

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes August 20, 2020 (Virtual Meeting)

Members present: Dawn Nicholson (Chairman), Karen Bedics, Bobb Carson, Brian Hague, Angela Kelly, Jay Fuggiti

Also Present: Scott MacNair (Township Solicitor), Robert Wynn (Township Engineer), **H&K Group**

Representatives: Scott Drumbore, (Manager of Engineering & Environmental Dept.) Joe LaFlamme (Legal Counsel), Mark Roth (Traffic Engineer from McMahon Associates), Doug Rudenko (VP at Vibratex). There were 53 participants which includes the panelist that attended the zoom meeting.

Ms. Nicholson called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. Minutes from the July 16, 2020 meeting were reviewed and approved with minor changes requested by Ms. Bedics asking to include the number of participants that had attended the Zoom Meeting. Ms. Bedics also recommended that an addendum be added to the public comment to include the comments made via zoom chat function. Motion by Brian Hague, Second by Bobb Carson, vote approved unanimously.

Conditional Use G-7 Quarry Application Review: The Planning Commission continued to review the Conditional Use G-7 Quarry application with the applicant.

Traffic Study: The Planning Commission began reviewing the Traffic Study with Mark Roth, the Traffic Engineer. Mr. Roth briefly gave a synopsis of the Traffic Study. He also explained the process on collecting data to complete the study. The majority of the data received were from truck tickets from the existing asphalt materials site located on Springfield St. Mr. Roth also covered when peak times would be, those peak times would be from during the morning from 7-9am which create additional 52 trips of truck activity and from 4-6pm in the evening would create an additional 10 trips, with most of the traffic coming from Rt. 309. Currently, the traffic trip on Springfield St. is about 25 trips during am peak hours and 4 trips during pm peak hours. The total amount of the projected trips would be about 91 trips or 60 trucks during an operating day.

The Commission questioned the applicant if the current drive entrance would be closed and if the truck and trailers that are currently located at the site are accounted for in the study. The question was referencing the size of trucks, which would be accessing the site. The applicant stated that it is planned to close the current entrance drive once the land development starts on the site and the large truck and trailers where accounted for during the study. The Commission expressed concerned of missing trip data for Springfield St. in the study, particularly referring to the amount of vehicular travel on a daily basis. Mr. Roth explained the different figures throughout the report, to help show the difference in volume of traffic before and after the development.

The Commission had inquired to when the traffic counts were performed and who collected data, was the data collected during summer months or during the school months, and how the bus traffic was accounted for during that time. Mr. Roth responded that the traffic counts were collected by Penndot before COVID-19 pandemic. Mr. Roth stated the data was also based on the numbers buses and trucks currently stationed on the properties located on the Springfield St. with a projection of the buses leaving and entering the area once a day. The Commission would like to verify the actual traffic created by the buses during peak school season and to see data that included the study.

The applicant also stated the traffic study was projected for 3 years. The Commission recommended that they would like to see traffic study completed every 3-5 years and if possible a 10 year projection study take place.

The Commission expressed concerns regarding the Springfield St. Bridge being compromised with the extra truck traffic, as well having concerns of truck traffic being diverted down Mine Rd. if an accident would occur on Rt. 309.

Blasting: The Commission moved on to addressing the impact of blasting with Mr. Doug Rudenko from Viberteck Engineers (Blasting Expert). Mr. Rudenko discussed how the blasting process would occur and how far the vibration could be felt throughout the area and how far are properties monitored and regulated from the blasting site. Mr. Rudenko also addressed the requirements to blasting according to the PA Blasting Code, which is audited by the DEP mining inspectors and blasting inspectors regularly and also if it is resident complaint initiated.

The applicant explained that blasting sites mostly use portable sensor during blasting but would be willing to consider installing permanent seismograph near the pipelines located on the site. Pre-Blasting surveys were discussed, during the discussion, the process was explained, and how the inspections/observations are completed and who would receive the reports. Copies of the reports are sent to the residents, DEP Mining district and the Township. The applicant also discussed the complaint process if a resident had an issue, a resident could contact H&K Group or the District Mining office. If there is any damage found on a property H&K Group would be required to correct those damages.

Township Engineer Response Letter:

The Commission addressed the different sections of the Township Engineer letter.

The sections included and discussed the consolidation of the parcels into one deed. The applicant would be discussing this with the property owner and report results to the Township Manager.

Any new uses on the property would need to have zoning approval. The applicant agreed and it was also indicated that the current use at the North end of the property would be addressed.

The applicant explained the response regarding the ground water report that was submitted was with the data the applicant had available. It was noted the Township has sent out RFPs for a Hydrogeologist to complete a study and the Board will vote on at their next meeting on September 8, 2020.

All wetland, water courses, etc., are all preempted. The applicant did state that if there are any impacted ponds or water ways, H&K would be required by the DEP to remediate the situation.

It was discussed the berms were preempted according to the Mining Act, however the applicant did indicate that it was discussed to create improvements to where berms could not be placed. The Commission stated that would need to research the requirement along the section that is closest to Rail to Trail with the County.

Air Quality, Noise, Dust Control and Lighting were all addressed in the application and discussed in previous meetings. Light usage throughout the site would be shielded which is indicated in the application when it would be needed.

Public Comment:

The applicant addressed the following questions and comments that were submitted by Township residents:

Pete Jones- 1876 Salem Rd., expressed concerns and questions that he posted in the Q&A section. He also expressed concern on the blasting impact would hon livestock and ponds in the area.

Arienne Enlinch- 2755 Rt. 412, Expressed concerns regarding fly rock and the appropriate safety measure taken to keep resident safe that are using the Rail Trail during blasting.

Eric M. Touchstone 1810 Salem Rd. Questioned how and if the residents would be affected from asbestos during the mining.

Frank Hollenbach- Rocky Valley Rd., asked if the Park and Land Board would be granted party status and had a commented about the safety and closure of the rail trail during blasting.

Addendum: Attached comments from Zoom Chat.

The next Planning Commission schedule on August 26, 2020 at 7pm, this meeting will be a work session to discuss any recommendation to be sent to the Board of Supervisors. This meeting will have public access via but there would be no public comments or any chat function available.

The meeting was adjourned at **9:00 pm** Motioned by Karen Bedics and Second by Brian Hague, All in Favor.