

**EAST GOSHEN TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING
1580 PAOLI PIKE
TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2017 – 7:00 pm
FINAL MINUTES**

The East Goshen Township Board of Supervisors held a public meeting on Tuesday, January 10, 2017 at 7:00 pm at the East Goshen Township building to discuss the Hershey Mill Dam breach location. Members in attendance were: Chairman Martin Shane, Carmen Battavio, Janet Emanuel and Charles Proctor. Also in attendance were: Rick Smith (Township Manager), Erich Meyer (Conservancy Board) and Eric Neast, Gannett Fleming.

Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance

Marty called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and asked Eric Neast to lead those present in the Pledge of Allegiance. There was a moment of silence to remember our troops and first responders.

Marty asked if anyone would be recording the meeting. There was no response.

Chairman's Report

Marty announced that Senya Isayeff resigned from the Board of Supervisors. Applications must be submitted to Rick Smith by noon on Friday, January 13, 2017. Although the appointment is only to complete Senya's term, it is expected that the selected applicant will run for office when the term expires.

New Business

Hershey Mill Dam Breach – Marty introduced Eric Neast, engineer with Gannett Fleming, who will review the options for the breach of the Hershey Mill Dam. Eric commented that in June 2016, the Board of Supervisors made a decision to breach the Hershey Mill Dam, which left people with a lot of questions. He explained that there are two options for the location of the breach.

The first is to breach that dam at the existing spillway and the second is to locate the breach to the east of the existing spillway, which would remain.

They need to get rid of the dirt they will be removing as a result of the breach and a spoil area has been selected on the east side of the impoundment.

Eric advised that the Wetland Assessment and Bog Turtle Habitat Assessment have been completed. None of the wetland areas had the three criteria needed to support Bog Turtles.

He also noted that the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission (PHMC) have advised him that a Historic Resource Survey needs to be completed. He has obtained a proposal from CHRS to prepare the Survey.

Julieta Calmon, 1549 Tanglewood Drive, mentioned that in previous meetings they considered putting the dirt along Hershey Mill Road to make a walkway.

Nancy Aller, 1218 Mayapple Lane, asked how high the dirt would be. Eric replied it would not be above the elevation of the existing dam.

Gerry Connelly, 1538 Sleepy Hollow Lane, mentioned that when you walk along Hershey Mill Road you can see a waterway. Eric pointed out that there is a small stream close to the road that goes into the main stream.

Marty commented that, if you haven't attended the Hershey Mill Dam Committee meetings, you should in order to know what they are considering.

Gerry Connelly asked how the water level was dropped. Eric explained that a pipe goes under the spillway and water flows into it. There is a valve on the pipe, which controls the water flow. The valve was opened and the impoundment was drained due to dam safety concerns.

Eric described the construction process and access to the construction area.

Ed Tomlinson, 1202 Foxglove Lane, commented that a resident along Greenhill Road used the dirt from an addition to his house to build a berm along Greenhill Road to lessen the noise. Maybe some of this dirt could be used for berms for residents who want a berm.

Julieta Calmon mentioned that she took a picture of a Bog Turtle that she saw along Tanglewood Drive. Eric explained what they do for the survey and that they only have to cover a 350 ft. area around the dam and there may be turtles outside of that area.

Gerry Connelly mentioned that where the spoil area is proposed to be, it gets marshy at times. He suggested moving it further up along the stream. Eric pointed out that this would put it into wooded wetland which is not permitted by PA DEP.

Robert Cosby, 1507 Greenhill Lane, commented that he lives near the "access" off of Greenhill Road and it hasn't been used.

Gerry Connelly assumes there will be no public parking. He believes there is an easement from Foxglove Lane. Rick verified that there were several easements in this area.

Eric explained the options for the breach. Option 1 proposes to breach the dam at the existing spillway. The red area shows where dirt will be removed. The advantage to this option is that the stream continues in the same flow pattern. It will require a temporary easement on Neil DeRiemer's property during construction. The cost of this Option 1 is \$200,000 – \$240,000 and the work should take 2-4 weeks. The 100 year flood plain will not be impacted after construction.

Neil DeRiemer, 1034 Hershey Mill Road, commented that, in the 35 years he has lived here, there has been flooding of his residence 4 or 5 times.

Option 2 proposes to move the breach to the east of the existing spillway. A new stream channel would be constructed and the current stream channel would be filled in. Since this would direct new water flow onto Neil's property, where doesn't currently happen, a construction and

drainage easement would be required. This option has impacts on several small wetland areas located below the dam.

Jon Tulk, 1210 Burning Bush Lane, asked if this will affect the stability of Neil's house and suggested using some of the dirt to give him some relief from the water.

Gerry Connelly asked where the spoil area will be in this option and what is the advantage to Option 2? Eric pointed out the spoil area will be in the same location as Option 1. The advantage to Option 2 is that it preserves the existing stone spillway.

Dick Dunkel, 1203 Burning Bush Lane, asked what the slopes are in the scooped out area above the breach. Eric responded the side slopes would be 4 to 1 and north slope would be 10 to 1.

Gerry Connelly asked if the Historic Commission can insist on Option 2 because it preserves the wall. Eric replied that they may favor this option.

Marty pointed out all of the groups and agencies that may be involved in this breach. It is a complex project.

Eric commented that a new scour hole will be created in Option 2. This would mimic the existing scour hole.

Ryan Armour, 1554 Tanglewood Drive, asked if the current stream channel below the dam must be filled in. Eric replied yes and explained that, if it is not filled in it would increase the total area of water.

Ed Tomlinson commented that if a pond is created south of the dam, it would be on Neil's property. Marty noted that the Dam Committee has discussed having a water feature.

Eric commented that only Option 2 will create the water fall if you want it. This Option 2 will require a permanent easement on Neil's property. The cost of Option 2 is \$215,000 – \$260,000. Option 2 results in a small decrease in the 100 year flood plain.

Eric showed color pictures depicting the existing spillway, and Option 1 and Option 2. He explained that riprap, which is large crushed stone, would be used around the scooped out area. Over time grass, etc. would grow in it except where the water flows through.

Dick Dunkel asked about silt. Eric commented this would be addressed as part of the construction process.

Ed Tomlinson asked if the scooped out area can be moved further north to make a pond with public access? And asked if flat stones be put around the edge for walking and sitting. Marty pointed out the safety concerns if this area is open to the public.

Rick noted that the Township had several other ponds that are available for public use.

It was suggested that gabions be used instead of riprap. Eric explained that gabions are stone in metal baskets, which rust over time. The dirt behind the stone can't migrate through.

Ryan Armour suggested some larger boulders be incorporated into the riprap.

Neil DeRiemer commented that 10 years ago in other states they were using anti-erosion mats. Eric advised that DEP Dam Safety is very conservative in their approach to dam.

Jon Tulk commented that in Option 2 the new stream channel is in a straight line and wondered if it can be curved. Marty commented that if it meanders through the property, mowing it will be more difficult for Neil.

Eric presented the following comparison of the Options:

	<u>Option 1</u>	<u>Option 2</u>
Construction		
<u>Cost</u>	\$200,000 – 240,000	\$215,000 – 260,000
Retain existing		
Masonry		
<u>Spillway wall</u>	No	Yes
Maintain existing		
<u>Flow patterns</u>	Yes	No
Downstream		
Wetland &		
<u>Stream impacts</u>	No	Yes
Temporary Construction		
<u>Easement</u>	Yes	Yes
Permanent		
<u>Drainage easement</u>	No	Yes
Impact to downstream		
<u>100 yr flood elevations</u>	No	No

Neil DeRiemer used the Option 1 breach plan to describe his idea which combined items from both options. He suggested that the dam be breached as depicted in Option 2. However, the area above the dam be graded so that the normal stream flow was directed over the existing spillway and the new stream channel below the dam be constructed to intersect the existing stream channel below the dam as soon as possible. He asked that the Supervisors not make a tonight in order to consider his option.

Marty mentioned that in 2009 the Board members met with the DEP, who suggested that we lower the existing spillway and about 60 feet of the dam to the east of the spillway by six feet. This would allow DEP to reclassify the dam and allow for a small waterfall, but the residents rejected it. The Board has to make a decision on Option 1 or 2, but if the residents want to see the 2009 option it can be brought back. Rick pointed out that the 2009 information is on the Township website.

Dick Dunkel noted the survey asked for feedback on the spillway. Marty commented that it was his understanding that the survey was about the area above the dam. He noted that the existing dam was overtopped and breached during Hurricane Agnes in 1972 and reconstructed in 1973 or 74.

Carmen asked the residents currently present at this meeting for show hands for each option. Option 1 had 1 and Option 2 had 6.

Carmen recommended that the Board not make a decision until they had time to review the survey, Eric had a chance to review the option suggested by Neil, and the residents had a chance to take another look at the 2009 option. The Board members agreed to table this matter to the Board's meeting on the 17th.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Kiefer
Recording Secretary

F:\Data\Shared Data\Minutes\Board of Supervisors\2017\1-10-17 Final Minutes.doc