Members Present: Robert Corman, Chairman; Kevin Abbey, Secretary; and Tom Poorman; Cecil Irvin and Jack Shannon

Members Absent: Freddie Persic, Vice Chairman; Tom Hoover

Staff Present: Bob Jacobs; Chris Price; Anson Burwell; Chris Schnure; Mike Bloom; Beth Rider and Mary Wheeler

Others Present: Stan Wallace, NEA, LLC; and Randy White, DCNR Assistant District Forester

1. Call to Order – Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Corman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Citizen Comment Period

None

3. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Abbey to approve the minutes of January 16, 2007, seconded by Mr. Irvin. Motion carried.

4. Planning Commission Member Updates

Chairman Corman introduced Randy White, DCNR, Assistant Forester for Rothrock State Forest. Mr. White stated that he was here just to touch base with the Planning Commission and let them know that DCNR is available to Townships, Counties just in an advisory / consulting role. If there are any questions on resource management, they have a lot of experience in that area and would be more than willing to be of any assistance. There are four (4) Forest Districts in Centre County and if a liaison is needed Mr. White stated that he is willing to act in that capacity, as they have experience in resource management (including lands abutting forest or open space areas), recreation, trails, etc. Our experience is on the resource end or when you are abutting against forest land or open space areas. We do have a lot of low density recreation, hiking, biking, mountain biking, planning for trails.

Mr. Jacobs questioned if the recent development activity impacted resources. Mr. White responded that, for example in the Bear Meadows Development area there has been a definite increase in traffic, walking and hiking and other recreational activities.
Mr. Jacobs questioned if there has been any gypsy moth problems. Mr. White responded that due to budget constraints, there is very little spraying being done. Rothrock had problems south of Lake Raystown. Black Moshannon had a lot of defoliation last year. There is not going to be much spraying this year due to budget constraints, but there are private sprayers willing to spray for a fee.

Mr. Jacobs stated that he has been receiving a lot of calls regarding the Siglerville Pike issue. Mr. White understands that the Amish folks that live in Penns Valley want to get over the ridge into Mifflin County to see their relatives, and recently there has been a big push to get improvements done to some of the roads including the State Forest Land. While DCNR understands their concerns, the cost benefit ratio just doesn’t cut it to improve the roads over that mountain. That is Bald Eagle State Forest Lands and the roads are administrative roads not public roads. It is up to the discretion of the State Forest to even have them open at all but it is not a public thoroughfare.

Beth Rider, Recreational Planner stated that she will be working with offices such as Mr. White’s once the Centre County Greenway / Recreation / Open Space Plan is started, because there will be integration of such things as hiking, biking, passive recreation etc. with these public lands. There will be a time when staff sits down with the neighboring Counties to review actual plans and include their recommendations into our Plan. It is nice to start a relationship with these folks.

Mr. Abbey stated that one of the largest new things to occur is the Musser track. It is a very large section of land, really just to the west of Shingletown Gap. It provides a land that was acquired through the hard work of ClearWater Conservancy and with both public and private contributions. They are working to provide another access way from just inside the eastern boundary of Ferguson Township along Route 45 up into Rothrock State Forest.

Mr. White stated that this transfer has not taken place yet. It will take a while to develop a parking place because we see it as a non-motorized access basically for hiking, biking, horseback riding. There is some E&S work to do on an old road that goes up into there. There is an old reservoir up in there that needs to be dealt with.

Mr. Abbey stated that there is also water access to a couple of property owners.

Mr. Irvin stated that was the State College water source at one time. It still serves a couple of farms in the area.

Mr. White said the Rothrock State Forest is not trying to exclude that access. Also, it will be necessary for the Ferguson Township Police to look over this parcel as it will be a gateway. This may shift some traffic off of Shingletown, because there is very little parking up there and it is right beside State College Authority Reservoir.

5. **Old Business**

None
6. New Business

- Centre County MPO Update – Mike Bloom

Mr. Bloom reviewed a powerpoint presentation (Attachment #1) with the Planning Commission members.

Mr. Bloom presented a map regarding the development in Walker and Spring Townships near the SR 64 / 550 corridors. There are various developments in this area including Brookshire, Kerstetter Estates, Zion Manor, Deerhaven and Stoney Pointe. Looking at Brookshire there are 96 Single Family Residential lots, 2 Open Space on 208 acres; Kerstetter has 147 Single Family, 2 Open Space lots on 94 acres; Nittany Glen has 9 Single Family Residential lots; Deerhaven has 181 Single Family Residential lots, 5 Open Space, 1 potentially for a Church on 90 acres and Zion Manor has 87 Single Family Residential lots, 1 Community Center on 30 acres. As you recall one of the key points that is discussed when these plans come in was the issue related to how Zion Back and Dunkle Road were going to work. Dunkle Road will be realigned to match up with Zion Back Road. Staff is working with developers, PennDOT and Walker Township on exactly how this intersection is going to look in the future. At this point staff is waiting for a revised traffic impact study. This revised traffic impact study is expected to take into account not only the traffic coming in and out of these locations, but also the impact on pedestrians crossing SR 64 between developments and the township parklands. Walker Township’s Ordinance calls for Fee in Lieu of Parklands. These fees will be used to develop a larger township park facility on 30 acres which will join the existing parklands. The concern with all of this development is getting the pedestrians across Route 64 safely. SR 64 is currently a standard two lane roadway, but the cross section may be widened to accommodate potential turning lanes. This coupled with the speed limit which is posted at 55 mph, but where the traffic travels significantly faster; poses a safety concern.

Mr. Stan Wallace, NEA, LLC stated that the traffic study is being worked on at this time. The developer is now ready to go full steam ahead; on their own. There has been a communication breakdown between Kerstetter and Brookshire at this time and to keep this project moving, Mr. Kerstetter has expressed interest in putting in the turning lanes himself, including the realignment of Dunkle Road and whatever has to be done to make sure that pedestrians can cross the road safely. If his client does this all on their own, what recourses down the road? This is being reviewed at this time.

Mr. Burwell stated that he met with PennDOT officials, Walker Township officials, Planning Office staff, developers and their agents. A revised traffic impact study will be developed working hand in glove with the two applicants to come up with a study that addresses various things as well as focusing on how it impacts and how pedestrian access would be addressed as part of that equation. As of yet we have not received that information, but in fairness to Mr. Wallace and his client, the Brookshire people have been treading water at this point.

Mr. Wallace stated that PennDOT expressed a lot of opinions, Mike Baglio (District 2-0 Traffic Engineer) was very informative and a traffic light was talked about at this intersection along with the new realignment of Dunkle Road and the Zion Back Road. However, PennDOT can’t take into consideration anticipated lots; they have to take into consideration what is there today, so with the projected traffic impact, a traffic light is not warranted. Since PennDOT can’t take into consideration anticipated lots, they also can’t include the pedestrian traffic into it. You take the traffic from the cars that are going to come in there to figure out whether or not you need a turning lane or a traffic light, but you can’t use the anticipated pedestrian traffic to get across the
road as part of the formula. PennDOT will only allow you to count what exists, so a traffic light is not warranted and it cannot be asked to be put in because there is nothing to warrant or require it. After it is all built; then probably yes.

Mr. Burwell stated that Deerhaven wasn’t part of the equation and that may trip the warrant for the traffic signal. But this is unknown at this time. Staff is still waiting for the revised and updated traffic impact study and reaction from PennDOT.

Mr. Jacobs stated that some of the property owners are going to challenge the township to have some areas rezoned to the same zoning for higher density residential use. With this change it will allow for the potential of another 300 – 400 potential single family dwellings. This would immediately trip the warrant for signalization.

Mr. Abbey stated that pedestrian safety is very important to him and he would like to avoid an at-grade crossing at this intersection. A traffic signal is primarily for vehicular traffic, and not pedestrian traffic. The Centre Region, State College and the more metropolitan parts of the county have spend decades jawboning with PennDOT to try and get moderately acceptable controls for the pedestrians in downtown State College. With all due respect for the development, I do not accept for a minute that a traffic signal is adequate safety for a road like this and what really needs to be avoided is an at-grade crossing. It can be done and we as a Planning Commission have a different responsibility than PennDOT does as the owner / maintainer of the states highway system. The more that Walker Township expands their facilities, the more attractive this area becomes. An underpass would work especially given the amount of land that is available.

Mr. Irvin questioned if their zoning required any parkland on the newer part of the development.

Mr. Burwell stated that the developer did a fee-in-lieu, so it is either you provide adequate parkland on a formula basis within the confines of the development or the township opts to in-lieu of doing that, pay a fee that is on a formula basis. That is then to be used within a 3 year time frame for establishing regional parks etc.

Mr. Jacobs agreed.

Mr. Bloom stated that PennDOT, the developer and the townships all agree that there is an issue with getting pedestrians safely to the parklands that needs to be resolved.

Mr. Abbey stated that to the credit of Walker Township the facilities that are being built are wonderful.

Mr. Jacobs stated that the key is to continue the coordination with all of the development activity that is going on here. Based on the efforts of the Planning Commission, working with the development community; staff is hoping that the vehicular and a pedestrian issues can be resolved.

Mr. Bloom proceeded to discuss developments in the area near the “Y” in Zion, which is the intersection of SR 64 and SR 550.

Springfield there are 182 total units in all the phases; Forest Heights in two phases there are 49 total units; Walker Meadows there are 84 residential lots; 2 open space lots and Stoney Pointe has 90 existing units, phase 1 was 42 units, phase 2 was the bank building and phase 3 there
are 48 residential lots on a total of 21 acres. Stoney Pointe is required to update its traffic impact study on a yearly basis. An eventual phase of the Stoney Pointe development will trigger the need for turning lanes at this location.

Also part of the Deerhaven Subdivision, they agreed to widen the Zion Back Road out to SR 64. The Deerhaven developers agreed to an 8.5’ right of way dedication on this project. They also agreed that a right turn lane coming in off of SR 64 onto Zion Back Road will be added. Cambridge has 1200 total units; 4 combined parcels; 305 acres.

Mr. Burwell interjected that everything that Mr. Bloom is talking about is in Spring-Benner-Walker Joint Authority area. On the Kerstetter property you are looking at 7 lots, where the Weis Market is going to be constructed. In addition, there is potential for a restaurant, retail store and bank. Autumn Ridge is 184 single family residences; 7 open space lots and one community well. There is a significant amount of development going on in this area. On Jacksonville Road there is a potential access coming out of George Scott’s Hog Farm. This may not be the best access, but bear in mind there may be 1,200 potential units out there. Staff has heard from Bellefonte Borough, because they are concerned what would happen to the Bellefonte Borough roads as this much traffic funnels into them.

Mr. Jacobs stated that the sewer capacity is going to be run to the limit. Bellefonte has agreed to provide water service to Cambridge Development. After talking to Mr. Milliron, it is understood that the Weis Store is going to develop a well. Staff is hoping that they will tie into the Bellefonte water system as well. Autumn Ridge is also developing a well system. Staff is hoping at some point that this will be tied into one of the public systems as well.

Mr. Price stated that Cambridge Development is interesting, because there is already an approved plan on a portion of those lots that could have significant negative impacts on Bellefonte Borough, perhaps even more impact than the proposed 1,200 unit configuration. One interesting elements of the current proposal is that some of the financing involved hinges upon a large component of the units being designated for affordable housing and financed through the Housing and Development Corporation out of Lancaster, who is a proposed partner in this project. If they have to move to an on lot type system, they may not be able to achieve the density that is required, which means the financing probably goes away and the whole project goes away.

Mr. Bloom stated that as part of a new MPO supplemental planning funds project, MPO staff will be doing further analysis in the SR 64/550 area and will occasionally update the commission as that project proceeds.

Mr. Bloom stated also that regarding the MPO agenda this month, a few items related to the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) will be reviewed. Credit needs to be given to Ms. Meek who has been working diligently putting together a public participation plan as required by SAFETEA-LU. It has been refined enough that the MPO should be adopting that soon. Staff is trying to make the public input process more user friendly by providing better more accessible opportunities for the public to express their feelings on what projects should be done.

Related to the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), there were 33 projects requested as part of the public input process prior to the LRTP adoption in September of 2006. Penn DOT requested 9 bridges and another 24 transportation enhancement projects were also requested. These projects were ranked by the Project Ranking Committee and the results will be reviewed at the MPO. Karen Michaels gave a presentation to the MPO regarding the bridges throughout
the commonwealth. It opened a lot of eyes as to the issues that the state is facing. Staff expects the list to be approved as presented, but PennDOT will be providing the MPO with more information on priority bridges during the next TIP process. There are a significant number (approximately 55) of what PennDOT terms “structurally deficient” state and municipal bridges that did not make the LRTP project list and those may to be evaluated and prioritized in the LRTP in the future. There were a limited number of Transportation Enhancement (Bike and Ped) projects requested for the first list, but these 24 new projects really change the look of the LRTP list. The cost estimates were stronger this time around. However, with the limited amount of funding that is out there for these types of projects, there are only a handful that make it onto the LRTP at this point. The MPO will review the list and some tough choices will need to be made.

Greg Kausch – Transit Planner, will be giving an update on the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services plan. Staff thought there would be more time to work on the Coordinated Human Services Plan related to the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) funding and also looking into coordinating services between the County Office of Transportation and CATA. However, the direction that we are getting now from PennDOT is that we need to get the coordinated plan done before May 31, 2007.

As the MPO Performance Review Committee has been holding meetings, I have been giving brief updates to the commission to keep you apprised of their work. When the MPO expanded countywide in 2004, it was decided that it should be done with the preface that the MPO return in 2 years to review how the MPO is doing, how it is working and if there were any flaws that need to be addressed. This is what is driving the performance review committee. Unfortunately, due to unexpected work tasks it has taken the MPO longer than those two years to get this effort moving. However, this effort is now well underway. At the most recent meeting, things that are being discussed are the MPO structure and how should votes be doled out on a countywide basis. Currently they are broken up by planning regions; Centre Region has one voter per municipality, plus a vote for CATA and one for Centre Region Planning Commission; Spring Township and Benner Township each have a vote; Penns Valley has a vote; Mountaintop has a vote; PennDOT has two votes and the County has two votes as well. A discussion has been had regarding whether or not this way of voting set up fair. The recent newspaper didn’t do a lot of justice to the discussions that have taken place to date. These are not easy topics, but the committee is working through them. Other concerns that have been discussed are financing the MPO and bylaws. One of the concepts that is going to be discussed at the MPO this month is adding 2 votes in the rural planning region, one in Nittany Valley and one in Penns Valley and removing the Centre Region Planning Commission vote. There is not consensus amongst the Performance Review Committee on this proposed structure; it is simply a concept being put out there to open the discussion at the MPO. The Performance Review Committee has discussed making MPO Coordinating Committee primarily elected officials. This most recent meeting was really the first meeting that the committee took a look at bylaws. The bylaws that were presented were based on the current structure of the MPO, not the concept structure. In addition to bylaws, funding the MPO will be another next major item. Mr. Bloom stated that he would be more than willing to give each of the planning commission members a copy of the MPO agenda, which contains a more detailed explanation of the concept structure and where the committee is heading. The MPO Coordinating Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 27th and the commission members and public are welcome to attend.
Note: The Centre County Planning Commission’s regularly scheduled meeting of February 20, 2007 was cancelled.

Subdivisions:

February’s Submission Cycle

1. Eagle Point Subdivision, Phase 3
   Preliminary Plan
   13-Lots (12-Residential & 1-Conservation Area Parcel)
   Benner Township

A motion was made by Mr. Shannon and seconded by Mr. Abbey to approve staff’s recommendation of Conditional Final Approval of the above-mentioned Plan. Motion carried.

March’s Submission Cycle -- none

Land Developments:

February’s Submission Cycle -- none

March’s Submission Cycle

2. Timothy F. Tressler & Michael C. Fedor Land Development
   Preliminary (& Final Plan -- reference the applicant’s ‘waiver request’)
   5-Units (5-Self-Storage Buildings)
   Huston Township

Mr. Wallace, from NEA, Inc. was present for questions.

A motion was made by Mr. Abbey and seconded by Mr. Shannon to approve the “Waiver Request” to waive the “Preliminary Plan” and proceed to “Final Plan” status for review and action. Motion Carried.

A motion was made by Mr. Shannon and seconded by Mr. Abbey to approve staff’s recommendation of Conditional Final Approval of the above-mentioned Plan. Motion carried.

3. Krislund Camp and Conference Center Land Development
   Preliminary Plan
   41-Units (20-Residential -- Adult Lodge Building #1, 20-Residential -- Adult Lodge Building #2 & 1-Omni All-Purpose Building)
   Walker & Miles Townships
A motion was made by Mr. Abbey and seconded by Mr. Irvin to approve staff’s recommendation of Conditional Preliminary Plan Approval of the above-mentioned Plan with the approval signatures of the Miles Township Board of Supervisors and the Walker Township Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission members. Motion carried.

Tabled Plans:

- Brookshire Subdivision, Phase 1
  Final Plan
  30-Lots (28-Residential & 2-Open Space)
  Walker Township

This Plan will continue to be tabled and the Planning Commission members will revisit at the Planning Commission meeting on April 17, 2007.

- Sinking Creek Subdivision
  Final Plan
  64-Lots (63-Residential & 1-Open Space/Natural Area)
  Potter Township

Mr. Wallace met with Pete Filo, Guide Rail Specialist for PennDOT requesting a change in the guide rails (moving them back) to enhance sight distance. Also, per Potter Township’s request PennDOT will do a safety study to consider reducing the speed limit on SR 0144 to 45 mph, and then a turning lane would not be needed.

A motion was made by Mr. Abbey and seconded by Mr. Shannon to approve staff’s recommendation of Conditional Final Approval of the above-mentioned Plan. Motion carried.

Time Extension Requests -- February’s Submission Cycle:

- Nittany Vista III East & West Re-Subdivisions, Lots 3A, 3B & 10R (CFA) File No. 231-06
  Walker Township………………………………………………………………………………..1st Request (No Fee Required)

- Remodelers Workshop Land Development (CFA) File No. 20-06
  Benner Township…………………………………………………………………………………..3rd Request (No Fee Required)

- The Woods at Sand Ridge Subdivision, Phase 5R (CFA) File No. 282-05
  Walker Township…………………………………………………………………………………..3rd Request (No Fee Required)

- P-O Area Senior High School Athletic Fields Land Development (CFA) File No. 188-05
  Philipsburg Borough………………………………………………………………………………..6th Request ($150.00 Fee Required)

- Penns Valley Emergency Medical Services, Inc. Land Development (CFA) File No. 63-05
  Gregg Township…………………………………………………………………………………..7th Request ($200.00 Fee Required)
• J. Stephen & Sherry E. Dershimer Land Development, Phase 1 (CFA) File No. 31-05
Worth Township.................................................................8th Request ($250.00 Fee Required)

Time Extension Requests -- March’s Submission Cycle:
• Jeffery D. Hosterman Subdivision (CFA) File No. 265-06
Gregg Township.................................................................1st Request (No Fee Required)

• Sports Management Group, Inc. Land Development, Phase V (CFA) File No. 113-06
Haines Township.................................................................1st Request (No Fee Required)

• Mountainview Estates Subdivision, Phase 1 (CFA) File No. 158-06
Potter Township.................................................................2nd Request (No Fee Required)

• Deerhaven Subdivision, Phase 1 (CFA) File No. 154-06
Walker Township.................................................................2nd Request (No Fee Required)

• Eagle Point Subdivision, Phase 1 (CFA) File No. 193-06
Benner Township.................................................................2nd Request (No Fee Required)

• Nittany Building Specialties, Inc. Land Development (CFA) File No. 186-06
Huston & Worth Townships..................................................2nd Request (No Fee Required)

• The Village of Nittany Glen Land Development, Phase IIA (CFA) File No. 95-06
Benner Township .................................................................2nd Request (No Fee Required)

• Freestone Golf Course Land Development for PennGolf Corporation (CFA) File No. 162-05
Huston Township.................................................................2nd Request (No Fee Required)

• Opequon Hill Land Development, Lot 83, Phases 2 & 3 (CFA) File No. 93-06
Benner Township.................................................................3rd Request (No Fee Required)

• Grauch Enterprises Expansion Land Development (CFA) File No. 278-05
Rush Township .................................................................5th Request ($100.00 Fee Required)

• Designers Studio Land Development (CFA) File No. 279-05
Potter Township .................................................................5th Request ($100.00 Fee Required)

• Gary G. Wilt Subdivision (CFA) File No. 307-05
Howard Borough.................................................................5th Request ($100.00 Fee Required)

• Authentic Ridge Subdivision (CPA) File No. 308-05
Walker Township .................................................................5th Request ($100.00 Fee Required)

• Snow Shoe Travel Plaza Lot Consolidation and Land Development (CFA) File No. 235-05
Snow Shoe Township ..........................................................6th Request ($150.00 Fee Required)

• Polymics Land Development (CFA) File No. 238-05
Benner Township .................................................................6th Request ($150.00 Fee Required)
A motion was made by Mr. Shannon and seconded by Mr. Irvin to approve the above-mentioned Time Extension Requests for February and March. Motion carried.

8. Director’s Report and Other Matters to come Before the Commission

--- Spring-Benner-Walker Joint Authority Resolution

Mr. Jacobs passed out information regarding Spring-Benner-Walker Joint Authority Resolution. Representatives from DEP; Spring Township; the Authority; Walker Township and the Planning Office were present at a meeting on March 16, 2007 to discuss the Resolution. Issues involving capacity; the moratorium; issues with SBWJA trying to purchase additional capacity to meet the needs out there; and what is going to happen in the future in terms of providing sewer service and EDU’s to new developments. This Resolution says that they will start to dole out EDU’s at the rate of 60 per proposed development activity. When this meeting started, SBWJA basically stated that they would approve the Resolution and the municipalities in Centre County will have to work your approval process into what we are presenting through this Resolution. It was a cordial meeting, but in the end after all of the discussion, they decided to hold off on adopting the Resolution until additional comments were provided by the municipalities. Mr. Jacobs requested the Planning Commission members review this Resolution and pass any comments on to him and he would then send a formal letter to SBWJA.

Mr. Price reminded everyone of the Planning Commission meeting a few months ago when the developers and engineers asked the Planning Commission to make an amendment to our policy until this moratorium was over. Staff worked through this and came up with something that was comfortable for everyone. However, this is the situation that we have been scared about all along. In fact, it is actually worse than where we were before, because, if SBWJA allocates only 60 EDU’s per proposed development, there are going to be a lot of projects with their foot in the door with approved preliminary plans. Everyone would ultimately be fighting for limited capacity and we could be in the position of having knowingly approved plans with more units than can be accommodated with sewer service.

Mr. Burwell stated that in fairness to SBWJA, they were trying to be fair and give everybody something, but this causes more problems than it solves.

Mr. Jacobs stated that staff will be working with SBWJA, their engineer and solicitor to look at the service area and find out what areas are potentially open for development activity.
--- CDBG Funding

Mr. Jacobs stated that our office has taken over the Community Development Block Grant Program in 2006. As of last week we got work from the state that $397,000 will be allocated for this program. This program will be utilized for infrastructure upgrades to communities that meet low-mod income requirements (51%) or more. Five projects have been approved for this funding:

Philipsburg Borough  $106,000 – Streetscape Project
Spring Mills & Gregg Township  $100,000 – Water Filtration Plant
Mountaintop  $40,000 – Water Line extensions
Rebersburg  $40,000 – Upgrade Water system
Osceola Mills, Rush, Decatur  $40,000 – for Lateral Extensions from the Sewer System in Sandy Ridge

To apply for these funds Municipalities need to make an application to the County. These will be put on a list and the projects will be reviewed on a 5 year projection. The County Commissioners make the final decision on which projects get the funding. Historically the County has allocated CDBG funds to sewer and water improvement projects. Staff is hoping to shift some of these monies in the future for housing rehabilitation and affordable housing projects. The key now is focusing on infrastructure.

--- Cleveland Brothers Access

Mr. Jacobs stated that Anson sent out a letter to commence construction on the project because Cleveland Brothers has met all of the requirements that were part of the conditional approval. A letter from the County Engineer has been received regarding the Rishel Hill Road issue (which is a secondary access to the Cleveland Brothers site). A request has been received from the applicant to realign both the Agricultural access to the Rockview Lands, which is also the secondary access to Cleveland Brothers, and the access to the County Prison. The final decision by the Commissioners was to make a compromise and allow modification to the County Prison entrance along with a slight modification to the access to Cleveland Brothers. This will allow future development activity on the two parcels adjacent to the access to tie into this road a little bit easier due to the curvature issues. As long as Cleveland Brothers is going to pay for the realignment of the County Prison entrance, the Commissioners would consider approval. There is a pre-construction conference on March 29th and Mr. Burwell and Mr. Schnure will attend to be sure that everyone is on the same page.

Mr. MacMath, Spring Township sent a letter to Benner Township regarding their displeasure with the whole issue of access on Rishel Hill Road. There is a concern with the traffic issue. The lower half of the Rishel Hill Road is in Spring Township and there are two or three proposals by S&A Homes to develop approximately 800 homes in this area. Rishel Hill Road needs to be reviewed in it entirety including all proposed development activity, not in just one area. The road that comes out on Rishel Hill Road will be a secondary access, which will be part of the business street system.
With no further business to come before the Commission, a motion was made by Mr. Hoover and seconded by Mr. Irvin to adjourn at 8:31 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Jacobs
Recording Secretary
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THESE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AT THE JUNE 19, 2007 CENTRE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.