

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Mark Stevenson called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. Other Supervisors present were Andy Merritt, Todd Kirsten, Barb Spencer and Ben Pisoni. Staff present were: Susan Steele, Township Manager; Amy Smith, Township Clerk; D.J. Liggett, CRPA; Trish Meek CRPA; Tom Zilla, CRPA; Greg Kauch, CATA Transit Planner; Don Franson, Township Engineer; Scott Brown, Roadmaster; Kathleen Yurchak, Township Solicitor; Bob Eberhart, OSPB; Ron Hoover, OSPB. Audience in attendance: Hugh Mose, CATA; Kimberly Fragola, CATA; Matt Kanepp, PennDot and Fred Henry, Mease Associates, Inc.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**

There were no citizen's comments.

4. **MINUTES**

• ***MOTION: Mr. Kirsten moved to approve the minutes of March 14th, 2013; Ms. Spencer seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried.***

5. **PRESENTATION BY TOWNSHIP ENGINEER, CCMPO AND PENNDOT RE: SUPERVISORS REQUEST FOR POSSIBLE WIDENING OF SHOULDER WIDTHS OF TOWNSHIP COLLECTOR ROADS (LOVEVILLE, MARENGO AND SMITH) FOR PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE TRAFFIC**

Mr. Franson provided a power point presentation. Mr. Franson stated he compiled information for the possible widening of shoulder widths along Loveville Road, Marengo Road and Smith Road. Mr. Franson stated all together these roads comprise 6 total miles. Mr. Pisoni questioned whether Mr. Franson knew what the populations were along each road. Mr. Franson stated he did not know the populations. Mr. Franson introduced Mr. Kanepp from PennDot.

Mr. Franson commented there were many obstacles to deal with along these roads such as utility poles, steep banks, trees, a fence, electric fence and a guiderail.

Mr. Franson stated, Option 1, an offroad sidewalk would need to be 5 feet wide and a shared use path would need to be 10 feet wide, there would be ADA requirements, a right of way would be required and would not be eligible for liquid fuels. Mr. Franson reviewed the vehicle code and commented that if there is a sidewalk it is mandatory to use it and the right of way is in the vehicles favor. Mr. Franson commented there would also be landscaping obstacles.

Mr. Franson shared some examples of what a sidewalk and shared use path may look like in illustration slides along with berming widths and swales. In some instances some areas would have to be cut and filled which gets expensive. Mr. Franson reviewed the pros and cons of sidewalks/shared use paths.

Mr. Franson reviewed the Options 2 and 3 of 4' or 2' paved or gravel shoulders and the pros and cons. Mr. Pisoni questioned whether there had to be a 20 foot cart-way with a 4' paved or gravel berm to stripe. Mr. Franson commented you cannot stripe at 18 feet, the minimum width to strip was 20 feet. Mr. Pisoni questioned why you could not. Mr. Kanepp stated it was under Federal Highway Administration regulations. Ms. Meek stated it was a minimum standard. Mr. Franson explained that if there are center lines the edge line pushes traffic in towards the center and makes the road appear smaller.

Mr. Franson reviewed 2' paved or gravel berm pros and cons. Mr. Franson commented that right now the township should have 2' gravel shoulders but they are not stoned a full depth. Ms. Spencer questioned whether both sides had to be done. Mr. Stevenson questioned whether any expenses could be paid for by liquid fuels monies. Mr. Franson stated option two or three could be covered by liquid fuels monies. These options would include the 4' foot paved or gravel shoulder or the 2' paved or gravel shoulders.

Mr. Franson reviewed sidewalk cost estimates. Mr. Franson explained that these cost estimates differs due to the number of obstacles on each road. Mr. Franson stated these estimates take into account for cut, fill, moving mailboxes and ADA tie ins. Sidewalk costs: Loveville Road - \$495,000; Smith Road - \$695,000 and Marengo Road - \$770,000. Mr. Franson commented that sidewalks are typically the responsibility of the adjoining property owner.

Mr. Franson reviewed the shared use path cost estimates. Mr. Franson commented that if there is utility involvement it can get expensive. Shared use path costs: Loveville Road - \$810,000; Smith Road - \$1,110,000 and Marengo Road - \$1,265,000.

Mr. Franson reviewed the 4' shoulder cost estimates. Mr. Merritt questioned how long a gravel shoulder lasts compared to a paved shoulder. 4' shoulder costs estimate: Loveville Road - \$630,000; Smith Road - \$850,000 and Marengo Road - \$955,000.

Mr. Franson reviewed 2' shoulder cost estimates. 2' shoulder cost estimates: Loveville Road – (gravel - \$125,000) – (paved - \$300,000); Smith Road – (gravel - \$165,000) – (paved – \$385,000); Marengo Road – (gravel – \$185,000) – (paved - \$425,000).

Mr. Franson reviewed the construction costs of all options. Ms. Steele questioned whether the 2' gravel berm is adding any width to the present roads. Mr. Franson said it did not, except if a two feet paved shoulder was added, there would need to be a one foot gravel shoulder infill.

Mr. Franson reviewed maintenance costs. Mr. Franson commented that every 15 years the Board would need to re-pave the shoulders and re-prime the gravel shoulders every year. Ms. Spencer stated that Smith Road has the most activity. Mr. Franson stated that Smith Road has the most connecting roads. Mr. Merritt commented he would prefer paving to gravel. Mr. Brown commented that if there were a 4' gravel shoulder pedestrians would still use the roads.

Ms. Steele questioned whether a 2' paved shoulder would be eligible for liquid fuels. Mr. Kanep stated it would be eligible.

Mr. Pisoni questioned whether if you had an 18' cartway with a 2' shoulder would you stripe? Mr. Franson stated you would stripe because you would have an additional one foot gravel shoulder past the paved berm.

Ms. Spencer suggested placing a 2' shoulder along Smith Road from Lutz Lane to the intersection of Smith and Marengo Road. Ms. Liggett commented she sees pedestrians walking from Lutz to State Route 550.

Mr. Pisoni questioned how often Smith Road was paved. Mr. Franson stated he uses a ten year plan that averages the life of a road. Mr. Brown stated that he is already using liquid fuels monies just trying to keep up with the paving so there is not much liquid fuels monies to spare. Ms. Spencer stated she was not sure what the point of this conversation was if the Township already was constructing a 2' foot berm on its roadways. Mr. Franson commented that they are looking at something that one could ride a bicycle on versus what is there now.

Mr. Franson reviewed asphalt increases from 1999-2012. There was discussion on the components of asphalt, costs and prevailing wages. Mr. Franson commented that liquid fuels monies are decreasing. There was discussion on the maintenance costs and what that would include.

Mr. Kirsten commented that he did not see how the township could afford to do any of these projects. Mr. Stevenson stated there would still be maintenance including re-painting. Mr. Stevenson stated this presentation helped fill in the uncertainties. There was discussion on how much money is spent on paving each year. Ms. Steele stated the Township receives around \$79,000 a year in liquid fuels monies. Of this \$79,000, around \$20,000 is used for snow removal and related activities. Then another \$10,000 a year is used for berming, line painting and other annual maintenance costs, which leaves around \$49,000 a year towards road construction costs. Ms. Steele and Mr. Brown reminded the Board that there are no paving projects this year. Ms. Steele commented that presently the repaving of Smith Road is split up now into one segment for three years, so if the supervisors wished to add paved berming to the costs, then Smith Road would need to be split it up even more.

Mr. Franson thanked Ms. Meek for her assistance with the power point.

Mr. Zilla commented that the General Assembly will soon be discussing transportation legislation. Mr. Zilla stated they are trying to bring additional revenues in fuel taxes and increase the amount coming back to the municipalities. Mr. Zilla commented that the State and Federal gas taxes have stayed the same since 1997. Mr. Stevenson requested Mr. Zilla send the Board this information. Mr. Zilla commented there is a link on the PennDot website and he would forward to Ms. Steele for transmittal to the supervisors.

6. PRESENTATION BY CATA SERVICES BY CATA AND CCMPO REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Mose introduced Ms. Fragola and Mr. Kauch to the Board. Mr. Mose commented that CATA offers three different services; CATA Bus – 7.1 million riders per year; CATARIDE - 35,000 riders per year and CATA Commute – car pool matching. Mr. Mose explained that CATARIDE is for Seniors over 65 years old and persons with disabilities.

Ms. Fragola reviewed the CATA budget and commented that CATA has a 14 million dollar budget. Ms. Fragola explained that the budget is based on contributions from Federal, State and Local government contributions. Ms. Fragola stated the Federal Government provides \$2 million and the State provides \$3 ½ million. The rest of the contributions are from local government funding and ridership. Ms. Fragola stated there will be service changes this year which will expand service within the State College Borough. Ms. Fragola stated CATA is requesting a 5% increase which will increase Halfmoon Township's contribution by \$300.00.

Mr. Kauch provided a power point and stated there were 6,918,104 riders in 2012. Mr. Kauch stated there were 3,719,978 riders on the campus routes and 3,198,126 on the community routes. Mr. Kauch reviewed the number of buses CATA has and stated there are 66 buses. Mr. Kauch explained the number of years for the useful life of a bus and reviewed the life of the buses in use. Mr. Kauch stated CATA is planning to purchase 4 new buses per year on average that cost \$450,000 each. Mr. Kauch commented that Halfmoon Township has 2,300 riders per year which on a month basis works out to 9/10 riders per day. Mr. Mose stated he looked into the costs for additional weekend service which would be \$900.00 for one trip in the morning and one in the afternoon. Mr. Mose stated it is difficult to recommend extending weekend service due to future demands of service. Mr. Mose stated none of the stops are utilized to the level to justify shelters but CATA may be able to work with the Township. Mr. Kauch reviewed the CATA ride numbers and stated there are 19 registered Halfmoon Township

residents but only 4 out of the 19 use the service. Mr. Stevenson questioned whether if there was an increase in CATAshare rides would the Township contribution increase. Mr. Mose said it would.

Mr. Kirsten requested Mr. Mose explain the limitation on CATARIDE. Mr. Mose stated CATARIDE riders have to be within three quarters of a mile in any direction from a CATABUS route.

7. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE MOTION TO APPROVE THE SEWAGE PLANNING MODULE FOR KRISTIE AND RICHARD WEISS SUBDIVISION

Ms. Steele stated staff recommends approval of the sewage planning module for Kristie and Richard Weiss Subdivision. Ms. Liggett provided a subdivision map and stated this subdivision is off of Beckwith Road. It is a two lot subdivision. Mr. Kirsten questioned what method is being used to address long term use of the absorption fields. Ms. Liggett stated there are marginal soils for the septic but there is a primary and secondary area and with mandatory pumping which addresses this concern. Mr. Stevenson questioned whether this will require a sand mound. Ms. Liggett stated she thought that it was suitable for a conventional system.

• ***MOTION: Mr. Kirsten moved to approve the Sewage Planning Module for Kristie and Richard Weiss Subdivision; Mr. Pisoni seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried.***

8. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE MOTION TO APPROVE THE NAME OF A SHARED DRIVEWAY IN THE ORCHARD CREEK SUBDIVISION TO APPLE CREEK LANE

Ms. Steele stated the Board should approve the name of the shared private driveway in Orchard Manor as Apple Creek Lane. Ms. Steele stated the County 911 Agency has reviewed this request.

• ***MOTION: Ms. Spencer moved to approve the name of a shared private driveway in the Orchard Manor Subdivision to Apple Creek Lane; Mr. Kirsten seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried.***

9. DISCUSSION BY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION BOARD REGARDING OUTSTANDING OPEN SPACE PROGRAM ISSUES THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WISH THE OPEN SPACE BOARD TO PURSUE AND ADVISE THE SUPERVISORS ON AND DEADLINES FOR SAME

Ms. Steele stated Mr. Eberhart would like to start looking at the present leases and revise current leases. Ms. Steele stated Mr. Yurchak and staff feel the leases are what they are and any issues can be dealt through codicils and amendments. Ms. Yurchak commented that one issue Mr. Eberhart had was language dealing with future mortgages but she did not feel amending this would work due to mortgage companies not agreeing to be second to the lease. Mr. Eberhart stated the leases will be in effect for a long time and may change hands several times. Ms. Spencer stated then the Board would deal with it then. Mr. Pisoni questioned what Mr. Eberhart hoped to accomplish. Mr. Eberhart commented the language could be changed so the lease was superior to the mortgage. Ms. Yurchak stated the mortgage company would have to agree to this not the homeowner and no mortgage company is going to retroactively agree to this. Ms. Spencer stated you may as well throw the program away then to try to accomplish this with existing leases. All the supervisors agreed that they did not wish the Open Space Board to revise or renegotiate the present leases and lease language.

Ms. Steele reviewed the pros and cons of changing the program from a lease program to a conservation purchase program prepared by the Open Space Board. Ms. Spencer commented that the program was written for leases and there is not a whole lot of land left to lease so she feels the program should move forward as a conservation purchase program. Ms. Yurchak questioned how that would be managed. Ms. Yurchak commented the Township already has a mechanism in place to purchase easements. Mr. Stevenson stated he would like to see some of that language relaxed in the permanent

purchase of easements. There was discussion on the Centre County program and what they are looking at when purchasing the development rights. Mr. Kirsten stated he would like to see the program become an easement purchase program. Ms. Spencer stated that same as well as Mr. Merritt stated. Mr. Pisoni felt it could go either way. Mr. Stevenson felt it should remain a lease program. Mr. Kirsten stated he felt the purchase is a better use of tax payer monies. Ms. Spencer reiterated that she thought it should be a purchase only program. The supervisors agreed to not make any decision on the lease vs. purchase option until the remaining issues were addressed by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Pisoni questioned how much income the Open Space Preservation tax brings in each year? Ms. Steele stated about \$140,000 per year. Ms. Steele stated after lease payment obligations and expenses there is about \$40,000 carried over. Mr. Pisoni stated it has left a bad taste in his mouth providing advance payments to landowners that have mortgages but does not have a problem leaving the program as a lease program. Ms. Steele commented that the Open Space Five Year Review Board projections indicated the most the township could bring in is about 200-300 more acres into the current lease program with the current tax base. Mr. Pisoni stated he would like to see the language changed so the township is superior to any mortgage. Mr. Stevenson commented it could take up to 15 years to save enough money to purchase a property. Mr. Hoover stated the lease ties up the development rights without putting out a lot of dollars. Mr. Stevenson stated he is fine leaving it as a lease program but would like to tighten up and be more selective on what is leased.

Mr. Kirsten questioned how many other municipalities have a program like this? Was the Township doing something ground breaking or something that no one else wants to do? Ms. Yurchak stated she would like to see how much land could be permanently purchased compared to what is leased. Mr. Eberhart stated that leasing gives the township time to pick out the properties they want to permanently preserve. Mr. Merritt commented that he voted for the 1999 referendum but would not vote for it again due to the fact that the township is providing lease payments to people and it is private property, they are in the clean & green program and getting a tax break and some of the properties preserved are not buildable anyhow. Mr. Hoover commented that it could change and become buildable some day.

Mr. Stevenson commented he would like to discuss this further at the next Board meeting and requested the Open Space Preservation Board work on the land rating system. Mr. Hoover explained the land rating system. Mr. Kirsten stated he would like to see property on a lease versus permanent purchase cost. Mr. Pisoni proposed that the Board dedicate a meeting to the OSPP topic. Mr. Kirsten stated he would like to see the Aquifer recharge map come into play. Mr. Stevenson requested that the OSPB incorporate the Aquifer recharge map into the land rating system.

10. MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Steele stated she received a letter from the Centre County Elections office stating they were moving the polling place from the Township Municipal Building to Halfmoon Christian Church along State Route 550.

11. SUPERVISORS' REPORT

Mr. Kirsten commented the Easter Party was a success and thanked the Port Matilda Fire Company, Dennie Huber, the Easter Bunny and the Park & Recreation Board.

Ms. Liggett stated she would like to add that the Clearwater Conservancy was awarded a \$185,000 grant for stream restoration projects in the Halfmoon Creek Watershed. Clearwater hopes to use the grant funds along with additional private funding sources to encourage property owners in the Halfmoon Creek Watershed to participate in projects that restore stream banks and riparian areas to mitigate stream impairment.

Residents with perennial or intermittent streams running through their property who are interested in participating in this program should contact Clearwater Conservancy 237-0400.

The Halfmoon Creek Watershed has been identified by the North Central Office of the Department of Environmental Protection as a priority for mitigation efforts

12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

- ***MOTION: Mr. Kirsten moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:38 p.m.; Mr. Merritt seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried.***