fees in the county. Many fees are regulated by the state and only four departments can change their fees. He also noted that it has been a number of years since fees have changed, some as far back as 2005. Fees are being adjusted in GIS, Assessment, Tax Claim and Voter Registration, and Planning Departments. He also said that they will not review the fees again in the next four years. He thinks all fees needed to be adjusted. Commissioner Dunkle noted that they decided to break the subdivision review fees down by number of lots and charge an additional per lot fee. He thinks this is a more accurate depiction of the situation and feels the revised fees are reasonable.

Commissioner Kevin Kodish stated that as a new board, they wanted to take a thorough look at fee structures and update everyone's fees at the same time. This board does not want to make further adjustments for the next four years.

The Commissioners would like to make the revised fees effective June 1st and will allow prenotice to the surveyors. Jim Spendiff questioned if this was enough notice.

Kent Spicher questioned the increase in fees of lot line adjustments. He asked how many of these plans are old surveys getting cleaned up. He was told there were not many lot line adjustments. What has been a problem is that some townships have not required applicants go through the subdivision process for lot line adjustments or mergers.

Michelle Bair feels the proposed fees may be too drastic. Dan Dunmire reminded everyone that some townships charge fees on top of the county fees as well. Bill mentioned that the estimated review costs were about \$29,000 last year. Jim Spendiff noted that this is not a cost recovery process.

Dan asked for a motion to recommend the revised fee schedule to the Commissioners, which is the Commissioners' proposal. Dave Pennebaker made the motion; however, no one would provide a second. Dan noted the great deal of reluctance to recommend the fee increase. The motioned died from lack of a second motion.

Jim Spendiff feels the reluctance is due to the size of the increase. He does not want to discourage development. He also stated that the fees will never cover all of the costs of the Planning Department. Michelle Bair agrees with Jim.

Commissioner Nancollas wants to raise the fees for the big developers who can afford the higher fees.

Michelle said that while she has sat on the Granville Township Planning Commission, she has seen many developments not go anywhere due to the economy. She feels Mifflin County gets an overflow from Centre County and does not want to discourage this. Jim Spendiff also noted that development of properties also brings more tax dollars.

Dan feels the Planning Commission cannot provide a recommendation at this time unless more time is given to discuss the fee schedule. The Planning Commission has only been able to review the fee structures for about a week. However, the Commissioners can take what action they choose. Discussion continued as to how much time the Planning Commission would need to review the fees. The Planning Commission would

like another month to review fees. Commissioner Nancollas offered one week. Commissioner Dunkle stated he wanted all fee increases to occur at the same time and they are planning on adopting all fee increases soon. Jim Spendiff questioned if all fee increases needed to be effective at the same time. Commissioner Dunkle stated the Commissioners need to adopt the fees officially and felt it would be easier to adopt all fees at the same time.

Bill would like the opportunity to review fees with the subdivision committee and any other planning commission member who is willing. He will coordinate a date. Discussion continued that the Planning Commission members wanted to see the fee schedules and were not necessarily concerned with the dollar impact.

The Commissioners agreed to give the Planning Commission one month to review the fees. Jim Spendiff would then like to see the fees not go into effect before July 1st.

Boat Launch

Lucas Parkes of The EADS Group provided an update on the boat launch. Plans and specs have been issued and seven construction companies have picked up the plan. A preconstruction meeting was held April 20th and bids are due May 4th at 11 a.m. If the bids are within budget, he will make the recommendation to the commissioners May 5th to issue the notice of intent to award. Once they select a contractor, he will take the next 30 days to do bonding, insurance and get all of the agreement documentation in place. This should allow having an agreement with the contractor by early June with notice to proceed by middle of June and 90 days for construction to wrap up by October 1st. Lucas performed a conservative estimate of construction costs and feels they will be around \$215,000. There is no contingency in place and the contractors are aware the project is federally funded and they know the amount available. There were three small construction companies and three or four larger companies who picked up the plans. Some have had previous experience with boat launches and stream restoration in the area. Some were just excavators who would have to subcontract the paving.

Upcoming Events

The dog park will open May 7th with a grand opening from 9-12. The dog park will be open daily. Dan will provide a presentation at May's meeting on the direction of the Chesapeake Bay Program. PennDOT will provide their annual presentation on roads and bridges in June. Mann Edge will be holding a ground breaking May 3rd.

County directory's and annual reports are available

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m. upon a motion by Michelle Bair.