MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
AUGUST 26, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT
Stephanie Stoner
Robert Zimmerman
Jennifer Brock
Art Vaitl

STAFF PRESENT:
Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer
Jason Finnerty, Tri County Planning Commission

OTHERS PRESENT:
John Murphy
John Zervanos

ROCKVILLE ESTATES Phase 1 Plan Change Request

Mrs. Stoner stated that a request was received from Yingst Homes to provide native fill instead of 2A stone in trenches for storm sewer in Phase 1.

Ms. Brock asked if the waiver request is for trenches on the entire plan.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Planning Commission discussed the trench detail in the spring at the request of the Mr. Weaver, Borough Manager. The Planning Commission advised that the request be sent to the Borough Engineering because it was an engineering issue. Mr. Weaver received comments from the Borough Engineer in April. The Planning Commission said that since it was a revision on the plan sheet that had been recorded at the court house it required the Planning Commission review and recommendation to Borough Council. On July 2, 2014 the Borough received a written request for a construction modification to the original recorded Rockville Estates Phase 1 plan set recorded in instrument number 201307522 on September 26, 2013, Book 65, page 164. The request stated that the following are items for consideration and approval *1. The request be approved for Kittochtinny and Caroline Drive Extension only. Any work in the existing public right of way of Ridgeview Road shall follow the currently approved detail with full 2A stone backfill. 2. A pre-construction meeting be held to outline the acceptable backfill process with representatives of the Borough and the Borough Engineering and contractor. 3. The Borough's on-site Engineering Representative be on-site all times during installation of all public and or bond improvements and given the sole discretion as to the determination of whether or not the existing on –site material is deemed suitable for re-use for backfill. In the event the existing material is determined to be unsuitable, compacted 2A stone backfill shall be used in the areas where the unsuitable material is encountered. 4. The Developer provide a mutually agreed upon third party geotechnical engineer to perform proctor testing of existing material and compaction testing of all backfill lifts at 200 foot trench intervals,*

or once per day, whichever is greater. Minimum compaction shall be 98% of Standard Proctor according to ASTM D-698 +/- 2%. 5. None of the conditions above will preclude the responsibility of the contractor to provide a proof-rolled (movement-free under a fully loaded triaxle dump truck) subgrade prior to placement of stone subbase and paving. 6. The Developer establish a cash escrow for the purposes of covering the public improvement inspection fees for the project. We typically suggest an escrow equal to 3-4% of the cost of construction, but this can be negotiated based on the size of the project. (Proposed $7,000.00 escrow to be replenished at $1,000.00). 7. The Developer provide a Maintenance Bond extension from 18 months to 42 months after road dedication if on site soils are used as backfill. 8. The Developer acknowledge that the Borough has the final authority to accept public streets dedication, and will refuse to do so if any issues arise related to this request. 9. The Developer prepare and execute an Agreement (reviewed by the Solicitor) outlining these terms and conditions and his offer to abide by them. 10 was deleted "Detention Basin Fencing Install a three rail split rail type fencing in lieu of the chain link type fencing which we feel will look additionally pleasing to the rural setting."

(For the record, Mr. Vaitl arrived at 6:55 pm)

Mrs. Stoner stated that the fence request was dropped. Everything on the letter is what the Borough Engineer wanted to see if they were using native materials in the trench.

Ms. Brock pulled the recorded plan and was looking for the grade.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the last sentence of the email to the Borough Manager from the Borough Engineer stated, *"The bottom line is that there is little question that this scenario can work given the right level of attention to detail during the construction process. The 2A backfill provides more flexibility in the construction process and more room for error on the Contractor's part, thus why it is use d so frequently. The additional costs involved with the potential of encountering unsuitable material, failing compaction tests, re-work, extended inspection times, etc. may make this alterative less financially attractive than what they think. I would have Yingst acknowledge this fact up front, so there is no issue with arguments related to time spent on rework or other things in the future."*

Mr. Finnerty asked if the improvement will be bonded.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the developer will provide a maintenance bond and extend the maintenance period from 18 months to 42 months after acceptance.

Ms. Brock stated from the construction until the dedication will be additional time that the trench will be sitting there so you are actually talking about a couple of years to determine if the trench material will fail.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the developer is responsible until dedication plus the 18 month performance bond.

Mr. Vaitl stated asked if the trench material waiver for storm sewer or sanitary sewer.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she thinks it is for storm sewer.

Mr. Vaitl asked what about sanitary sewer trenches.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that it looks like they want to use dirt as the backfill material.

Mr. Murphy arrived and stated that the trench detail waiver request is for all storm sewer and sewer trenches. Compaction is the key. There will be onsite inspections. The maintenance period has been extended to 42 months which is 3 ½ years which will allow three cycles of summer and winter after it is accepted.

Ms. Hardman asked why do they want to use the proposed restoration material.

Mr. Murphy stated that the purpose of the request is an economic factor. It is common place now and is being done in other municipalities.

Ms. Brock stated that the maintenance bond starts after dedication which won't start until Phase 1 is done which is even more time to determine if the trench material has failed.

Mr. Murphy stated that it is estimated to be five years but if there is any failures it will happen then.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the next phases will have the new trench detail.

Mr. Murphy stated that future phases will show the new trench detail.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the geotextile material is also required based on the Borough Engineer's review and as shown on the new detail.

Mr. Murphy stated that it is not really a new detail because there is no migration of fires into the stone which is another precautionary level.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the developer accepted the geotextile material.

Mr. Murphy stated that the developer did accept the geotextile material.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what the length of this section of road was.

Mr. Murphy stated that he did not have the exact length but it is for a couple of the long streets.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the waiver request does not apply to Ridgeview Road. The current detail will be followed for Ridgeview Road because they already started that work.

Mr. Vaitl asked if Kittochtinny Drive and Caroline Drive are the only streets in Phase 1.

Mr. Murphy stated that Kittochtinny Dive and Caroline Drive are the only streets in Phase 1.

Mr. Murphy stated that developers start looking for more economical and more efficient ways to perform the work.

Ms. Brock asked if the engineering representative is on site at all times.

Mr. Murphy stated that this is already happening.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Borough Engineer is also adding a geotextile layer to the list of criteria.

Mr. Murphy stated that the geotextile layer is an extra layer of protection.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what type of pipe will be in the trench.

Mr. Murphy stated that the pipe can be anything because the material is compatible.

Mrs. Stoner stated that United Water services the area and may also need to approve the trench material.

Mr. Murphy stated that United Water must approve the trench detail separately. The conditions were offered by the developer. The Borough Engineer only added the geotextile layer.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Borough Engineer and Borough Solicitor reviewed the waiver request.

2. SALDO and Well Ordinance – Engineering review comments.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Borough Engineer's comments were reviewed at the August 19, 2014 work session meeting. There were questions on comment #1 and #5. Mrs. Stoner would like to make the changes discussed and request clarification for #1 and #5 and forward the ordinances to the Borough Solicitor for review.

Ms. Brock asked for a review of the Borough Engineer's comments.

Mrs. Stoner reviewed the memorandum dated August 15, 2014 from Ronald C. Brown, Borough Engineer.

1. Section 22-502.2.A. General Arrangement: Existing Arterial & collector Streets with the borough should expressly defined by name in the SALDO. It almost seems some of these requirements should be contained in the Zoning Ordinance as opposed to the SALDO. **Question**
2. Section 22-509, Flag Lots: Do these requirements conflict with Zoning Ordinance? *No conflict*

3. Section 511.3.F. Permeable Pavement: consideration should be given to the maintenance and life cycle requirements of permeable pavement for any streets intended to be dedicated to the Borough**. Changed to remove permeable for streets**.
4. Section 512.3. Private Streets: We recommend the Solicitor review this section, specifically subsections C through F.
5. Section 513, New Street Design Standards: Recommend incorporation of a requirement to comply with PennDOT Publication 70M, Design of Local Road and Streets to avoid a potential conflict with narrow new street construction and the ability to collect Liquid Fuels funding for said street in the future. **Question**
6. Section 513.C.2, Design Standards: Revise "should" to "shall". **Changed**
7. Section 513, Curb Design Standards and Section 522.2.B.b.: Include requirement for the installation of ADA ramps at all intersections per PennDOT Roadway Construction Standard RC-67M. **Changed**
8. Section 530.2.D.2.c., Stormwater System Design: Recommend the requirement that conveyance structures can pass the 100 year storm event for off-site drainage. **Changed**
9. Section 530.2.D.3, Rainfall: Remove the specific values contained in the 24-hour event table and reference NOAA Atlas 14. **Changed**

B. Well Ordinance

1. Section 501.2., Scope: Remove reference to "Chapter 500". **Will be Chapter 23**
2. Section 501.3.45: Update Form Number (all sections). **Changed**
3. Section 501.7.2.3.7.2.: Updated reference from "paragraph 501.9" to 501.10.
4. Section 501.7.2.4.3.: Confirm required capacity – 400 gallons of storage conflicts with requirements of Section 501.7.2.10.1. **Changed**
5. Section 501.8.2.5.: Replace term "may" with "shall". **Changed**
6. Section 501.13.8: Solicitor should review section and provide recommendation for appeals process and incorporate directly into this Ordinance or another by reference.
7. Section 501.13.5.: Suggest revision to 30 days. **Changed**
8. Section 501.13.5.1.1.: How will yearly testing be confirmed? Should results be submitted to the Borough? **Yearly testing will not be confirmed. Results will not be submitted to Borough**
9. Section 501.13.10.4.: Are fines an appropriate penalty? **Yes**
10. Forms: Update Ordinance and Chapter numbers. **Codification will change numbers.**

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 26, 2014

1. CALL TO ORDER. The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT
Stephanie Stoner
Robert Zimmerman
Art Vaitl
Jennifer Brock

STAFF PRESENT:
Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer
Jason Finnerty, Tri County Planning Commission

OTHERS PRESENT:
John Murphy
John Zervanos

2. MINUTES:

a. June 24, 2014 Minutes

Page 1, 3. Change "Minuets" to Minutes" throughout.
Page 2, C. Change "Vaidl" to "Vaitl".
Page 2 D. change "NPDS" to NPDES".
Page 2.6.paragraph 3 change "b" to "by"
Page 2,6. Paragraph 4 change "facads" to "facades".

MOTION: Ms. Brock moved, seconded by Mr. Zimmerman to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

4. **OLD BUSINESS.**

A. SALDO and Well Ordinance: Review of Engineering comments. Send to Solicitor.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the engineering comments were reviewed at the work session. Clarification is needed from the Borough Engineer for Comment 1 and 5. The SALDO and Well Ordinance are ready to send to the Borough Solicitor for review.

MOTION: Ms. Brock moved, seconded by Mr. Zimmerman to forward the SALDO and well ordinance to the Borough Solicitor for review and comments. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Zoning Ordinance/Chapter 27

a. Part 14 Development Standards. On hold until SALDO and Well Ordinance is completed.
b. Part 15 Performance Standards. On hold until SALDO and Well Ordinance is completed.

C. Rockville Estates Update.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there was an update of the storm event in July.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that there was heavy rain that built up behind the wood chip barrier which broke loose and jumped the curb. The water hit the first house heading down Caroline Drive facing Caroline Drive toward the Whitetail development and the water just kept going ending up in the creek. Yingst Homes personnel were there that night cleaning it up. The Borough cleared the remaining in a day and the Fire Company also helped clean the debris.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she talked to the Perry County Conservation District twice and they sent her the most recent report indicating everything during the inspection was acceptable.

5. NEW BUSINESS.

A. Rockville Estates Plan Change Request.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the plan change request for the trench material detail was discussed at work session at length.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what the total depth of the trench was.

Mr. Murphy stated that the trench depth varies.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the existing blacktop will be altered.

Mr. Murphy stated that the request is specific to the correspondence submitted.

Mr. Finnerty asked what plan sheet will be changed.

Mr. Murphy stated he did not plan to record the detail sheet.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he recommended that the plan sheet be re-recorded.

Ms. Brock stated that the reason for recording it is to record that the Borough agreed on the change.

Mr. Murphy stated that they normally don't record a change like this one but if the Borough Solicitor recommends that the plan sheet is recorded, they will do so.

Ms. Brock stated that as-built plans could be submitted.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the plan change did come in as an official request but there was no application or filing fee submitted.

Mr. Murphy stated that the trench detail change is a minor change which does not require an application for plan approval.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she will discuss the procedural issues with the Borough Solicitor.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the review may take more of the Borough's time. There is engineering time spent on this. In terms of procedure, if the Borough Solicitor does recommend that the plan is recorded, the Perry County Planning Commission will be required to provide review comments.

MOTION: Ms. Brock moved, seconded by Mr. Vaitl to approve the trench detail plan change request in accordance with the August 6, 2014 written request with attachment of the July 2, 2014 letter from the developer with the nine conditions and the Borough Engineer's recommendation for a geotextile cover shown in the trench detail submitted via email in accordance with the Borough Solicitor's opinion on procedural matters as to recording, plan application, filing fee and Perry County Planning Commission review. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Zervanos stated they will be working on the basins to the west and basins to the east; and then they will connect them.

Mr. Vaitl stated that Yingst Homes works on Sundays.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the storm event in July was at the west end of the property.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that the storm event in July effected Caroline Drive and Ridgeview Drive.

Mr. Zervanos stated that everything was taken care of with the July storm event. They immediately called the Perry County Conservation District to come up with an interim plan until they have the basins completed. The Conservation District approved everything.

Mr. Murphy stated that the latest report from the Conservation District was good.

Mrs. Stoner informed them of the two rockfall projects.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the rockfall project in Duncannon will start next year.

Mr. Zervanos stated that PennDOT is requesting right of way for the rockfall project. They were told by PennDOT that this fall they are doing cleanup of trees. Then next year they will do rockfall project.

Ms. Brock said she will be interested in seeing the tree clean up without a road closure.

Mr. Finnerty stated that a letter was sent to PennDOT advising the department of the County Planning Commission's concern over US Rt 11/15 road closure south of Duncannon. The other options are still being considered. If the road is closed it will create a nightmare especially if there is a flooding event.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the closing is a three month event.

6. GENERAL ANNOUCEMENTS.

A. Update Planning Commission Bylaws.

Mrs. Stoner stated a sample bylaw was provided by Mr. Finnerty as a guide.

B. Perry County Comprehensive Plan & Task Force Groups.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he has scheduled eight meetings for September which will involve four committees (tax reduction task force, natural resource issues task force, economy issues task force and the transportation issues task force). The four task forces were the result of the community issues survey.

The top ten issues are: lowering taxes, protection of open space and preservation of agriculture land, economic growth, natural resource protection, transportation and infrastructure improvements, economic development – manufacturing, economic development and community retail options, transportation improvements dealing with multi model and public transit, education, job training and workforce development and more efficient comprehensive means of trash collection.

The first meetings will address problems, then goals and then work on objectives. The second meetings they will work at high water marks, trying to achieve them and how to get there.

The first set of meeting dates are September 3 for Natural Resources, September 9 for Tax Reduction, September 10 for Economic Issues and September 18 for Transportation.

7. REPORT ON BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING - NONE
(Next Council Meeting September 8, 2014).

Mrs. Stoner stated she has not report for last Borough Council meeting. She will attend the September 8, 2014 meeting.

8. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 9/16/2014 @ 6:30pm/NEXT REGULAR MEETING @ 7:30 pm, NEXT WORK SESSION 9/23/13 @ 6:30 pm.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the bylaws will be discussed at the special meeting on 9/16/2014.

Adjournment: Ms. Brock moved, seconded by Mr. Vaitl to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer/Recording Secretary