

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 24, 2009

1. Rockville Estates Phase 1 Final Plan.

Mr. Brown stated on page 4 of 26, parcels AA, BB, which are paper right of ways, should be dedicated to adjacent property owners. A quit claim or a claim of adverse possession can be done. These right of ways were a part of the Ridgeview plan that intended to further subdivide up the mountain.

Ms. Brock stated that Parcel Z right of way is not extended.

Mrs. Stoner asked Mr. Brown what were some of the overall comments of his report.

Mr. Brown stated that the driveway issues need to be addressed. He is making a recommendation that no formal action is taken on the plan at this meeting because a Highway Occupancy Permit is needed to upgrade the pipe under Rt. 11/15. Also, the Planning Commission needs a recommendation from the Sewer Committee on a plan for the sewer that they are happy with. The sewer needs realigned at Fishing Creek.

Mr. Harris stated that there is an 8 inch line from Kittochtinny Drive to Ridgeview Drive. The developer did not want to make any improvements until they get to the other phases. The line on Ridgeview Drive needs replaced or slip lined. They want to get Phase 1 built.

Ms. Brock stated that the sewer is an issue that needs to be settled.

Mr. Harris stated that if the Planning Commission is going to wait for the HOP approval before making a recommendation on Phase I it will be at least 60 to 90 days. The Sewer Committee can review the issues within that time frame.

Ms. Brock stated that the sewer plan and time frame for the improvements needs to be provided. The improvements do not need to be done before they make a recommendation.

Mr. Vaitl stated that since they have to connect to the line on Ridgeview Drive, why not connect to a new line.

Mrs. Stoner stated that they want to see the time frame for the work.

Mr. Harris stated that the sewer committee is going on the recommendations of the Borough Engineer.

Mr. Brown stated that one comment on storm water says that they must design the storm water facilities to accommodate runoff from residual tract. So they must do calculations based on the rest of the phases happening.

Mr. Harris stated that Phase 1 will have an 8 inch line so he recommends that the improvement of the line on Ridgeview is done before Phase 1 construction.

Mrs. Stoner stated that they should not hold up the approval of the Phase 1 plan for the completion of the improvement.

Mr. Vaitl recommends that the completion of the sewer line improvement should be a condition of approval of the Phase 1 plan.

Mr. Harris stated that the HOP should not be a condition of approval.

Mr. Brown stated that the condition of approval of the plan should be that the Planning Commission receives the approval by PennDOT of the HOP for the pipe under Rt. 11/15 for drainage facilities and that there is a developer's agreement to complete the sewer improvements before construction of a house in Phase 1.

Mr. Zehring stated that there is no cul-de-sac shown at the end of lot 155 and lot 293.

Ms. Brock stated that the cul-de-sac was a condition of approval of the preliminary plan. The two big issues for Phase 1 approval is the approval of the HOP and the sewer plans are finalized and that there is a developer's agreement to complete the improvements before beginning Phase 1 housing construction.

Mr. Brown recommends that the Sewer Committee approve the Developer's sewer upgrade plans.

Mr. Harris stated that the sewer line on Ridgeview Drive should be replaced or the existing line slip lined.

Mr. Brown stated that the other review comments are technical on elevations and checking of flows. Another big item is the buffer. Page 16 does not show a buffer behind the detention basin. A visual barrier should be provided behind lot 14, basin #1 on page 16 and basin #3 on page 15. A buffer cannot go across the front of the basins. The intent of the buffer was to block the existing homes on Ridgeview Drive.

Mr. Zehring stated that the buffer may be a problem because of the grades.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the basin must maintain a certain amount of slope and a certain amount of bottom.

Mr. Brown stated that there is an elevation of 480 and then it drops down. A better understanding of how the buffers are being constructed is needed.

Ms. Brock stated that page 15 shows that the contours are being lowered.

Mr. Brown stated that a detention area must be built with a fence around it.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she did not see anything on the plan regarding vegetative plantings.

Mr. Brown stated that page 26 is showing the existing tree mass to remain.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there are existing trees behind lots 1-14 but the trees are being removed at Open Space E and D.

Mr. Brown stated that the Developer agreed to build a berm with trees in the buffer behind the homes on Ridgeview Drive which is to stop sheet flow off the mountain.

Ms. Brock stated that page 16 shows a swaling area at the tree line.

Mr. Harris asked what are the maximum grades permitted for sanitary sewer.

Mr. Brown stated that grades above 12% require tie downs. There are no grades above 12% anywhere. There is no maximum grade down hill.

Mr. Brown stated that there are engineering comments regarding the water line. The water lines are shown on the plan.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the Developer must have an approved final plan before the water company will look at the design.

Mr. Vaitl stated there is also a retention pond at Open Space C.

Mr. Brown stated that the pond will detain the water and then goes out. It is designed so that the water will be out of the pond within 48 hours. The pond is not designed to retain. There were perc tests done to determine rate. Some elevations need to be clarified.

Mr. Harris stated that lot 12 lateral crosses through lot 13 shown on Page 13. Will there be an issue where the Borough will need to get involved on property disputes. The plan does show an easement.

Mr. Brown stated that there will be easements. The easement needs to be referenced in the deed.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the sewer lateral is the homeowner's responsibility.

Mrs. Stoner stated that laterals have never been the Borough's responsibility. Property disputes would be a property owner to property owner issue.

Mr. Brown stated that protective covenants and deed restrictions would be provided.

Ms. Brock stated that the wording of the easement should be included in the protective covenant and deed restriction.

Ms. Mohr asked when the homeowner's association bylaws will be provided. The Planning Commission should have that now.

Ms. Brock stated that the Planning Commission needs the wording of the easements, homeowner's association bylaws and easement for the trail dedication and timing of issues for trail dedication of land.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the easement for the trail was not included in Phase 1.

Mr. Brown stated that in theory the trail would be in the back of Phase 1. There will be space between parcel K and N and continues on Parcel A and C on Page 4. There is connectivity.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Parcel K is Phase 1 and Parcel N is Phase 3. Some of Open Space A is in Phase 3.

Ms. Brock stated that the trail easement needs to be discussed.

Mr. Brown stated that whether the trail easement is shown in Phase 1 or Phase 3 is the Borough's call. There would be a question if the plan does not go beyond Phase 1.

Mr. Harris recommended that the trail easement be included in Phase 1.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Page 3 shows the phasing of the development. There are no dates for each phase.

Ms. Brock stated that the land dedication for the trail needs to be worked out.

Mrs. Stoner stated that a verbal commitment was made to give an easement across the property in Rye Township for the trail.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the Open Space needs addressed.

Mrs. Stoner stated the trail easement should be worked out before there are any approvals.

Ms. Brock stated that one way to work out the trail easement is for the Developer to give a date.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the trail easement needs to be done as part of Phase 3.

Ms. Brock stated that the trail would go through Open Space C.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Developer should provide the language proposed for the trail easement.

Mr. Brown stated that Open Space A and C will be deeded to the Borough.

Mr. Vaitl stated that he did not think the sliver behind Phase 1 and Phase 2 was to be dedicated.

Mr. Brown stated that the sliver behind Phase 1 and Phase 2 is Open Space A. There is a legal description on the plan for all the open space.

Ms. Brock stated that the basin to the west of Caroline Drive is Open Space C on page 3 and labeled Open Space Z on page 4.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that page 4 is a parcel plan subdividing the entire development to facilitate future phases. The plan is subdividing by lots. Phase 2 and Parcel K is the same. Page 4 shows the parceling of the entire area.

Mr. Brown stated that Phase 1 is Parcels J and K. Parcels E and Z are detention ponds.

Mr. Kmiecinski read General note #1, *“The purpose of this plan is for the subdivision and land development of 33 single family dwelling units in Phase 1 of Rockville Estates and the subdivision only of the entire tract into smaller parcels to facilitate compliance with requirements for a 55+ age restricted development, the Pennsylvania Uniform Planned Community Act.”*

Ms. Brock stated that it will be defined.

Mr. Vaitl stated that Parcel J should not be applicable to the 55+ community.

Mr. Brown stated that the dedication of the open space will be done in future phases. The developer is not planning to dedicate open space as part of Phase I.

Mrs. Stoner stated that they should be concerned with the parceling of the rest of the land. This could be problematic.

Ms. Brock also feels it could be problematic because someone else could become an owner of a parcel in the middle of the development.

Ms. Mohr stated that the parcels would fall under the new ordinance.

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 24, 2009

Call to order and roll call. The meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm

Roll Call:

1. MEMBERS PRESENT

Jennifer Brock, Chairman
Stephanie Stoner
Monte Shearer
Shawn Vaccaro
Jim Zehring
Art Vaitl
Lori Mohr

STAFF PRESENT: Ron Brown, Borough Engineer
Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer
Mike Kmiecinski, Tri County Planning Commission

OTHERS PRESENT:

Brian Harris, Borough Manager
Forrest Troutman, Yingst Homes Inc.
Paul Hepler, Yingst Homes Inc.

Deb Hepler, Yingst Homes Inc.
John Murphy, Alpha Consulting Engineers
Rich Castranio, Alpha Consulting Engineers
Joe Bilda, Alpha Consulting Engineers
Andrea Hoch, 601 Landsvale Street
Delores Stephens, 900 Landsvale Street
Joan Raisner, 203 Kings Highway
Jim Sabo, 100 William Street, Rye Township

2. MINUTES:

a. February 24, 2009 Minutes

MOTION: Mr. Vaccaro moved, seconded by Mrs. Stoner to approve the January 27, 2009 minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT. NONE

4. OLD BUSINESS:

a. Subdivision Amendment -Plan Specifications and Procedures

Ms. Brock stated that the subdivision amendment for plan specifications and procedures are in the review process.

5. NEW BUSINESS:

b. Rockville Estates Phase I Subdivision Plan

Ms. Brock stated that the Rockville Estates Phase 1 Subdivision Plan is before them to discuss. There are a lot of Borough Engineer comments.

Mr. Murphy, Alpha Consulting Engineers, presented the plan along with a new exhibit. The plan was preliminary approved by the Planning Commission in September, 2008 and the Borough Council in December of 2008. The total plan consists of 294 overall lots on 475 acres. Phase 1 has 33 lots for single family residents on 37.7 acres from Kitchichtinny Drive to Ridgeview Drive. They submitted the NPDES application to DEP and the Erosion and Sedimentation control Plan to Perry County Conservation District. They received approval of the DEP for the sewage exemption module for Phase I. They are working on PennDOT upgrades. They are also working with the Sewer Committee on downstream upgrades. They received the Borough Engineer and the Perry County Planning Commission comments and have no problem addressing the comments.

Ms. Brock stated that there were a number of issues discussed at the workshop. The timing of off site improvements of the sewer line and storm sewer involved for Phase 1 was an issue.

Mr. Murphy stated that the HOP for the drainage improvements was executed by the Borough and will be delivered to PennDOT tomorrow.

Ms. Brock stated that the sewer line work behind Lady Finger going under highway and tracks planning and timing belongs to Phase 1.

Mr. Murphy stated that they are in the process of analyzing sewer for the entire project.

Ms. Brock stated that it needs to be done now. The Ridgeview Drive sewer improvements and behind Lady Finger going under highway and railroad tracks is part of Phase 1.

Mr. Murphy agreed that sewer improvements need to be done as part of Phase 1 which will be outlined in the developer's agreement and a financial security in the form of a letter of credit will be submitted prior to recording.

Ms. Brock stated that the timing and scope of work must be delineated with Phase 1.

Mr. Murphy stated that it will be done prior to recording of the plan.

Ms. Brock stated that legal documents for covenants, homeowner's association and easements must be submitted for the Borough Solicitor's review.

Mr. Murphy stated that Mr. Troutman will be finalizing the legal documents. He has been working with Mr. Altland on specific language.

Ms. Brock stated that the timing for land dedication and easement for the trail needs to be worked out. There is also confusion with the phasing plan and parceling of the land on Pages 3 and 4. What they are talking about is deeding the parcels.

Mr. Troutman stated that the parceling is not for development purposes. The parceling is for the 55+ community.

Ms. Brock asked if the parceling would be a recorded deed.

Mr. Troutman stated that the parceling would be a recorded as separate parcels but not land development of parcels.

Mr. Brown stated that they are asking the Planning Commission to approve the subdivision of parcels as part of Phase 1.

Mr. Troutman stated that latter is correct because it goes hand in hand.

Ms. Brock stated that it would keep things cleaner if they would only parcel Phase 1 with Phase 1.

Mr. Troutman stated that parceling and phasing is not the same. Parceling the subdivided property is so they can achieve a Planned Community in accordance with the Planned Community Act in order to make a homeowners association for 55+ and the area that is not 55+. Without parceling they cannot achieve a Planned Community. In order for the lots to be transferred to owners so it is no longer part of the subdivision it has to be a separate parcel.

Ms. Brock stated that if the entire land is parceled in Phase 1 there could be landlocked parcels and separate parcels. They're not sure the rest of the subdivision will happen which might cause problems later.

Ms. Mohr stated that the Planning Commission does not want subdivision of the parceling as part of the subdivision.

Mr. Troutman stated that he talked to Mr. Altland regarding the parceling. Mr. Troutman understands the Planning Commission's concern that they don't want to create landlocked parcels. There is no development being sought. There is a restriction that the parcels cannot be transferred and will remain as one. The parceling will not be transferred from the current owners.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Planning Commission needs a legal opinion from the Borough Solicitor.

Mr. Troutman agreed that this is a legal question.

Ms. Brock stated that if approval is received for Phase 1 with the parceling and the subdivision is halted for some reason, at that point they would have created landlocked parcel.

Mr. Murphy stated that Mr. Altland can advise the Borough in order to protect their interest to make sure parcels are not split up and can't be separated.

Ms. Brock stated that maybe there could be something in the deed that there is no intention to transfer parceled land.

Ms. Mohr suggested doing Phase 1 and 2. If someone wants to buy a parcel they would not be exempt from the new ordinance.

Mr. Troutman stated that the only way that a person could development the parcels is as shown on the Rockville Estate plan. If some how a parcel was pulled apart and sold off it would not be a part of the Rockville Estates Plan and would be subject o the new ordinance.

Ms. Mohr stated that the parceling plan would have already been subdivided for 50 lots on the land.

Mr. Brown stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to approve Phase 1. By protracting the larger piece of land into parcels; he questions what comes first, the parceling or the phasing. If the parceling is approved by the Planning Commission, the parcels can be subdivided off in totality to someone else. They just want to make sure there is no problem down the road.

Mr. Troutman stated that the plan is what the Borough Council approved. It is the preliminary plan that was approved.

Ms. Brock asked what the timing was for the creation of the parcels. There are metes and bound descriptions of the parcels. She understands the 55 and older regulations for parceling.

Mr. Murphy stated that key is for Mr. Troutman and Mr. Altland to work out legalities.

Ms. Mohr stated that there will be individual lots that will be parcels.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the parcels are not lots right now.

Ms. Brock stated another issue is the timing of the land being dedicated to the Borough and trail easement. Right now have Open Space A is in Phase 2 and Phase 3. What are thoughts on requiring the bulk of Open Space A in Phase 1?

Mr. Murphy stated that the open space dedication in other phases can be worked out as they move forward.

Mr. Murphy stated that he would like a recommendation from Planning Commission and approval of Borough Council contingent upon approval of the Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP). There will be an HOP for the storm sewer which they are applying for in the next day or so. There is a HOP for the traffic light that has been approved. There will be a third HOP for the sanitary sewer.

Ms. Brock stated that the Planning Commission wants the engineering and timing to be worked out in Phase 1 in a developer's agreement.

Mr. Murphy stated that they will provide a developer's agreement.

Ms. Brock asked about other issues.

Mr. Harris stated that there was an issue regarding the buffer behind Ridgeview Drive.

Mr. Murphy stated that he will make sure the buffer goes all the way across.

Mr. Brown stated that there was a commitment made with the Ridgeview Drive property owners regarding the buffer.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the commitment was that the existing evergreen trees would remain around drainage ponds. The plan shows the existing trees will be removed.

Mr. Murphy stated that they will not remove trees adjacent to property owners.

Mrs. Stoner stated that on Page 15 there are no trees.

Mr. Murphy stated that is no grading there. There will be an evergreen buffer beside lot 1. The percentage of disturbance is per lot.

Ms. Brock asked what the buildable area is.

Mr. Murphy stated that the house plan will be indicated when the building permit application is submitted.

Ms. Brock stated that Page 11 shows setbacks on the lots.

Mr. Murphy stated that the house footprint and the driveway will not be shown on the lot. The maximum disturbance of lots is individual.

Mr. Vaitl asked about the buffer for storm water.

Mr. Castranio stated that there is a 25' undisturbed area.

Mr. Murphy stated that they will direct water to ponds on every side. There will be a berm built. A restrictive covenant will be applicable for each lot.

Mr. Vaitl stated that there are no dates for the phasing plan on the drawings.

Mr. Murphy stated that the plan will be revised to show dates for the phasing plan.

Ms. Brock stated there are two thumbs that come down to Ridgeview Drive which are unopened roads. It differs from map to map.

Mr. Brown stated that there are a lot of unopened streets applicable to the plan. The unopened streets need to be resolved.

Ms. Brock stated that one of the unopened streets has an existing driveway on it. This would be adverse possession.

Mr. Murphy stated that they do not want the Borough to own them. The right of way issues will be worked out in Phase 1.

Ms. Brock stated there is also a driveway on Parcel I.

Mr. Murphy stated that Parcel I is the same type of thing. The developer will maintain ownership until the process is completed.

Mr. Troutman stated that they can say it will not be developed and it is being parceled out so it can be transferred to adjacent property owners. Whatever is done with parcels will not be any more of a burden to the Borough.

Ms. Brock stated that except when you subdivide a piece of land and it becomes a separate piece of land.

Mr. Troutman stated that there is no land development being approved with parceling.

Mr. Harris asked about the cul-de-sac at the end of Reiff Drive.

Mr. Murphy stated that he will revise the plan to show a cul-de-sac at the end of Reiff Drive which was approved and documented on the preliminary plan.

Ms. Mohr referred to the storm water report – page 7.

Mr. Murphy stated that they are asking for one waiver for Phase 1. The waiver is from Section 22-405.1.DD(1) which states, “*Profiles of each street showing the existing and proposed grade on the centerline and along each property line. Profile scales to be 1 inch equal 40 feet for the horizontal scale and 1 inch equals 4 feet for the vertical scale.*” They are requesting the profiles are 1 inch equals 50 feet for the horizontal scale and 1 inch equals 5 feet for the vertical scale. Ms. Mohr stated that there is no lighting shown on the plan. Details, location and type of lighting are required to be shown.

Mr. Murphy stated that he will add the information on the lighting.

Mr. Brown stated that the storm water management plan for Phase 1 must be designed to accommodate storm water from the residual tract.

Mr. Murphy stated that the storm water management plan was discussed and the information regarding storm water from the residual tract will be added.

Mr. Brown stated that there may be an impact to the pipes.

Mr. Murphy stated that will verify the calculations.

Ms. Brock asked if the pipes will be designed for the other phases.

Mr. Brown stated that they have to design swales on new streets.

Mr. Murphy stated when the next phase comes in they will be conservative on the design and if it never happens; that is good.

Mr. Murphy stated that they are working on doing a hydro analysis for predevelopment prior to construction. They anticipate blasting so they are doing a survey of all properties by taking pictures of basements, documenting conditions, etc. They are trying to be proactive with studies to prevent litigation.

Mrs. Stoner asked if blasting requires a permit.

Mr. Murphy stated that blasting does not require a permit. They are making sure that if something does happen, they will know exactly what happened. There will be a meeting to explain what the developer is doing.

Mr. Vaitl stated that another thing to keep an eye on once building starts is the change to underground springs. The effects of underground spring disturbance will change things somewhere.

Mr. Murphy stated that the underground water table is up and down. It can handle impacts.

Ms. Brock stated that there was a spring hit in another development that caused problems but it is finally drying up. What you are reading on the water table may not be what it is.

Mr. Murphy stated that the underground water table will be an on-going study as they go through the process. Their goal is to get all questions and comments addressed. They are close to

completing the engineering comments. The planned community issues need worked out. The sewer also needs to be finalized.

Ms. Hardman stated that Mr. Murphy said that they want the plan approval conditioned on HOP approval and provided prior to recordation. Mr. Brown stated that he wants the HOP approval prior to the Planning Commission's recommendation to Borough Council.

Mr. Murphy stated that the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) does not require the HOP approval prior to approval of the plan.

Mr. Brown stated that larger pipes are being connected into smaller pipes under Rt. 11/15. He is not comfortable with that based on what he is seeing now because there could be capacity issues which will cause the water to back up on Borough streets. He asked that the Borough reserve the right to make sure there is no ponding created. He is concerned that the pipe under Rt. 11/15 will affect the whole drainage facility.

Mr. Murphy stated that the will keep the Borough Engineer informed of the HOP review process and approval.

Mrs. Stoner stated that it is her understanding that there are a few things the Borough Engineer is recommending is done before the approval of the plan and the sewer line issues done prior to construction.

Mr. Murphy stated that it will be addressed in the developer's agreement. The work will not be physically done. Prior to approval of the plan, everything will be spelled out.

Ms. Brock stated they are working toward everything being delineated. The Borough Engineer needs to be comfortable with timing and pipe size

MOTION: Mr. Vaitl moved, seconded by Ms. Mohr to table the plan. The motion passed unanimously

Mrs. Stoner recommended that Mr. Altland attend the next Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Harris stated that he will have Mr. Altland at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Mohr asked if the Planning Commission will be able to see the HOP and other legal documents at some point.

Mr. Harris stated that the HOP and legal documents need to be provided prior to plan approval and not recording of the plan.

Mr. Brown stated that Mr. Altland will need to indicate that he has reviewed and approved all the legal documents.

Mr. Vaitl stated that it is interesting that the Borough Council approved the parceling of the land.

Ms. Mohr stated that as long as the parceling only applies to Rockville Estates Subdivision plan.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the parceling deals with the 55 and over community and the homeowner's association for the 55 and over community.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the land being transferred to the Borough is part of the parceling. If someone did purchase a parcel, they must come back before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Brock stated that once the land is subdivided it is subdivided.

Mr. Vaitl stated that they said there is no deed.

Mr. Brown stated that a deed can be prepared at any time. All that is needed is a legal description.

Ms. Mohr stated that there may be a difference in parceling and subdividing.

Mr. Brown stated that he feels it can be conveyed. The Planning Commission needs the Borough Solicitor's opinion on parceling.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the right of way for Ridgeview Drive was cleared up with Big Bee Plaza with a minor subdivision on land transfer. She feels that same thing should be done with other right of way issues.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that one of the rights of way on Ridgeview Drive has the curb cut as if there was to be a street. The curb could be closed.

Mr. Harris asked if there will be issues with Rockville Bridge.

Mr. Brown stated that Rockville Bridge will not be affected. The sewer line will go under the railroad arch. The work will be done under the supervision of PennDOT to realign the sewer. There will be no work toward the bridge. All the water comes out at Big Bee Plaza to the Diner and across Rt. 11/15; then going to railroad property through the existing ditch.

Mrs. Hoch asked what affects blasting will have on Rockville Bridge.

Mrs. Stephens stated that the Rockville Bridge is a very import bridge. It was guarded on 9/11.

Ms. Brock stated that a permit may not be required for blasting but they should keep the railroad informed. The blasting plan should be submitted for the railroads review and have a review period for a response. She can call them to see how much review time they need for a response.

6. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.

- a. The Land Logics representing The Susquehanna Water Gap Landscapes will hold a workshop on March 30th and April 2nd to discuss reviews of municipality's ordinances that could result in drafting ordinances and proposed revisions to existing ordinances. The project is part of the Kittochtinny Ridge and Susquehanna Greenway Plan.
- b. PA Municipal Planning Education Institute is sponsoring a seminar entitled *The Course in Community Planning* on Wednesdays of April 15, 22 and 29, starting at

6:15 pm to 9:30 pm located at the Hummelstown Borough Building, 136 S. Hanover Street, Hummelstown, PA 17036.

7. Report on Borough Council Meeting (Next Council Meeting 4/13/09):

Ms. Brock stated the Borough Council that she did not attend the March 9th Borough Council

Mr. Harris gave a report on the Borough Council meeting. The Kings Highway banking project was approved from Caroline Drive to Township line. The cost was \$150,000. The project includes a 4 foot bike path on the south side of the road. The Trout Run culvert bridge repairs began on Monday. They are replacing 320' of sanitary sewer heading east. Also, Pennoni is doing the design work for the square to go out for bid in June to separate the sanitary sewer and storm water from Rt. 850 to the Subway. The Borough Council voted to return the money in the amount of \$250,000 and PennDOT's \$208,000 for the improvement of the downtown area because they didn't want to compromise the cartway since it needed to be ADA accessible. There were the telephone pole and sidewalk issues.

Mr. Brown stated that in order to make the improvements to the square the traffic flow would be restricted to one way only. Parking was also an issue. Fire trucks couldn't get through.

Mr. Harris stated that design work is also being done for separation of sewer in the northern area of town.

Mrs. Stoner stated that grant money available through Recovery and Reinvestment.

Mr. Harris stated that he received a letter regarding the Recovery and Reinvestment monies that the design work must be ready to go to bid in 180 days. They are not that far into the design plan.

Ms. Mohr stated that there are a lot of bills being proposed for additional monies that are coming available.

Ms. Brock stated that the sewer needs to be separated through the Subway.

Mrs. Stoner stated that eventually the Borough will be required to separate everything.

Ms. Mohr stated that there are requirements that sewer nutrient loads are reduced in Marysville.

Mrs. Stoner stated that it may be a good idea to plan to design separation through the Subway.

Ms. Mohr stated that the bills are specifically for the separation of storm and sanitary sewers.

Mr. Harris stated that there is a four month DEP approval.

Mr. Brown stated that a lot of municipalities have the plans and design work done. Sewer plants account for 12% of nitrogen's in Chesapeake; 60% is from fertilizer. There is money available through a bond initiative with a 50/50 match.

Ms. Mohr stated that there are also EPA requirements. Marysville has an exemption now for storm water.

8. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 4/8/09 @ 6:30pm/NEXT REGULAR MEETING 4/28/09 @ 7:30 pm, WORK SESSION @ 6:30 pm.

MOTION: Ms. Mohr moved, seconded by Mr. Shearer to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer