

07/20/06-7:30 P.M-EAST COCALICO TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
WORKSHOP MEETING

PAGE 1

ATTENDEES:

Supervisors: Douglas Mackley, Alan Fry, Noelle Fortna

Township Treasurer: Elwood V. Schwartz

Police Department: Police Chief George Beever

Transportation Engineer for Planning Matters: HRG-Scott R. Russell, P.E. and

Associates: Hank Warner and Maureen Coleman

Land Planning Engineer for Planning Matters: BEL-Brent Lied, P.E.

Township Manager Karen Koncle

Visitor: Ken McCrea

CALL TO ORDER-7:30pm: Chairman Mackley called the Workshop Meeting to order at 7:30pm in the Conference Room of the Municipal Building.

ANNOUNCEMENT – EXECUTIVE SESSION: Chairman Mackley announced that during the Police Department discussions, the Board will go into Executive Session to discuss personnel matters. When concluded, the Chairman will reconvene the Workshop Meeting.

POLICE DEPARTMENT MATTERS-7:30PM: Police Chief Beever and the Board discussed department related matters.

A. MONTHLY REPORT: The Chief and Supervisors reviewed the monthly report.

VASCAR REPLACEMENT: Chief Beever noted the replacement of the cruiser vascar units were scheduled for replacement in 2007. However, with money saved on cruiser purchases and the age of the units making it difficult to get replacement parts, we are able to replace with the purchase of seven units from YIS with improved technology call V-Tech. YIS will also provide a buy-back option of the old units.

SALE OF FOUR OBSOLETE CRUISERS: The Chief asked for authorization to advertise for bids to sell three obsolete police cruisers with bid opening on 09/06/06 at 10am at the Township Building with potential contract award consideration by the Supervisors at the public meeting on 09/06/06 in the evening.

MOTION: Secretary Fortna made a motion to authorize the advertisement and bid opening as noted above. Chairman Mackley seconded the motion and asked for questions. There being no questions, the Supervisors voted unanimously to approve the motion.

PRISON POPULATION MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT: Chief Beever has been asked to represent the County Chiefs' Association on this Committee. The Supervisors so noted.

B. TRAFFIC STUDIES ON CERTAIN TOWNSHIP ROADS-SPEEDS ON CURVES, ETC: Secretary/Assistant Roadmaster Noelle Fortna asked the Chief for an Officer to perform speed limit studies with a member of the Highway Department on entire lengths of the following roads plus using the ball-bank-indicator for curves for appropriate signing: N. Muddy Creek Rd., Chestnut Hill Rd., Peiffer Hill Rd., Kramer Mill Rd. and, S. Muddy Creek Rd., plus any others from Roadmaster. Ms. Fortna asked to accompany in the Study Unit if scheduling will allow. Chief Beever will check with scheduling and arrange the studies.

C. ACCIDENT REPORTS: Discuss PD furnishing Roadmaster copies of accident reports for Roadmaster investigation of roadway/signage conditions. Chief will discuss the request with Officers and come up with a working arrangement for communication.

D. FEASIBILITY STUDY-NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Chief Beever and the Manager received initial forms. It was suggested a meeting be arranged with the Architects to discuss the methodology. Manager asked Chief Beever to advise on his schedule for such a meeting.

E. YOUTH AID PANEL: Insurance matters for assignees is under study with Insurance Agency.

F. GARDEN SPOT ROAD TRAFFIC SIGNAL REPAIR: The Contractor scheduled signal repairs on 07/26/06.

G. BIKE PATROL-STOP AT POOL-PR WORK FOR PATRONS: Chief Beever will check.

RECESS WORKSHOP MEETING AT 7:45PM, AND CONVENING OF AN EXECUTIVE STSSION FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING PERSONNEL MATTERS WITH POLICE CHIEF. WHEN EXECUTIVE SESSION IS ADJOURNED, THE WORKSHOP MEETING WILL BE RECONVENED: Chairman Mackley made the announcement and the Board went into Executive Session.

ADJOURNEMENT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:57PM AND RECONVENING OF THE WORKSHOP MEETING.

Chairman Mackley reported that at this time, there is no action to be taken on personnel matters.

TRANSPORTATION MATTERS: Township Transportation Engineer-HRG/Scott Russell, P.E. arrived and introduced two HRG Associates: Hank Warner and Maureen Coleman, also attending. Both are recently affiliated with HRG and will be working on East Cocalico matters. Township Land Planning Engineer-BEL/Brent Lied, P.E. also attended.

A. SALDO AMENDMENT-PAVING SPECIFICATIONS: Scott distributed draft copies of the proposed Amendment and it was noted that in accordance with the Solicitor's advice, the draft legislation was forwarded to Lancaster County and Township Planning Commissions. The Supervisors reviewed the proposed legislation with the Engineer.

Scott Russell explained one of the differences with this Amendment is the addition of geo-technical design requirements. In Section 502.11.5, the regulations will require soil testing under proposed roads which will have to meet certain standards or else suitable soil and materials will have to be imported for use. These requirements will assist in taking care of some of the problems facing the Township with road construction. PADOT requires this as well.

The Amendment requires pavement base drain with a reduction in local road pavement thickness by 1" of bituminous pavement.

The Amendment requires 6" depth stone subbase on the three classifications of roads: local, collector, arterial.

The Amendment includes ramped up weather limitations in Section 502.11.11.

Brent Lied explained another change was dealing with industrial and commercial private property improvements. Required design is based on anticipated traffic volume, soil conditions, vehicle loading, etc. It establishes a minimum standard and goes from there.

Additionally, the tie-in issue to existing pavement was clarified.

Also, backfill materials are required to be tamped in 6" lifts.

Copies of the proposed Amendment are available for review.

B. UNIT PRICE INFORMATION UPDATE: Scott Russell provided a copy of news article in 07/07/06 Lancaster New Era Newspaper. Scott noted the unit pricing is reaching the high end of estimates. We may be seeing project work scopes reduced due to the higher costs of materials. A comparison of prices this year prior to oil reaching \$80/barrell to two-years ago, indicates a 25% increase. Scott predicted a time period where there will be less bang for the buck in all areas of public works improvement projects. This situation could become a reality instead of a short term situation.

C. STONE HILL ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT: Scott Russell explained he sees this project as the first priority of the Township projects. Scott noted he updated the costs estimates based on the recent increase in fuel and material costs for the stormwater improvement portion of the project and for the Sunline Coach Co. contribution. It has increased from \$132,000.00 to \$150,000.00. It may be to everyone's best interest to use "actual time and materials" costs instead of a fixed fee based on the Engineer's estimate.

This idea should be determined in an agreement between the Township and the Property Owner. The Supervisors acknowledged the need for a Developer's Agreement. Scott also noted he has refigured the paving estimates with the awareness of the new pricing. \$280,633.00 is the estimated roadway improvement cost. This estimate is after a reduction in cartway width and using a recycling method to reclaim the roadway.

Scheduling of the phased approach for this estimated \$484,817.00 project is to do the stormwater improvements and widening as Phase I in 2006, and Phase II in 2007 which is the roadway work.

HRG is ready to finish the bidding documents, provide a developer's agreement, and advertise for bids. It is noted the Phase I work is well suited to Fall/Winter since there is no pavement restoration or concrete work. Also, it is the slower time for contractors which may result in favorable pricing. The Supervisors so noted.

D. KURTZ RD./272 INTERSECTION: Scott reminded that because of the Denver Road Bridge matter, the temporary signal for Kurtz Rd/SR 0272 Intersection is the second priority engineering project in the Township.

PADOT has received the temporary signal permit analysis and has it under review. After HRG gets PADOT comments, HRG recommends ECT authorize a scope of work and budget for design of the traffic signal/intersection improvements and to get permitting. This will then be in place to be ready for construction. You may want to construct and bag the signal so that you are ready for a bridge weight restriction and/or for bridge replacement. The signal may need to be operational until the funding of the bridge replacement is determined. The Supervisors so noted.

E. COL. HOWARD BLVD./PEPPERIDGE FARM BLVD. PROJECT: It was noted the Lancaster County Commissioners granted a construction completion extension to 12/31/07. This is the third priority project but must be completed by 12/31/07.

Scott reminded that the project budget was \$421,500.00 with the County paying about \$160,000 of that total, (38%). The original design would have been covered with this amount of budget. PADOT required changes to the original design necessitating changes to the budget.

PADOT requirements will require re-engineering which will drop the construction costs but with a lot less concrete work. Scott provided a drawing showing the Reamstown Road portion of the project remains unchanged. You will have restricted left turns from Reamstown Road. Most of the widening on the North side of Col. Howard Blvd. will be eliminated, and all improvements will be limited to the center bituminous section. About half of the concrete work has been eliminated. This will help the cost. Curb on the north side will be eliminated and existing bituminous shoulders will remain. The Pepperidge Farm (PF) left turn lane into PF will remain the same with a rebuilt median at the same location. The design will include the left turn lane into the future shopping center site with the elimination of the second left turn, and with options for the developer to make improvements as PADOT deems necessary. The left turn lane can be started near the 222 Bridge if needed. Shopping Center required improvements

will be confined to their side. PADOT prefers two turn lanes if one gets above 400' long. Signal poles will be set back far enough to allow for additional PADOT requirements of the developer as PADOT deems necessary. The rebuilt section of PADOT overlay project will be eliminated and we will put concrete barriers in place, and it won't go all the way to the ramps but stop with the PADOT repaved area for a tie-in. We've eliminated some of the drainage and don't need Erosion and Sedimentation Plan design/approval. The existing drainage will be maintained with minor changes. The changes should reduce the project costs by half. It may allow the County to go up from a 38% match to a 50% match since the over-all cost may be reduced by about \$100,000.00 or so. It was noted we will need to re-educate the County on the PADOT required revisions to get the County's consent and hopefully, the same dollar amount. Additionally, it was noted the Shopping Center development will be in line for off-site improvement contributions. The Engineer estimates the redesign work for the ten task areas will total approximately 264 hours additional work at an estimated cost of \$21,500.00. It was reiterated that the project design, permitting, and construction must be completed by 12/31/07.

C. RIDGE ROAD RAILROAD CROSSING-DETOUR: Penn Eastern Rail Lines Inc., (PERL) President John Nolan informs the reconstruction of the Ridge Rd. Crossing will require the road to be closed for approximately three days. John must prepare a detour route for PADOT and must notify the Township if Township roads are used. John inquired of the Township about possible suggestions. This information was discussed with the Roadmaster and it was determined Miller Road is not a good alternative.

Chairman Mackley offered that PADOT will be replacing the bridge later and has designated Reinholds Road as the detour route with a tie-back to Denver on Monroe St. and go out Hickory Lane to Brunners Grove Road or Mechanic Street to SR 0897. The bridge replacement is expected to close Ridge Rd. from March to October.

If Penn Eastern uses this route, PERL would need coordination with Denver Borough and possibly West Cocalico Township.

The Supervisors acknowledged that PERL may use Reinholds Rd. and possible Brunners Grove Rd. If other Township Roads are used, then the Supervisors will need to review and acknowledge prior to placing the detour into operation. Contact will be made by phone and letter with John Nolan, PERL.

D. TRAFFIC SIGNAL SPECIFICATIONS UPDATE: The existing Township traffic signal specifications were adopted in 1999. HRG will update specifications to include generation hook-ups and updated technology.

E. DRIVEWAY/STREET OPENING PERMIT ORDINANCE: Brent Lied/BEL is in process with assistance from HRG. Brent will have a draft for review by the Solicitor and Scott within a month.

F. ORDINANCE REFERENCES TO PADOT SPECIFICATIONS: Scott noted that using PADOT references eliminates the need to update local ordinances.

G. OTHER MINOR ITEMS:

1. LINE ROAD DEVELOPMENT/STEVENS COURT TRAFFIC STUDY:  
This development is located in West Cocalico Township and abuts East Cocalico Township. It will be served by East Cocalico Township Authority with public water and sanitary sewer. The developers were asked to submit a traffic study to both municipalities. Both Township Traffic Engineers independently concluded there are no traffic improvements warranted for the proposed residential development. It was noted the initial density was drastically reduced and the commercial use was eliminated. The Supervisors so noted.

HRG/Hank Warner and Maureen Coleman left the Workshop Meeting.

LAND PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS: BEL-Brent Lied

A. ZONING MATTERS:

1. AUTO SALES ZONING AMENDMENT: The Zoning Officer is conferring with the Solicitor to incorporate the clarifications gleaned from the last discussions with the Supervisors.

2. KITTLER HEARING-08/02/06: The Hearing is being continued as noted.

3. OTHER ZONING MATTERS: Draft letter to Sara Thrift Shop was approved by Board.

4. INGRAM POWDER COATING – ZONING ISSUE: The Supervisors request the Zoning Officer to research the number of businesses being conducted at this address.

5. PMHA CHANGES: Secretary Fortna will forward to the Zoning Officer and Inspector the changes to the State Manufactured Housing Regulations.

6. DOG ORDINANCE: The Supervisors had a draft ordinance under study to contain dogs, etc.

MOTION: Chairman Mackley made a motion to authorize the Solicitor to advertise the most recent draft of the Dog Ordinance for adoption. Secretary Fortna seconded the motion. Chairman Mackley asked for questions. There being none, the Board unanimously approved the motion.

B. PLANNING MATTERS: Township Land Planning Engineer and Transportation Engineer reviewed the following with the Board:

1. VILLAGE OF EAST COCALICO/PROPOSED ROADWAY LINK TO SOUTH MUDDY CREEK RD AND ASSOCIATED DESIGN ISSUES-WAIVERS,HOP ACKNOWLEDGEMENT LETTER, ETC.: Location was noted and that the plan is at the preliminary stage. Access is an issue. The second access would be onto S. Muddy Creek Rd. from a strip of land adjacent to Quail Hollow Development and this proposed development which PADOT owns, and which would eventually link into the adjacent Fox Brooke Development to provide the second through access route. The Developer prepared the Highway Occupancy Permit Plan and asks the Township for an acknowledge letter to PADOT. The strip of land, which the proposed road crosses, is owned by PADOT and is not part of the 222 right-of-way, it is a stand-alone piece. This is a unique situation. Usually, the strip of land would be in private ownership. The Engineers discussed with the Board design features of the road, width, may require some retaining walls (boulder) to transition grade, what will the ownership be after construction, is it dedicated to the Township or will PADOT be involved? Scott Russell noted PADOT's Central Office and Legal Counsel have been discussing this unique situation. The PADOT strip of land has a purpose to service the PADOT drainage system at the other end, a major culvert pipe that goes under Route 222. If PADOT relinquishes ownership, there are legal issues: who will be responsible to maintain the PADOT drainage system, how will they do the legal transfer from PADOT to the Township when a developer is involved and Developer will have to assume temporary ownership to do the transfer, or a direct transfer from PADOT to Township and what happens if developer pulls out? There are numerous concerns. The Developer is requesting assistance with the HOP. There was discussion about Township risk relative to the various options. The current design of the roadway is 26' wide with no parking on either side, curbing will be required. The Supervisors agreed that the Transportation Engineer will send an acknowledgement letter and list the concerns with an option to further review and furnish comments following the receipt of the PADOT comments.

2. HEATHERWOODS DEVELOPMENT, PHASE 1-B-GRADING AND ADJUSTMENTS TO PREVIOUS RETAINING WALL, AND STREET PAVING AND CURBING DEFICIENCIES, AND STATUS OF FINANCIAL SECURITY: Brent Lied noted a solution for the boulder wall and elimination of the need for guiderail is in place, and encouraged the Supervisors to look at the re-worked construction. Brent also asked the Supervisors to note the paving deficiencies in Phase 2 with dips in the road, etc. HRG informed the developers of the road deficiencies and directed them not to go forward. The developer proceeded anyway and issues will need to be resolved at a later date. Letter of Credit versus bond was discussed. The Township wants to retain a letter of credit rather than a bond because of these outstanding issues. The Supervisors agreed. The 07/13/06 letter from Township Solicitor advised the Developers accordingly.

4. MITCHELL TRACT-WAIVERS ASSOCIATED WITH ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS/WIDENING AND IMPROVED GRADING OF ROADSIDE SWALES IN LIEU OF WIDENING, REMOVAL OF TREES WITHIN R-O-W ALONG BRUNNERS GROVE ROAD, SIZE/CONDITION OF EXISTING STORMWATER CULVERT UNDER DOGWOOD DRIVE, PARK AND RECREATION CALCULATION FOR FEE IN LIEU OF LAND DEDICATION: Brent provided pictures and plans for discussion with the Board.

WIDENING: The Township could require road widening. The tract across the street was not required to widen. It may not be in the best interest of the Township to require the widening, but it is important to require drainage and have the developer provide swales and grading for improved drainage prior to construction. The Supervisors concurred with the recommendation to waive widening as discussed and the Engineer will discuss the consensus with the Planning Commission.

TREES: There is also the engineering recommendation for removal of trees within the existing right-of-way (16.5' from centerline), and to accommodate the drainage swale. A tree removal plan was reviewed. Liability issues were discussed and some of the trees are dead. MOTION: On a motion by Chairman Mackley, seconded by Secretary Fortna, and there being no questions, the Board unanimously approved the motion per the recommendation to require the removal of trees within the 16.5' from the centerline of the road right-of-way.

IMPROVED DRAINAGE SWALES ALONG DOGWOOD DRIVE AND BRUNNERS GROVE ROAD: Ask the Developer to grade defined swales along Dogwood Drive and Brunners Grove Road, and at the corner of Dogwood Drive and Brunners Grove Road at the hump, to turn the swale taking the drainage back through the site and into the proposed drainage basin to eliminate the flow across the intersection.

SIZE/CONDITION OF EXISTING STORMWATER CULVERT UNDER DOGWOOD DRIVE: Discussion was held concerning existing conditions and the impact from the proposed development. MOTION: On a motion by Chairman Mackley, seconded by Secretary Fortna, and there being no questions, the Supervisors unanimously approved the motion for the consideration of relief of the widening, providing the applicant provides defined roadside swales along Brunners Grove Road and Dogwood Drive, and makes a contribution toward the future replacement of the downstream pipe under Dogwood Drive.

PARK AND RECREATION FEE IN LIEU OF LAND: The Developer is asking for consideration of the recent auction sale value in 08/05 of the parcel for the calculation. The requirement was reviewed for the fee in lieu of land dedication. The amount offered is \$2,307.16 for the 6,000 sq. ft. required in place of land. The Supervisors decided to take this matter under study and tabled making a decision at this time.

SEWER MODULE RESOLUTION: Brent noted that the sewer module submittal was reviewed by DEP and two comments were received. Recommend the Board authorize the Township Manager to sign the amended module upon recommended approval by the Township Land Planning Engineer.

MOTION: Secretary Fortna made the motion, seconded by Vice Chairman Fry, and

there being no questions, the Supervisors unanimously approved the recommended motion as noted above.

4. MARTIN/HOLLINGER TRACT-WETLAND ISSUE: Brent updated the Board about a comment received regarding the delineation of the wetlands. The applicant will have their consultant respond and provide permit exemption information for the driveway from the Lancaster Conservation District and/or DEP. The lot configuration was reviewed. A general question was raised about the Martin Farmer getting cows across to the pasture.

5. FOX BROOKE DEVELOPMENT MATTERS AND STREET NAMES: Brent advised that a technical review meeting with the developer and staff was held today.

STREET NAMES were discussed and changes are welcome. Fox Brooke would have two accesses by itself.

THE LINKING ROAD to Village of East Cocalico is not shown as being constructed by the Fox Brooke Developer on the most recent plan. It is conceptually shown where it would be located but the developer surfaced concerns about permitting issues. Staff reviewed the various situations that exist regarding the interconnection of the various adjacent developments and that the Township is encouraging the Developer to go forward in getting the permitting needed for construction of the link as part of the Fox Brooke Development.

WIDTH OF INTERNAL ROADS in select areas of the development was discussed with the developer and the potential reduction in width to 28-32' instead of requiring the 36' widths. The merits of the width reduction were discussed: traffic calming, less cost to the Township to maintain/reconstruct in the future, environmental benefits, less run-off problems and greater porosity for stormwater infiltration.

SIDEWALKS are shown on both sides of all streets. There are areas along the open space that may lend itself to creating a macadem path to provide a link but eliminate the extensive sidewalk that doesn't have homes fronting on it for over 1,000'. This would provide a nicer trail through some of the large open space around the pond and with less run-off. The Supervisors concurred on the elimination of sidewalk where appropriate, and the placement of a macadam trail around and through the open space to provide a logical pedestrian network link with required sidewalks.

DEDICATED RECREATION AREA location was discussed on Road Tour and mentioned again. Brent noted that another meeting between the Developer and Township Recreation Board and Planning Commission Representatives and Staff is in the offing. Location for such facilities will be a focal point of these discussions. The Developer is asking to be permitted to provide fee in lieu of, for a small portion of the required land area amounting to 1.2-1.6 acres. Other items for this meeting's discussions are: what grading will be required for the dedicated rec area, what is the design of the park, what will the developer commit to construct in the park area. If you accept the fee in lieu of a small portion of land, then we can encourage more for the features such as: grading, utilities, parking lot, etc.

6. RIDGE ROAD TRACT DEVELOPMENT: A letter was issued to the landowner who will be accepting stormwater in the meadow area which will be coming from the stormwater improvements required of this development. We also have a meeting scheduled with the Penn Eastern Rail Lines President John Nolan and the Developers to address stormwater run-off concerns from the detention basin into the railroad right-of-way. Also, the recreation issue of determining an acceptable fee in-lieu-of land dedication will be coming up. The sewer module is before DEP at the Harrisburg level.

7. LOCKER ROOM MINI STORAGE- RETAINING WALL AND POROUS PAVEMENT:

RETENTION WALL: Brent advised there are two small retaining walls and both are already in place. As you drive down the access drive, one is to your left and another further down. Ideally you would have a plan showing a detail design submitted for approval followed by construction per design. These are not extensive but are 4-6' high. They were constructed without prior approvals. The question is, how to deal with them now. They are private features on private property. Failure would not directly impact public infrastructure in any way. Engineers recommend the developer submit a professional engineer's opinion of the walls' stability as constructed. Then we can respond that the Township will not perform a detailed structural review, but instead, will count on the applicant's professional engineer's certification as an appropriate assurance that the walls are safe. We would recommend a hold harmless agreement with the developer to manage the Township's liability. The Supervisors concurred.

POROUS PAVEMENT: The Developer used porous pavement in the first half of the project and now is requesting to use porous pavement in the second half of the project. The Transportation Engineer will provide the EPA Federal Guidelines for porous pavement maintenance and management. How rigid does the Township want to be in enforcing the maintenance of porous pavement? Proper delineation of the porous pavement and required EPA maintenance of the pavement is essential to insure it remains effective. Annual inspections would be necessary. Policy development is appropriate. Porous pavement will become more common and likely be here for a long time. Porous pavement will be used more in the future and it should be. There also needs to be consistency with other factors as well. A form document for recording is encouraged. The Engineers will take this matter under study with the Solicitor and provide the Supervisors a recommendation.

8. ECTA WATER BOOSTER STATION #1 FINANCIAL SECURITY, IGA AND STORMWATER MAINTENANCE

AGREEMENT: Financial Security, etc. for this plan was discussed.

MOTION: On a motion by Vice Chairman Fry, seconded by Secretary Fortna, and no questions, the Supervisors unanimously approved the motion to grant a waiver to Section 402 and Section 303.6.11 of the Subdivision/Land Development Ordinance (SALDO) related to financial security for the East Cocalico Township Authority (ECTA) Booster Station #1 Subdivision/Land Development Plan.

MOTION: On a motion by Secretary Fortna, seconded by Vice Chairman Fry, and with no questions, the Supervisors unanimously granted a waiver of Section 303.6.13 of the SALDO related to the Memorandum of Understanding/Improvement Guarantee Agreement for the ECTA Booster Station #1 Plan.

MOTION: On a motion by Vice Chairman Fry, seconded by Chairman Mackley, and with no questions, the Supervisors unanimously granted a waiver to Section 303.4 of the Stormwater Ordinance regarding the requirement for a stormwater maintenance agreement.

9. WICU SECTIONS 5 AND 7A: Brent explained that there were building additions on approved plans that were not constructed and aren't shown on the As-Built Plans. A request for clarifications has been sent to the applicant and the applicant's engineer. Does the developer plan to abandon certain improvements and if so, how do we proceed to document these items? We also need to make sure that those things not constructed were not required for improvements that were constructed. For example, a storm water basin and sidewalk may be required for existing improvements that were constructed. A letter of credit reduction will be processed following the receipt of the clarifications. These plans are a number of years old and need to be finalized. The plans were approved under the former Ordinance. The Solicitor will need to be involved. There is the potential for a future phase which will be under the new Ordinance.

TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER SCOTT RUSSELL LEFT THE MEETING.

10. TATE – STORMWATER EXEMPTION FROM THE STORMWATER ORDINANCE: Brent explained the location on Vera Cruz Road. Detailed information was submitted by the applicant's consultant to support the exemption request for the building of a new house. The Ordinance criteria for an exemption was reviewed with the Board. It was expressed that a holistic review is important and that fairness is necessary. A meeting was held on site and voluntary stormwater efforts are being incorporated as discussed. The Engineer recommended approving the stormwater exemption based on the voluntary measures agreed to by the owner in writing/letter (stone pits for the roof drains, creating a berm in the area of the former timber clearing to function as an infiltration area, and maintain counter slope on some of the drive. The Supervisors concurred and noted this is a case-by-case evaluation.

11. FLETCHER MATTER-MEETING: Secretary Fortna noted there was an in-field meeting. Mr. Fletcher was made aware of taking on stormwater management for the entire development would be a monumental expense, and we can't take that on. BEL/Cory Rathman aptly assisted with explaining the existing conditions. There was a concern expressed by Mr. Fletcher about stones/gravel coming from the neighboring property during run-off events. The file is being reviewed. Pictures were reviewed. The existing situation has been reviewed with property owners numerous times in the past. This is a private issue between neighbors. A letter from the Engineer is requested to be sent to Mr. Fletcher clarifying the Township position with a copy of a letter to his

neighbor at 10 Edie Drive if previously written.

12. STORMWATER MATTERS:

a. 30 AND 40 POPLAR DRIVE: Brent reported we had an in-field inspection and there are no simple solutions. Drainage is coming down 897 onto Poplar Drive. There is erosion along the bank and the swale silts in with run-off, putting debris on the roadway. Even on a dry day and several days later, there is a continual seep and the adjoining property owners have a perception this is caused by the East Cocalico Township Authority's sewer project. The question is whether the sewer extension which was constructed with several clay dykes could be serving as a conduit for the stormwater seep. There is the possibility for considering under-drain installation and outlet through easements to the stream. How extensive will this become? There is very little slope along the road. It is very flat. There are no easy solutions. There was an expression from the uphill property owner suggesting his cooperation for a mutually beneficial solution. This matter is being taken under study.

b. CORNER OF 897/BRUNNERS GROVE RD: This matter is under study with the Conservation District, and with the Township Engineer and Roadmaster. There is a culvert under Martin Drive and concerns have been expressed by an adjoining property owner.

c. KRAMER MILL ROAD/SHARP AVENUE: The Habeckers will be sent a letter from the Township Engineer listing the efforts underway.

d. MUDDY CREEK ROAD –BURKHOLDER: The initial attempt for cooperative efforts were not accepted by the developer but we will try another approach for working together.

13. ANY OTHER LAND PLANNING MATTERS:

a. WOODY WASTE SITE DISCUSSIONS: Concern was voiced regarding the engineering of the site at the current location when we take into consideration the property/building needs assessment survey. This will take 5 acres out of 8 acres. Is this where we really want the facility to be permitted?

Brent suggested that Cory identify the extent of cost involved to bring the activity into compliance with Act 101 before we proceed. The Board concurred.

b. REAMSTOWN MEMORIAL PARK WALKING PATH PLAN REVIEW: Brent reported that BEL/Cory Rathman will meet with Ken McCrea to discuss the plans. Stormwater management will need to be reviewed. We need to be consistent with meeting the regulations. There are options to meet the requirements.

c. MORGANSHIRE HOP:FOR ACCESS OFF 897/D & E SUBSTATION: PADOT has approved the HOP. The D & E Substation easement document does include a reference to the 12' access. It is a matter between the property owner and D & E.

d. OLD HOMESTEAD RESIDENT-SINKHOLES ON COWPATH: The Roadmaster will inspect.

e. E & J DEVELOPMENT: Ken McCrea noted the developer will be required to meet stormwater requirements. Mr. McCrea noted they need to look at what happens downstream flooding. Mr. McCrea is beginning a project to get a significant amount of actual storm data on flow through the stream which can be used to evaluate what's going on. Mr. McCrea noted that in the response letter he got about the basin, there was clearly information that said that the models they are using don't work at all because they said based on the amount of rain, the park shouldn't have flooded. Well guess what, it did, so therefore, there is a model problem and their evaluation about what's going on doesn't match with the real world. Mr. McCrea said, "I am just providing them some actual real world data on what actually happens in a storm." Who is them? Them was clarified as BEL, the Township Engineer, who could then pass the information along to the developers' engineers who are designing the stormwater basin in the subdivision. "The set up in on my back porch since I (Mr. McCrea) lives in the middle of the drainage basin for this thing." Mr. McCrea explained his project set up. Staff gauges were installed, one near the entrance of the pipe under the Reamstown Park Ball Field and one in the Ridgeview Stormwater Management Basin, that are going to be video taped during storms so we have exact rainfall data and water level data at the pipe under the ball field, and if water shows up in the basin. The basin being discussed now is the basin in Ridgeview Estates, right above the Park that's next to and discharges in the stream. Water goes through the basin because there is no restrictive outlet control structure. It has an 18" diameter horizontal pipe and that is the only outflow control, and it is basically there but doesn't do anything.

Brent noted one suggestion was, can a modification be made to the Ridgeview Estates Basin to try to retrofit it to help solve some of the flooding problems. BEL discussed the pros and cons with that and who would have to be involved and how involved would this property owner have to be.

Ken McCrea noted he spoke with the property owner and he is cooperating with me on this data gathering. He let me put this staff gauge in his back yard and enter onto it. I discussed with him the possibility that if it turns out that it might be useful modifying it (the Ridgeview Basin) so that it detains more water, he didn't have any problem with that.

Brent noted that only highlights one potential issue. If the basin is modified in any way and results in more water being stored there, it may be a bigger maintenance issue for him and that's why that property owner would have to authorize that type of improvement. Clearly there are things that could be done up-site. You could install infiltration chambers.

Mr. McCrea stated the intent was that if what you are doing in this basin is simply adding an outlet riser pipe that controls the flow out of it better than the 18" horizontal pipe, that is a fairly inexpensive fix. Infiltration beds, that's another story. That's expensive and we are not proposing that anything like that be done.

The question was raised who would do this work and pay the costs? This is private property. The Township has no ownership. This would be the private property owner that would have to bear the expense and do the installation. No upstream consequences to any upstream property owners has been considered.

Brent noted that you have to be careful when you modify a basin, that yes you can hold back or retain more water, but you have to make sure that then depending on the particular type of storm event that occurs following that, that you don't actually aggravate the situation. You could potential get a larger peak flow rate now because the basin capacity is eaten up because you wanted to hold back that smaller storm event, now you've got the big event, and there's no available capacity so it's going out over the spillway. So there are things you have to be careful about. You could possible eliminate some of the smaller nuisance flooding, but you could set yourself up that if you got the perfect storm, that you would actually get impacted much harder than you would have with the current situation. Those type of discussions have to come into play.

Mr. McCrea stated that is the whole point, is figuring out exactly what's going on there in terms of the timing. In this storm, which is very tiny and doesn't mean too much, but the flow peaked and went back almost to base line in the basin in Ridgeview before any of the water from East Cocalico Heights showed up down there. There is a different pipe coming out of there. The water coming from Ridgeview is clear. The water from East Cocalico Heights looks like someone was driving a tractor through the stream, it is completely opaque. This storm was July 12, 2006. Mr. McCrea noted he caught the storm on the 27<sup>th</sup>. What came out of that was, it flooded out over the ball field. The total amount of rain was less than an inch, which is a little scary. It is more a factor of instantaneous rainfall intensity than it is storm total. If this holds for future storms, the time difference between peak rainfall and peak stream discharge at the park, is only 20 to 25 minutes. Whatever happens, happens very quickly. The only storms that are going to impact the flooding are storms that dump a lot of rain in a half hour. It can rain at the rate of 1/2" an hour indefinitely and it will never flood. It needs to get over about 2" an hour before the stream starts coming up radically. Hopefully, in another month, we will have good data. It is informative.

Brent noted that it isn't that nothing can be done. There needs to be careful consideration, and people need to realize what's happening and realize the difficulty in doing things like this, and insuring other people cooperate and authorize the alterations, and all those type of things.

Mr. McCrea stated he is familiar with this. He noted he worked for an engineering firm for three years and he is very familiar with stormwater management stuff. For the time being, is antidotal information cause I don't have real data to go with it, but there was a storm about a month before this that I was out early in the morning watching what was going on, and in that storm the basin in Ridgeview did actually detain some water. It got up to about 2' deep in the basin which is still just a little bit in the middle. The peak

retention in the basin and peak flow coming out of it unfortunately seemed to correspond with the peak flow from the stream upstream suggesting there are two options that might actually help flooding: (1) is putting a control structure which delays it, and (2) remove the control structure so that the water goes out of there before the main peak of the flood comes through from upstream. That could also theoretically reduce the flooding at the Park but that wouldn't necessarily be too good for downstream. It's a complicated situation.

Chairman Mackley noted that the control factor downstream is the 48" pipe under the ball field.

Mr. McCrea agreed and noted that the pipe will have to be replaced because there are sections that are starting to go. So probably within the next 5 years the pipe is going to be replaced.

Brent noted that as was previously said, one option for improving the condition at the one location may worsen the condition at your next study point downstream.

Mr. Mackley also noted the bridge structure further downstream.

Mr. McCrea noted the structure is 20 times as great.

Brent noted you are collecting additional flow from other areas, the school, etc.

Mr. McCrea will email the walking path information to the Township.

The Township Land Planning Engineer left the meeting.

ON –LOT SEWAGE MATTERS: Nothing additional at this time.

EAST COCALICO TOWNSHIP AUTHORITY MATTERS: None

SOLICITOR:

- A. KITTLER HEARING-08/02/06: So noted.
- B. COCALICO COMMONS ZONING TEXT & MAP HEARING-08/16/06: So noted.
- C. DRAFT SIDEWALK SNOW REMOVAL ORDINANCE: The Solicitor will advertise the Ordinance for Board action at a future meeting.
- D. CODIFICATION: This process is ongoing.
- E. CRIMINAL COMPLAINT-SEWAGE VIOLATIONS: In process.

07/20/06-ECTS WORKSHOP MEETING

PAGE 16

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

A. CHAIRMAN:

1. RECREATION:

a.. REGIONAL PARKLAND/REC CENTER: The last meeting was cancelled. Mr. Mackley reported the Needs Assessment is on going. An August Meeting is expected.

b. GRANT APPLICATION: This item was tabled for tonight.

2. TOWNSHIP BUILDING – TOWNSHIP/ECTA NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Need clarification via a meeting.

3. COCALICO LEADERS MEETING AT ADAMSTOWN BOROUGH HALL ON 07/25/06 AT 7PM: Supervisor Fry and Treasurer Schwartz will attend.

B. VICE CHAIRMAN: Nothing additional at this time.

C. SECRETARY:

1. HWY DEPT STAFF MEETING-07/19/06: Secretary Fortna noted the Highway Department Staff Meeting was held at noon today. Minutes will be forthcoming.

2. CONTRACTED MOWING FOR 1975 N. READING RD.: The Roadmaster will acquire a quote from the contractor.

3. MGS NOTIFICATION: If their permit needs to be renewed or if their operation is expanding relative to the permit, the business must notify the local government unit of such correspondence with DEP. The information is copied to all officials for input within 30 days. Comments get forwarded to DEP.

TOWNSHIP MANAGER: Nothing further at this time.

LONG RANGE PLANNING: None, now.

PENDING ITEMS: Nothing further at this time.

COMPLAINTS/CONCERNS/QUESTIONS NOT ALREADY ADDRESSED: None.

ANY OTHER ITEMS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD: Mr. Schwartz asked about ordering knox boxes for the Township Building and for the building at 1975 N. Reading Rd. MOTION: Vice Chairman Fry made a motion to authorize the purchase and installation of both Knox Boxes as recommended. Chairman Mackley seconded the motion and there were no questions. The Supervisors unanimously approved the motion.

ADJOURN: On a motion by Secretary Fortna and seconded by Vice Chairman Fry, the Supervisors unanimously agreed to adjourn at 11:31 p.m.