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RESOLUTION
OF THE BOARD OF TOWNSHIP SUPERVISORS
OF SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP, CRAWFORD COUNTY, PA.

WHEREAS, the Summerhill Township Planning Commission has been created to consider, among other things, long range plans for the growth and development of the Township; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has used the services of the Crawford County Planning Commission staff and various studies, surveys and analysis of the Township have been completed and discussed in public meetings and a series of Township development objectives and policies have been formulated by the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, plans and policies affecting the future of Summerhill Township have been developed and adopted for recommendation by the Planning Commission to this Board; and

WHEREAS, the Summerhill Township Supervisors have been represented at the regular meetings of the Planning Commission through the course of the preparation of a comprehensive plan; and

WHEREAS, this Board has reviewed and approved the Background Information; the Regional Context; the Population Forecasts; the Plan Objectives, Policies, Projects and Programs for future land use, roads, community facilities and services, and housing; the priorities for plan projects and programs; the Existing Land Use map and the Land Use Plan map; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the Township Supervisors to exercise foresight in guiding the affairs of the Township; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interests of the Township to establish policies for management of its growth and development; and

WHEREAS, the Summerhill Township Supervisors held a public hearing on a Comprehensive Plan of Summerhill Township on July 1980;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP, CRAWFORD COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA:

That the document, Summerhill Township Comprehensive Plan dated July, 1980, shall be the guide for the future development of Summerhill Township.

ADOPTED THIS 1ST DAY OF December, 1980

Earl R. Daniels, Chairman
Summerhill Township Supervisors

O.C. Richmond
Summerhill Township Supervisor

Dennis Dougherty, Secretary
Summerhill Township Supervisors

Robert H. Loughner
Summerhill Township Supervisor
Introduction
INTRODUCTION

This Plan is the result of the combined efforts of the Summerhill Township Planning Commission and the Crawford County Planning Commission staff. Interest in a plan for the Township developed as a result of the U. S. Steel Corporation's proposal to build a giant steel making complex on the shores of Lake Erie only seventeen miles to the north. If the mill is ever constructed its impact will certainly be felt because of the Township's location along the Route 18 corridor which is the major transportation link between the proposed mill site and Crawford County.

U. S. Steel officials indicate that there could be 8,500 workers at their "greenfield" plant by 1988, if construction starts in the early 80's, and the number of construction workers at the peak of construction is estimated at 10,500. The total impact population for Pennsylvania and Ohio combined is estimated at about 40,000 people with each state gaining about 20,000 new people in the impact area. Crawford County could see a population increase from just U. S. Steel related growth of 5,500 people by 1990.

Given this potentiality, the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), responded admirably to the call for federal financial assistance for planning related to Steel's impact on Northwestern Pennsylvania. Through a grant from ARC the Crawford County Planning Commission was able to help the Township Supervisors organize a planning commission in the fall of 1979. Since then the Commission, made up of nine citizen volunteers, has worked long hours toward the fruition of this plan. The policies and programs set forth in the "Plan" section are theirs. We of the County Planning Commission staff wish here to thank them for their effort.

For the reader who is not aware of the Township's location in relation to the rest of Crawford County and its neighboring counties to the north and west, a Three County Regional Map is provided on the following page.
THREE COUNTY REGIONAL MAP
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PREPARED BY CRAWFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Background Information
PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The Background for Planning is particularly important because the information it contains is needed to develop the policies and programs which are key to the Comprehensive Plan for Summerhill Township. Thus the Background is the "foundation" of the Plan.

All available information which relates to the planning effort in Summerhill Township should be included in the Background. Gathering this information is a process whereby the professional planner and the citizen planner on the Township's Planning Commission work together. The professional, a staff member of the Crawford County Planning Commission, is responsible for guiding the citizen planner and for the ideas, research and development of the background narrative. The citizen planner on the Township Planning Commission is responsible for assuring that the Background information is complete, accurate and reflects the needs of the Township as a whole.

The process of developing the Background also provides a unique opportunity for any Township resident to bring forth ideas and, with professional help, start them on the road to reality.

At this early stage in the report it seems fitting to make a few general observations:

There is an overriding concern in the Township to retain what the Commission Members call "rural character." It is this character which makes Summerhill an attractive place to live.

The basic industry in the Township is farming, however, most residents have full-time employment in non-farm jobs located outside the Township. The strength of farming as a full-time activity has eroded measurably since the Second World War. There is a fear that this erosion will continue and with it a way of life which has provided the most significant characteristic of the Township.

There is a desire to boost the economy of the Township by accepting new growth which would help strengthen the local economy. Of course this desire is tempered by the feeling that any new development be compatible with the Township's rural character. This would seem to indicate that some kind of controls on new growth may be needed.

The possible necessity for land use controls comes into conflict with a reluctance felt by the Commission to have government interfere too greatly in the lives of people. This is a common dilemma in areas where little government regulation has been necessary. Future development pressures on rural character may, however, necessitate some kind of local government management over future land uses.
EARLY HISTORY

Summerhill Township was formed from Beaver and Cussewago Townships in 1829. Its population in 1830 was 644 people. At that time it included the northern half of what is now Summit Township, but in 1841 Summit Township was formed, reducing Summerhill to its present proportions of approximately twenty-five square miles.

Summerhill's first settler was reputed to have been James McDowell who built a home in Conneaut Creek Valley in 1796. He was soon followed by others such as the Sterlings, the Fettermans, and the McMillans. Many of these settlers had skills which greatly benefited the community. John McTier, for example, was a stone mason who built chimneys for many of the settlers. Samuel Gowdy manufactured the wooden plows needed in the fields. Neal McKay was a weaver as well as an early Justice of the Peace.

Several small businesses were built in Summerhill. Josiah McNamara began the first tannery in 1800. James Fetterman built the first distillery in the area, but at least two others were built soon after. Michael Winger built the first sawmill. Other sawmills, a steam mill, and a carding mill quickly followed. By the canal days in the 1840's lumbering was very active.

The first schoolhouse was a log structure built on the farm of W. C. Sterling in 1812. It was a half mile north of Dicksonburg and was used for six years. The early teachers were Triphosa Rugg, Samuel Steele and Whately Barret.

The Beaver and Erie Canal, engineered primarily by W. Milnor Roberts and Milton Courtwright, ran through Summerhill in a north-south direction in the Conneaut Creek Valley. It connected Pittsburgh to Lake Erie at Erie. When construction on the canal began in 1838, a considerable amount of money and effort was poured into it. Summerhill's population grew as boatmen and maintenance workers were needed and by 1840 the population was 1,638.

When the canal became operational in 1844, it was greatly relied upon for transportation of iron ore, coal, merchandise, and passengers. During its prime, the locks of the canal were in constant use and large sums of money were invested in improvements.

Dicksonburg, a small village in the southern part of the Township, became a center of activity during the canal days. By the late 1800's there were fifteen homes, a store, a school, a blacksmith, a large grist mill, a grange and a Methodist Church. The Dicksonburg Grange No. 556, Patrons of Husbandry, was organized on May 12, 1875 - today it is abandoned. The Dicksonburg Methodist Church was organized in 1802 and was rebuilt in 1835 and 1851. It is still in
use today. The village still maintains its identity, but with no canal and no railroad station the activity is much less than in earlier days.

The Erie-Pittsburgh Railroad, later known as the Pennsylvania Railroad, began service in 1866 through Conneaut Township just a few miles west of the canal. The competition from this railroad in a few short years pretty much put the canal out of business. In 1871, storm damages to a canal aqueduct in Erie County halted all operation. Another railroad company, the Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad, owned a controlling interest in the canal and doomed the waterway by investing its money in the construction of a railroad on the towpath of the canal instead of repairing the storm damage. By 1888 the railroad was completed and performing the services previously provided by the canal. Though the Pennsylvania Railroad (Penn-Central) is now abandoned, the Bessemer and Lake Erie is still serving the area. It is the major rail line from Pittsburgh to the proposed U. S. Steel mill site on Lake Erie.

The maps on the following pages depict Summerhill Township as it appeared in 1876, as well as Conneautville Borough and Dicksonburg. It should be noted that the maps of Summerhill and Dicksonburg were drawn by J. C. McDowell of Dicksonburg, Pa. These maps were taken from an 1876 publication entitled Combination Atlas Map of Crawford County, Pennsylvania, by Everts, Ensign and Everts, Philadelphia.

---

PHYSIOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

Summerhill Township is located in northwestern Crawford County just south of Conneautville Borough. It shares its northern boundary with Conneautville and Spring Township. Hayfield Township is to the east, Summit Township to the south and Conneaut Township to the west. (See previous Three County Regional Map.) Ohio lies 6.7 miles to the west and Erie County 6.6 miles north. Geometrically, Summerhill has a rectangular shape being 4.1 miles from north to south and 6.2 miles from east to west. It has slightly over twenty-five square miles in area.

Most of the landscape is gently rolling hills in a rural setting. Many small streams cut through the hillsides creating an interesting diversity of terrain. The most significant natural feature is the Conneaut Valley which runs in a north south direction separating the Township into a western third and an eastern two thirds. A plateau is found in the eastern half of the Township between the Conneaut Valley and the Cussewago Valley further east in Hayfield Township. To the west of the Conneaut Valley the terrain begins to gently flatten as one approaches Conneaut Township.

Conneaut Creek, the largest stream in the Township, begins in Summit Township to the south entering Summerhill south of Dicksonburg. On its journey to Lake Erie it meanders north through the Township to Conneautville, Springboro and on to Albion in Erie County where it turns west to Ohio and enters Lake Erie at Conneaut.

Many fingerlike tributaries run down the slopes of the valley on their way to Conneaut Creek and create a constantly changing relief sometimes carving deep cuts into the hillsides. The largest such tributary is Fish Creek with runs from the southwest corner of the Township along the boundary with Conneaut Township and then turns east toward Conneaut Creek just south of Fish Road.

The third largest stream in the Township is Rundelltown Creek which runs along Route 198 at Norrisville and then turns north going through the northeastern portion of the Township. It goes to Rundell in Spring Township and eventually into Cussewago Creek. Rundelltown Creek does not end up in Lake Erie as does Conneaut Creek, it goes via Cussewago Creek into French Creek and is actually part of the Mississippi River system. This brings up a point of at least academic significance.

The high points on the plateau between the Conneaut Valley and the Cussewago Valley form a Continental Divide. All waters going to the Conneaut system go to Lake Erie and eventually to the Atlantic Ocean. Just a few feet away the water draining to the east goes into Rundelltown Creek or Inlet Run and eventually finds its way to
the Gulf of Mexico. As one would imagine some of the highest elevations in the Township are found along this Continental Divide. The hill between Route 18 and Inlet Road with the Dicksonburg Road to the south and Wing Road to the north is the highest point along the Divide - 1,371 feet above sea level. However, this is not the highest elevation in the Township.

The highest elevation is 1,410 feet above sea level and is found in the extreme southeastern portion of the Township along and just west of L.R. 20047 between the Dicksonburg Road and Robinson Road. From this high area in the southeast the land slopes generally to lower elevations in a northwesterly direction. Thus near Conneautville along the Conneaut Creek bed there are elevations as low as 940 feet above sea level. Elevations in the southwestern portion of the Township vary from 1,290 feet west of Shermansville Road to approximately 1,000 in the Conneaut Valley near Dicksonburg.

In the northeastern area above Route 198 the elevations vary from 1,370 feet at Norrisville to approximately 1,200 feet where Rundelltown Creek goes into Spring Township. The hill forming the Continental Divide runs north and south and lies just west of Rundelltown Creek. This major relief feature varies in elevation from 1,300 feet to 1,370 feet. To its west lies the Conneaut Valley. The small Inlet Run lies to its east and is south of Rundelltown Creek. Inlet Run flows south into Summit Township and feeds Conneaut Lake.
INTRODUCTION

A good record of the way land is used today in Summerhill Township is important for several reasons:

- New growth and change can be followed and mapped so that one can easily see where changes are taking place.

- New development can be encouraged to locate in areas where similar uses already exist, i.e. industry.

- Potential land use problems such as, congestion, use conflicts or flooding can be reduced.

- Potential clusters of development can be predicted with better accuracy.

- Existing problem areas can be evaluated in relation to other uses around them.

Since planning for the future must rely heavily on what has been done in the past a good graphic and statistical record at the beginning of the planning process is extremely important. We hope that the Existing Land Use map, found in the cover jacket of this report, and the Land Use Accounts and other statistics found later in this section will provide a sound base of land use information from which to begin planning.

The information on the Existing Land Use map was compiled by the staff of the Crawford County Planning Commission in the fall of 1979. Aerial photographs were used as well as extensive field work and input from the Summerhill Township Planning Commission. Statistical information is based on mechanical analysis of areas taken from a completed 1 inch equals 1,000 feet land use map of the Township.

LAND USE PATTERNS

If one looks at the Existing Land Use map of Summerhill Township it is easy to conclude that the area is rural in character. Approximately fifty-four percent of all the land is either woodland or brush, and thirty-nine percent is used for agriculture. This leaves only about six percent of the land for all other uses including residential, commercial, industrial, public, recreational and roads. Table 1, Land Use Accounts for Existing Land Uses, shows the percentages for each land use in detail as well as the number of acres.
and square miles devoted to each use. Perhaps a brief description of each type of land use will help to establish any patterns of use which exist and to illustrate how they relate to one another.

**Agricultural Uses**

Farming, which occupies approximately thirty-nine percent of the land, is important both economically and socially in Summerhill Township. It is the farms and the wooded areas separating the fields that create the rural character of the area. There are twenty full-time farms scattered throughout the Township as well as some sixty-six part time, or hobby farms. Most tilled land is planted in hay or corn and most active farmers are in the dairy business.

Concentrations of full-time farms are found in four areas of the Township. In the extreme southwest corner there are six full-time farms and there are five in the northwestern section. Three full-time farms are located near the center of the Township along Route 18, and there are four full-time farms in the northeast section.

This is not to imply that land is not being tilled or used for agriculture in other areas of the Township. Tilled fields and pasture lands are found all over the Township even though there aren't any full-time farmers in the area. Many fields adjacent to the full-time farms are rented in order to increase full-time operations. There are also many part-time, but active, farmers who grow crops or have some animals. Then there are several hobby farms, or farmettes, where people might raise a few horses or other farm animals for their own enjoyment or use.

**Commercial Uses**

Uses of a commercial nature such as grocery stores, repair shops and the like occupy less than one percent of the land in Summerhill Township. These uses nonetheless are important to residents and the local economy. At the present time there are nine commercial uses in the Township. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audrey's Upholstery</td>
<td>Route 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austins Repair and Welding</td>
<td>Canal Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonanno Body Shop</td>
<td>Route 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doxol Propane</td>
<td>Shermansville Road (L.R. 20044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gills Grocery Store</td>
<td>Norrisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotchkiss TV Repair</td>
<td>Carr Road (L.R. 20048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Kettle Tavern</td>
<td>Dicksonburg Road (L.R. 20042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Knoll Taxadermy</td>
<td>Shaw Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss Cattle Dealer</td>
<td>(L.R. 20038)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the scattered locations of these businesses there is no commercial center in the Township. Most businesses are where they are because the owner lives on or near the property.
Industrial Uses

Industrial uses include such things as manufacturing, saw mills or other similar uses. In Summerhill there are five uses classified as industrial which together utilize approximately nineteen acres of land. They are listed as follows:

- Hoover's Saw Mill - Dicksonburg Road (L.R. 20042)
- Junk Yard - Norrisville
- Junk Yard - Route 18
- Ohio Rubber Company - South of Conneautville
- PennDOT Maintenance Area - Route 198

There is a loose concentration of industrial uses near the southeast corner of Conneautville where one finds Ohio Rubber, a junk yard and the PennDOT maintenance area. The saw mill and the other junk yard are widely separated.

Though these industries, with perhaps the exception of Ohio Rubber, do not employ many people, they do contribute to the economy of the Township. The loose concentration of industrial type uses just south of Conneautville Borough would make this area a logical choice for future industrial sites. This idea is supported by the fact that in this area of the Township there could be rail access to the Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad; Route 18, a major traffic artery, is easily accessible and there is the possibility of public water and sewer extension from Conneautville at some future time.

Industrial uses, because of their nature, often do not fit well into areas where people live. Some evidence of this happening can be found near the two junk yards. Both are unsightly and are near homes. Though these are relatively minor annoyances they can be frustrating and point out some of the potential problems associated with industrial or heavy commercial development near residential areas.

Public/Semi-Public Uses

Land devoted to public uses and semi-public uses is combined into one category here because they are generally similar in nature. Public uses are those which are owned by and used by the general public. In Summerhill Township they include the Township Building on Crozier Road and a small building on Dicksonburg Road just west of Route 18 used for storage by the Township. These are the only truly public uses in the Township. If there were a school or a post office these would also be considered public uses.

Semi-public uses are those which are operated by certain public groups and usually serve only a limited portion of the public. They include such uses as: churches, granges, cemeteries, and in some
cases public utilities. In Summerhill Township there are ten uses in the Semi-Public category: 1 church, 4 cemeteries, 2 granges, a nursing home and 2 public utility uses. The Dicksonburg Methodist Church is located in Dicksonburg on the north side of Dicksonburg Road between McDowell Road and the Bessemer Railroad. The Dicksonburg Grange, now in disuse, is located just east of the Methodist Church. The second, and still active, grange is the Eureka Grange 816 in Norrisville. The four cemeteries are: Shaw Cemetery on the north side of L.R. 20042 just east of Shaw Road; McDoell Cemetery on the east side of Canal Road between Wing Road and Hill Road; Dicksonburg Cemetery in Dicksonburg; and Cribbs Cemetery near Conneautville south of Route 198 and across the stream opposite the old Conneautville Nursing Home. The Rolling Fields Nursing Home which is just east of the old nursing home on Route 198 is a beautiful new semi-public use in the Township. The remaining semi-public uses are utility substations. One is a Rural Electric substation on Canal Road between Fish and Hill Roads, and the other is an AT&T substation east of Center Road between Wiseman and Hill Roads. These public and semi-public uses take up approximately twenty-eight acres of land, or about two tenths percent of the total land.

Recreational Uses

There are two recreational uses in the Township. One is Shaw Park operated by the Conneaut Valley Recreation Association just south of Conneautville between Conneaut Creek and the Bessemer Railroad, and the other is Indian Mound Campground on the north side of Fish Road just west of Conneaut Creek. The park occupies approximately six acres and is open to the public. The campground occupies approximately twenty-one acres and is privately operated.

Residential Uses

Residential uses by far outnumber any other uses. There are a total of 398 residential structures in the Township. Of these 275 are permanent homes, 95 are mobile homes, 21 are farm homes, 3 are vacant homes, and 4 are abandoned homes. Five of the permanent residences also have a commercial use on the same property or even within the same structure as the residence. These uses are called mixed commercial/residential uses. For statistical purposes the commercial portion of the use was included in the commercial figures found in Table 1, and the residential portion was included as part of the count of residential uses. (See Housing Section.)

Residential uses of various types are found throughout the Township along existing road frontages. With two exceptions, there are no real clusters of homes as one might think of in suburban residential developments. The exceptions are a clusturing of homes in Norrisville and the mobile home park on Route 198 just east of Smith Road. Residential uses take up approximately 586 acres or 3.6 percent of the land.
Road and Railroad Uses

Roads and railroads comprise the fourth largest use of land after woodland/brush, agricultural and residential uses. In all there are approximately 359 acres, or about 2.2 percent of the land devoted to these transportation uses. There are 59.4 miles of roads in the Township of which 34.4 miles are Township roads and 25 miles are state roads. The Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad has almost exactly four miles of tracks running north and south through the Township from Conneautville through Dicksonburg and on into Summit Township. The acreage of 14.7 acres for railroad use was calculated by multiplying the entire length of the railroad (21,400 feet) by an average width of 30 feet. This leaves the roads utilizing about 344 acres of land. Most roads are fifty feet wide but there are a few Township roads like Hill Road which are only thirty-three feet wide. Actual road right-of-way widths were taken into account in determining the acreage figure for roads. Roads and railroads will be further discussed in the Community Facilities and Services section of this report.

Vacant Subdivided Lots

Vacant divided lots are simply parcels of land which have been divided up for future use - probably as residential lots. There are several scattered throughout the Township and a concentration of thirteen such lots along Route 198 just east of Smith Road. Vacant subdivided lots utilize approximately forty-three acres of land.

Woodland/Brush Uses

By looking at the Existing Land Use Map and at Table 1, one sees that woodlands and brush occupy the greatest amount of land in Summerhill Township. Over fifty-four percent of the land or some 8,900 acres is either in trees or brush. This report does not distinguish between the two because of the difficulty in so doing. But from field observation one can say that roughly two thirds of the Woodland/Brush category is in trees and about one third in brush. Areas were considered to be brush when growth was too heavy to be easily plowed under or cut with a brush hog.

Patterns of woods and brush are found throughout the Township, however, they are extensive in four areas: to the south of and along Route 198; south of Dicksonburg Road east of Dicksonburg; north of Dicksonburg between Route 18 and the Shermansville Road north to Hill Road continuing almost to Conneautville between Canal Road and the Shermansville Road, and in a north-south corridor between the Conneaut Township line and the Shermansville Road from Summit Township to Conneautville. Like any rural area in this part of Pennsylvania, it is the trees in combination with fields and country roads which help to create Summerhill's rural character.
LAND USE ACCOUNTS

Land use accounts are simply statistics on how parcels of land are divided up according to size in acres. Also included are the number of parcels in various size groups, the percentage of parcels in each group and figures on how many parcels are owned by persons living outside the Township. All of this information was taken from 1980 County Assessment Office records, which go according to property deeds.

Table 2 shows a breakdown of how many parcels of land there are in the Township according to various sizes in acres. It is easy to see that most parcels are over ten acres, which clearly illustrates the rural nature of the Township. More people own parcels between ten and forty-five acres than any other size, and parcels from one-hundred to two-hundred acres are fewest in number.

Table 3 uses the same information but shows how many parcels are owned by people living outside the Township. Forty-three percent of all parcels, and also forty-three percent of all the acreage in Summerhill, is owned by non-residents. These property owners also found the ten to forty-five acre size the most popular. Whether or not the high percentage of land owned by persons outside the Township is a result of speculation created by the possibility of the U. S. Steel plant remains to be established.

### TABLE 1

**LAND USE ACCOUNTS FOR EXISTING LAND USES**

**SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP - FALL 1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE CATEGORY</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>SQUARE MILES</th>
<th>% TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6,421.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>39.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Semi-Public</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>536.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/Railroad</td>
<td>359.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Divided Lots</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland/Brush</td>
<td>8,913.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>54.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>16,410.8</td>
<td>25.6*</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: State records show 16,038 acres or 25.06 square miles for Summerhill Township.

* Square mile figure is based on total acreage figure.

SOURCE: These figures were compiled by the Crawford County Planning Commission staff after a field survey in the fall of 1979.
### TABLE 2

**LAND PARCELIZATION STATISTICS - INVENTORY BY PARCEL SIZE**

**SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP - APRIL 1980**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCEL SIZE IN ACRES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PARCELS</th>
<th>PERCENT PARCELS IN TWP.</th>
<th>ACRES IN CATEGORY</th>
<th>PERCENT TOTAL ACREAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 Acre</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15.6 %</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 - 1.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.5 %</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 - 2.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.1 %</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 - 3.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.2 %</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 - 5.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 - 10.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.3 %</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>2.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 - 45.0</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>28.4 %</td>
<td>4 558</td>
<td>30.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.1 - 100.0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>19.9 %</td>
<td>7 777</td>
<td>51.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.1 - 200.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
<td>1 986</td>
<td>13.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>578</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 091</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** Each property ownership (deed) is counted separately according to 1980 county assessment records.

The statistical area for the township is 16,038 acres or 25.06 square miles. The discrepancy between this figure and the total in the 4th column exists because of the nature of the county’s assessment records, and the fact that the area of roads is not included.

**SOURCE:** Crawford County Planning Commission staff calculations.

### TABLE 3

**LAND PARCELIZATION STATISTICS**

**PROPERTY OWNERS RESIDING OUTSIDE OF SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP**

**SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP - APRIL 1980**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCEL SIZE IN ACRES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PARCELS</th>
<th>PERCENT PARCELS IN TWP.</th>
<th>ACRES IN CATEGORY</th>
<th>PERCENT TOTAL ACREAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than 1 Acre</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.4 %</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 - 1.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.8 %</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 - 2.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4 %</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 - 3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7 %</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 - 5.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.8 %</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 - 10.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.5 %</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 - 45.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13.8 %</td>
<td>2 283</td>
<td>15.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.1 - 100.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.5 %</td>
<td>3 194</td>
<td>21.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.1 - 200.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2 %</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>249</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.1 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 493</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.1 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Crawford County Planning Commission

Staff calculations from 1980 county assessment records.
INTRODUCTION

This section deals with population - current, past and future. It is important to know how many people there are in the Township and something about these people in terms of their age and sex distribution. Schools, roads, utilities, health care facilities, fire and police services and all other services are directly affected by the number of people living in a community. As a general rule, the more people there are the greater the demand for services and community facilities will be. Thus, community planning becomes increasingly important as population increases. Shortly we shall see that Summerhill Township is a growing community, but first let us establish a baseline from which to plan. That baseline will be the current population, as best we can determine it.

CURRENT POPULATION

The 1970 Census is the most recent "official" count of Summerhill Township's population. According to this census the 1970 population was 963 people. Table 4, Population by Age and Sex 1970, shows that 1970 population broken down into different age groups by sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>% MALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>% FEMALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: U.S. Census - 1970
Several observations can be made from this table. For example, there were 150 women of child bearing age (ages 15-44); 532 people were in the work force age group (15-65); and there were 149 senior citizens (age 65 and over). The 5 to 14 year old group had the most people (193) and made up twenty percent of the total population. This age group also contained more than twenty percent of all females and more than nineteen percent of all males. Over the entire population there were nineteen more females than there were males, and females outnumbered males by the largest amount in the 65 and over age bracket. Males slightly outnumbered females in all other age groups except the 5 to 14 and 45 to 54 year age groups.

It is also interesting to note that sometime between the ages of 15 and 24 young people are leaving the Township, and that a greater percentage of females leave than males. This trend continues up through the 35-44 year age group. This is explained by the fact that in many rural areas young people leave home to seek education and employment elsewhere. More women leave than men because employment opportunities are fewer for women in the Township and because many marry someone from outside the community. The fact that in 1970 there were more women than men over 65 years of age reflects the national trend that women generally live longer than men. However, there were not always more women than men in this elderly group as we shall see in the next section on Population Trends.

Determining the 1975 or 1980 population for the Township is a difficult task without an actual census. Until the results of the 1980 U. S. Census come out in 1981 we can only make an educated guess of today's population. Suffice it here to say that actual housing counts taken by the Crawford County Planning Commission in 1979 indicate that the population has grown since 1970. This observation differs from population estimates of the Bureau of the Census for 1975 issued in a publication entitled "Population Estimates and Projections," Series P-25, No. 686 May 1977. This report estimated Summerhill's population to have been 893 in 1975 - a loss of seventy people since 1970. It is felt by the authors of this report that the actual census of 1980 will show a modest increase rather than a decline. (See Population Forecast section.)

POPULATION TRENDS

Summerhill Township has experienced many fluctuating trends in population since the 1830's when its population was 644. The Township's peak population of 1,638 occurred in 1840 during the canal era, and its lowest population since 1830 occurred precisely 100 years later when the population dipped to 685. This low was probably due to the depression of the 1930's. It is interesting to notice that in the first hundred years of Summerhill's existence, the Township showed a net gain of only 41 people. From 1940 to 1970, however, Summerhill has been gradually growing.
TABLE 5
POPULATION COMPARISONS 1840-1970
SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
<th>ACTUAL CHANGE</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>+994</td>
<td>+154.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>-478</td>
<td>-29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>+77</td>
<td>+6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>-162</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>-177</td>
<td>-20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>+145</td>
<td>+21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>+109</td>
<td>+13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>+53</td>
<td>+5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Crawford County Planning Commission staff analysis of U. S. Census Data

It is difficult to identify specific reasons for the sharp changes in population as shown in Table 5. The greatest flux in population occurred between 1830 and 1850 when the population jumped from 644 in 1830, to 1,638 in 1840 and then dropped to 1,160 by 1850. Most of this flux can be attributed to the construction of the Beaver and Erie Canal which commenced in 1838, was completed in 1844. The influx of canal construction workers would be reflected in the 1840 Census. The decrease of 478 persons from 1840 to 1850 can be attributed to two major events: the formation of Summit Township from a portion of Summerhill in 1841, and the completion of the canal in 1844.

During the forty year period from 1890 to 1930, Summerhill experienced steady declines in population. This is explained in part by the advent of the industrial revolution in our society and the resulting decline in the number of farmers. This trend reversed during the 1930's when the Township experienced the largest increase in population since 1840. The population of Summerhill has continued to gradually increase since 1940. This is probably due to general national population increases and the more recent trend for people to leave the cities for rural areas.
### TABLE 6
SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP
POPULATION 1940-70
PERCENTAGES BY AGE GROUP AND SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; OVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census

M.A. - Median Age
Table 6, Population By Age Group and Sex 1940 - 1970, graphically shows different age groups by sex for the decades of 1940, 1950, 1960 and 1970. This "population pyramid" allows one to follow any age group through the decades and note changes.

It was mentioned previously that female senior citizens outnumbered males in 1970. As one can see from Table 6, this was not always the case in Summerhill. By 1970 the number of women over 65 had almost doubled from the number of women in that age group in 1960. This is difficult to explain, but a good guess is that very few of the women who were over 65 in 1960 died between 1960 and 1970. If this was the case the population of women over 65 could have doubled during the ten years as the 55 to 64 year old group approached age 65.

As the table shows, the 5 to 14 year age group has been the largest for the four decades. It also shows that on the average there have been more males in each age group over the decades. One can clearly see from this table that young men and women over the age of 14 began to leave the Township. The recession during the 1950's must have hit the Township particularly hard as one looks at the difference between the number of young people in the 15 to 24 age group in 1950 and that same group ten years later (ages 25 to 34) in 1960. The table also shows the median age of all people in the Township for the four decades. The median age of 32.8 years is not an average, but rather the mid point in age from the youngest person to the oldest.

A table such as this can be a useful planning tool since it can give some indication of the size of various age groups over a period of years. This can be very helpful in school planning, and in the planning of other facilities such as housing and services for the elderly. The use of the table can be enhanced by color coding the same group of people (the bars) for different decades.

Table 7, Comparison of Population Trends, provides a comparison of total population from 1940 - 1975 for the six municipalities in the Conneaut Valley area. During the 1940's all of these communities experienced increases in total population with the growth rates of Summerhill Township and Conneautville exceeding those of the others. In the 1950's, Beaver and Conneaut Townships grew while the other communities decreased in population. The overall population change from 1940 - 1970 for the Conneaut Valley Area was an increase of 6.3 percent. Summerhill Township had the highest overall increase of sixteen percent for this same time period. Spring Township was the only community in the Conneaut Valley to experience a net decrease in total population during the thirty year period.
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### TABLE 7

**COMPARISON OF POPULATION TRENDS**  
**CONNEAUT VALLEY AREA 1940-1975***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUNICIPALITY OR AREA</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE 40-50</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE 50-60</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE 60-70</th>
<th>1975**</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE 70-75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill Twp.</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>+13.1%</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>+5.8%</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Twp.</td>
<td>1 296</td>
<td>1 362</td>
<td>+5.1%</td>
<td>1 305</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>1 287</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>1 402</td>
<td>+8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboro</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>+7.2%</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>+0.3%</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>+10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conneautville</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1 177</td>
<td>+22.0%</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>1 032</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
<td>1 082</td>
<td>+4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Twp.</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>+2.6%</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>+5.4%</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>+13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conneaut Twp.</td>
<td>1 208</td>
<td>1 235</td>
<td>+2.2%</td>
<td>1 285</td>
<td>+4.8%</td>
<td>1 322</td>
<td>+3.0%</td>
<td>1 418</td>
<td>+7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conneaut Valley</td>
<td>5 609</td>
<td>6 083</td>
<td>+8.5%</td>
<td>6 013</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>5 663</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>5 314</td>
<td>+5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford County</td>
<td>71 644</td>
<td>78 948</td>
<td>+10.2%</td>
<td>77 956</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>81 342</td>
<td>+4.3%</td>
<td>85 357</td>
<td>+4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

* Conneaut Valley Area for the purposes of this report includes: Conneautville and Springboro Boroughs and Beaver, Conneaut, Spring, and Summerhill Townships.


**SOURCES:** Crawford County Planning Commission staff analyses of U. S. Census data.
POPULATION FORECAST

There are several different methods which can be used to calculate future population; some of them are simple, while others are extremely complicated. All, however, are estimates based upon our knowledge of past trends and our understanding of future constraints. As such, the forecasts discussed here reflect different assumptions concerning the future population of Summerhill Township. One such assumption is that U. S. Steel may build its large steel making complex in nearby Erie County. These forecasts should not be interpreted as anything more exact than educated guesses.

Five methods were utilized to project population: These methods are as follows: 1) Arithmetic Extrapolation - a projection of past population changes into the future; 2) Linear Regression - the mathematical line which best expresses past population changes into the future; 3) Housing Count Method - based on housing changes from 1970 through 1980; 4) Proration of the County Comprehensive Plan forecast and 5) a consideration of the proposed U. S. Steel plant impact population on Summerhill Township. The following is an explanation of these methods and the accompanying results.

Arithmetic Extrapolation

This method involves the calculation of previous population trends and the projection of these trends into the future. Four previous trends were calculated for this projection. These are the population changes according to the U. S. Census between 1940 and 1970, 1960 and 1970, 1940 and 1975 and 1970 and 1975. (See Table 7 Comparison of Population Trends Conneaut Valley Area.) The resulting forecasts however are based upon the assumption that future growth will follow these same past trends.

Between 1940 and 1970, Summerhill averaged an increase of 5.3 percent per decade. Projecting this same rate of growth over the three decades from 1970 to 2000 indicates the following future populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Forecast</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These projections show Summerhill's population in the year 2000 increasing over the 1970 population by 16.7 percent (161 persons).

The rate of growth between 1960 and 1970 (5.8 percent) was higher than the average between 1940 and 1970 (5.3 percent) causing a higher population forecast when projected to the year 2000. If just the 1940 to 1970 growth rate is used, the following projections result:
These forecasts are slightly higher than the previous set.

A projection of the rate of change from 1940 to 1975 results in somewhat lower forecasts than the previous two. The reason for this is that the U. S. Bureau of the Census has calculated a drop in Summerhill's population in its 1975 population estimates. (U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P. 25, No. 686, May 1977.) Using this estimate, the rate of population growth from 1940 to 1975 is 2.5 percent per decade which results in the following forecast:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Forecast</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This forecast is somewhat lower than the previous two.

As mentioned earlier, the Bureau of the Census has estimated a loss for Summerhill's population in its 1975 estimate. This estimate is based on tax returns and available birth and death rate information. If correct, Summerhill's population in 1980 may be less than in 1970 (963) despite other indications in the three previous forecasts. Assuming that the Census estimate of 893 for 1975 is accurate, the rate of population change from 1970 to 1975 was -7.3 percent. Projecting this trend into the future gives us the following forecast:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Forecast</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>1,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This projection indicates 351 fewer people in Summerhill Township by the year 2000 than in 1970, a highly unlikely situation.

Though it is difficult to say which, if any, of these forecasts is a more accurate prediction of future population, an examination of housing growth (discussed further on in this report) between 1970 and 1980 indicates that the Bureau of the Census may have significantly underestimated Summerhill's growth during the 1970's.

Linear Regression Method

This method is best explained by saying that a series of past population figures are mathematically plotted over a period of time. Then "the best fitting" straight line is drawn through these points and continued into the future. The "best fitting" line is actually
the straight line which comes as close as possible to all of the plotted points. This process is done mathematically, but can also be plotted on a graph, if one desires. By utilizing population figures from the U.S. Census for the years 1940, 1950, 1960 and 1970 the following projections were derived:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Forecast</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Census estimate for 1975 is plotted using this method, very different results are obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Forecast</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Count Method**

The 1970 Census showed 294 housing units in Summerhill Township. Of these, 250 were occupied conventional units and 13 were occupied mobile homes. The remainder were vacant or seasonal units. According to a field survey conducted by the Crawford County Planning Commission in the Fall of 1979 there were 397 residential structures, some with possibly more than one living unit. Of these, 295 were occupied houses, 95 were mobile homes; four were abandoned and three were vacant. Using the Census averages of 3.2 persons per household and 2.3 persons per mobile home, the 1979 population of Summerhill would appear to be around 1,162 people.

Another housing situation which should be taken into consideration is the establishment in April 1979 of the Rolling Fields Nursing Home within the Township. This facility added 121 elderly people to the Township's population.

Using the estimated population for 1979 based on housing changes (1,162) and the linear regression technique with the population changes from 1940 - 1970, the following is obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Forecast</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the 121 occupants of the nursing home are added as a constant figure for each decade, the following forecast results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Forecast</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This constant is based on the existing bed capacity of the facility.
Proration of County Comprehensive Plan Forecast

The Crawford County Comprehensive Plan includes a projection of county-wide population to the year 2000. This forecast was done through the careful use of 1970 Census figures and the Cohort Survival technique. By averaging Summerhill's percentage of the County's population for the last four decades and applying that percentage to the County's predicted population for 1980, 1990 and 2000, we obtain a population forecast based on past trends. Summerhill's percentage of the County's population averaged 1.2 percent. This method provides the following forecast:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Forecast</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preceding forecasts are extremely varied. But which, if any of these predictions is accurate? Since the most recent information concerning the population of Summerhill is the housing survey conducted in fall of 1979 it seems reasonable to assume that the population of Summerhill is growing. Therefore, by discounting the 1975 Census estimates which predict a loss for 1980, we can average the remaining forecasts to obtain an overall average forecast. Table 8, Summary of Population Forecasts, shows the results of all methods used and the overall average forecast for the Township.

**TABLE 8**

**SUMMARY OF POPULATION FORECASTS**

**SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic Extrapolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 - 1970 Trend</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 - 1970 Trend</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1940 - 1975 Trend</strong></td>
<td>963</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>1,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1970 - 1975 Trend</strong></td>
<td>963</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Regression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 - 1970 Trend</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1940 - 1975 Trend</strong></td>
<td>963</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Count *** 1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Regression 1940-1979</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Plan Proration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 Cohort Survival</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE (minus 1975 estimate)</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:  
* 1970 U. S. Census  
*** Existing Land Use Survey, Fall 1979 - Crawford County Planning Commission
None of the preceding methods takes into account the 121 beds recently added to the Township by the Rolling Fields Nursing Home. Assuming that the number of residents in the nursing home remains the same until the year 2000, the overall "average" forecast population in Table 8 can be increased by 121 persons. The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Forecast</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another factor which has not been included thus far in the population forecasts is the potential impact of U. S. Steel on the Township's future population. This factor along with any number of unpredictable events could vary Summerhill's future population considerably. Therefore, it should be understood that the forecasts which have been presented in this Section are merely predictions based upon assumptions and should be considered as such.

PRELIMINARY 1980 CENSUS FIGURES

Since this Plan was begun before the 1980 Census was taken in April of 1980, the current population figures and the Population Forecast used in the Background are based on 1970 Census information. In June of this year preliminary 1980 population and housing counts for Summerhill Township and Crawford County were released by the Bureau of the Census. The following narrative is a brief update and analysis of this information. Bear in mind that these figures may be adjusted slightly later in the year when the final Census counts are officially established.

The 1980 preliminary Census count places Summerhill's 1980 population at 1214. This is an increase of 26.1 percent over the Township's 1970 population, or a gain of 251 people. Almost half of this large population gain can be accounted for by the influx of 121 residents in the Rolling Fields Nursing Home when it was opened in 1979. The remaining 130 people are a combination of the natural growth increase and new residents of the Township.

The number of housing units reported in the preliminary count is 412 units. This is 118 more units than the 294 units reported by the 1970 Census. Although 55 units are reported as being vacant, there is still an increase of 63 units, or 357 total housing units in use. Summerhill averaged 307 persons per household in 1980 as compared to 3.43 per household in 1970.

This preliminary information indicates that the population forecast based on the housing changes method shown earlier in this report is probably the most accurate. That forecast predicted the following:
### Year 1980 1990 2000

| Population Forecast | 1,222 | 1,293 | 1,361 |

Obviously, the population of Summerhill is growing, and as the 1980 information indicates, perhaps faster than most people realize.

### U. S. STEEL GROWTH

In light of U. S. Steel's proposal to construct the world's largest steel making facility along Lake Erie in nearby Ashtabula and Erie Counties, the Northwest Pennsylvania Futures Committee developed potential population impact figures for all communities expected to be impacted in Crawford and Erie Counties. These projections were based on an expected primary and secondary growth to the entire area of approximately 40,000 people by 1990. This assumes that construction would begin in the first half of the 1980's. For planning purposes the 40,000 people were divided equally between Ohio and Pennsylvania giving each state an impact of approximately 20,000 new people in relatively unpopulated areas.

The Futures Committee predicted that Crawford County can expect between 5,500 and 5,800 people out of Pennsylvania's share of the 20,000. Since the Conneaut Valley and the Route 18 corridor are considered prime locations for future settlement of U. S. Steel workers, Summerhill Township can expect approximately 320 new persons by 1990 if U. S. Steel builds.

If we accept the previous forecast of 1,293 people by 1990 for the Township and add the impact from U. S. Steel, Summerhill's 1990 population could reach 1,643 persons. This would be an increase of 650 people over the 1970 population of 963, or an increase by almost seventy-one percent (70.7%) in just twenty years. If our previous forecast without U. S. Steel is close to being accurate, the increase from 1970 to 1990 will be 330 people, or a percentage increase by thirty-four percent (34.3%) over the twenty year period.

Suffice it to say that whichever forecast is correct, present trends in housing and future events, such as U. S. Steel, should be monitored closely by Township and school district officials.
ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

This section of the Background presents an analysis of economic trends in Summerhill Township using employment and income statistics from the 1970 U. S. Census and more recent information from the local tax collector. Jobs and income are important indicators of a community's economic vitality. Thus, the narrative which follows is divided into two sections; one on employment and one on income. This analysis should provide a good baseline to which future economic trends can be compared. As a planning tool it can be a helpful resource when land use decisions or other Township policies are made which might have an effect on the local economy.

EMPLOYMENT

The Labor Force

The labor force generally includes persons fourteen years and older who are classified as employed or unemployed, excluding members of the armed forces, people who work less than fifteen hours a week, students, housewives, retired persons, inmates of institutions and persons who cannot work due to long term physical or mental illness.

TABLE 9

LABOR FORCE CHARACTERISTICS
SUMMERHILL AND CRAWFORD COUNTY - 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>EMPLOYED</th>
<th>IN LABOR FORCE</th>
<th>(TOTAL)</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>OUTSIDE LABOR FORCE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>(TOTAL)</th>
<th>TOTAL GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHILL</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(241)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHILL</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>(246)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHILL</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(366)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>(366)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% TOTAL GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>(20 819)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3 360</td>
<td>6 946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>(11 108)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>3 659</td>
<td>16 042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>1 119</td>
<td>(31 927)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>7 019</td>
<td>22 988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% TOTAL GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Census 1970
As shown in Table 9, Summerhill Township's labor force in 1969 totalled 366 people. Of these, 343 were employed while the other 23 were unemployed. The table also reveals that 47 percent of the Township residents over 14 years old were employed and 3 percent were unemployed. By adding these percentages (46.9% + 3.1%) we can see that 50 percent, or exactly one-half of Summerhill's residents in this age group were members of the labor force. Of those in the labor force, 66 percent were men, and 34 percent were women.

Of the fifty percent not included in the labor force, ten percent of the residents were in institutions. This number is much larger than the county average, and may be due to the number of elderly in nursing homes. Ten percent of the residents over fourteen years old were in school and thirty percent were not included in the labor force for other reasons. Many of these people were retired or housewives.

Table 9 does not show the unemployment rate, but rather the percent (3.1%) of non-employed persons in the entire age group when the 1970 Census was taken. The unemployment rate for the Township is derived by dividing the number of unemployed by the total labor force (23 ÷ 366 X 100 = 6.3%). Notice that this percentage is different than the three percent unemployed mentioned earlier. This is because three percent of all Township residents (fourteen years and older) were not employed, whereas six percent of the Township's labor force were unemployed. This emphasizes the difference between those people actually in the labor force and that part of the total population old enough to be in the labor force.

This six percent unemployment rate compares to a three and one-half percent unemployment rate for the county during the same period. Since no statistics on the current employment picture are kept by Summerhill Township it will be difficult to make accurate current comparisons until the 1980 Census. Should you wish to try your own comparison, the following unemployment rates are provided for western Crawford County, the state and the nation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W. Crawford Co.</th>
<th>Penn.</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 1980</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment By Industry And Occupation

Table 10, provides data on employed persons by industrial classification and by sex. Each employee is placed into the category which best describes the industry in which he or she is employed. As shown in the table, the largest number of workers were employed in manufacturing. These workers totalled over half of the Township's labor force with twenty-seven percent in durable goods and twenty-three percent in non-durable goods. Professional services and wholesale/retail trade ranked second and third with sixteen and fourteen percent respectively.
TABLE 10

EMPLOYMENT BY MAJOR INDUSTRY
SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP AND CRAWFORD COUNTY - 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDUSTRY TYPE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% TOTAL SUMMERHILL</th>
<th>% TOTAL COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Forestry</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (Durable Goods)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (Non-Durable Goods)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and Retail Trade</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Repair Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/Recreation Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry not reported</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EMPLOYED</strong></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: U. S. Census 1970

Women far outnumbered men in the professional services category. This is probably because of larger number of women school teachers and other professionals living in the area. There were also quite a few women employed in the manufacture of non-durable goods. The third highest employer of women in the area was wholesale/retail trade.

On the county level, as in Summerhill, professional services and wholesale/retail trade ranked next in importance behind manufacturing. Manufacturing of non-durable goods, however, employed a much higher percentage of Summerhill residents than County residents. This is probably due to the fact that the Albro Packing Co. in Springboro was still operative in 1969. This would also account for the large percentage of women employed in the manufacture of non-durable goods, i.e. pickles. Summerhill Township also had a larger percentage of workers in agriculture/forestry than the county.

Employed Township and County residents (fourteen years and older) by occupation and by sex are examined in Table 11. This table provides more specific information as to the type of work each individual does. For example, it is sometimes not enough to know that a person is involved in some type of manufacturing; it is
also useful to know whether that person is a foreman or a laborer. This table gives a better idea of the skills and trades Summerhill Township residents rely upon for employment.

TABLE 11
COMPARISON OF OCCUPATION GROUPS
SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP AND CRAWFORD COUNTY - 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% TOTAL SUMMERHILL</th>
<th>% TOTAL COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers/Administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen/Foremen</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Operators</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Except farm)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Laborers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers/Farm Managers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-household Services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Workers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported Occupation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EMPLOYED</strong></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>100.0%*</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures may not add due to rounding

The largest classification is that of operatives with approximately thirty-six percent of all Township residents employed in this field. This category covers a wide variety of job activities, including: insulation workers, assemblers, manufacturing checkers, station attendants, furnace workers, meat cutters, welders, etc. It would include most workers in a pickle plant. Non-household services was the second largest group with almost seventeen percent. This was followed by craftsmen/foremen with thirteen percent. Professional/technical workers comprised almost ten percent and farmers made up eight percent of the work force.

The information in Table 12 provides a reasonably accurate accounting of where Summerhill Township residents worked in 1978. As can be seen from this table, three hundred sixty residents worked outside of the Township. Of these people approximately eighty-five percent worked in Crawford County - most of them in Meadville or Conneautville. Just over eight percent worked in Erie County mostly in the City of Erie or Albion. Only about one a half percent worked in Ohio.
### Table 12

#### Employment Location of Residents Working Outside of Summerhill Township - 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Employed</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crawford County</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie County</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence County</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>360</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** These employment figures do not include full-time farm workers, or residents working inside Township.

**Source:** Wage Tax Collector, Summerhill Township, data organized by Crawford County Planning Commission staff.
Very few residents actually worked in the Township. In fact, five people are employed by the Township and eight people are full-time farmers. The rest of those working in the Township are self-employed or working at the area nursing home. As job opportunities are few in the Township, practically all of Summerhill's labor force seeks employment elsewhere.

INCOME

The economic vitality of a municipality is usually measured by the unemployment rate and the incomes of those residing in the community. These statistics are most meaningful when compared with the income indicators of surrounding areas. The following table provides the information necessary for such a comparison.

TABLE 13
FIVE YEAR INCOME COMPARISONS
CONNEAUT VALLEY AND CRAWFORD COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill Township</td>
<td>$8,333</td>
<td>$12,158</td>
<td>$2,369</td>
<td>$3,456</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>$6,972</td>
<td>$10,172</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Township</td>
<td>$9,724</td>
<td>$14,343</td>
<td>$2,312</td>
<td>$3,410</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>$9,412</td>
<td>$13,383</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conneaut Township</td>
<td>$8,380</td>
<td>$11,740</td>
<td>$2,020</td>
<td>$2,090</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>$7,715</td>
<td>$10,809</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>1,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conneautville Borough</td>
<td>$9,225</td>
<td>$13,146</td>
<td>$2,491</td>
<td>$3,550</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>$7,653</td>
<td>$10,906</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Township</td>
<td>$8,269</td>
<td>$12,618</td>
<td>$2,041</td>
<td>$3,114</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>$7,308</td>
<td>$11,152</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboro Borough</td>
<td>$7,570</td>
<td>$11,665</td>
<td>$2,231</td>
<td>$3,438</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>$6,913</td>
<td>$10,653</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford County</td>
<td>$8,323</td>
<td>$13,173</td>
<td>$2,637</td>
<td>$3,726</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>$7,580</td>
<td>$10,711</td>
<td>8,342</td>
<td>85,357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1975 Family Mean Income is a linear projection based on the percent increase of per capita income.

* Total Mean Income is the average of all mean family incomes and all unrelated individual mean incomes.


In 1969 according to the U. S. Census the per capita income for Summerhill Township was $2,369 and ranked second highest of the six municipalities. This figure was obtained by dividing the total income for the Township by the total number of residents in the Township. By the end of 1974, the Township's per capita income was $3,456 a forty-six percent increase. This increase, however, simply allowed Summerhill to remain second in rank among the six municipalities in per capita income. In the "Family Mean" income category the Township ranked fourth both in 1970 and 1975.

On a county-wide basis, Summerhill's income figures were always slightly less than the county average. The 1970 family mean for the Township was $990 below the County's and the 1975 family mean...
was $1,015 less. The per capita income for Summerhill was approximately $270 less than the County's for both 1969 and 1974.

Table 14 compares the relative numbers of people in a given income range and shows the changes in these incomes between 1969 and 1978. The table is based on two sources. The 1969 source is the U. S. Census while the 1978 source is local wage tax information. This means that only those persons who filed 1978 wage tax returns are included. This accounts for the lack of information in the "no income" category for 1978.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME RANGES FOR PERSONS 14 YEARS AND OLDER BY SEX</th>
<th>SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP 1969 - 1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0% | 332 | 241 | 573 | TOTALS | 361 | 129 | 232 | 100.0% |

Note: Persons with "No Income" are not included in grand total or percentages.


In looking at the table one sees that about fourteen percent of the income earners in 1969 made less than $1,000 per year. By 1978, this had dropped to just over eight percent who were making less than $1,000 annually. In 1969, no women made over $7,000 per year; by 1978, however, forty-one women were making over $7,000 per year and eighteen were earning more than $10,000 annually. In 1969, men were fairly well distributed among the income ranges, tapering off a bit after $8,000 a year. By 1978, the men formed a group at the $10,000 to $25,000 range.
INTRODUCTION

The condition and availability of housing is important in that it affects a community's ability to attract new residents and maintain present ones. Summerhill Township, being primarily a rural community, has no apartment buildings and very few two-family residences. This means that the Township attracts people interested in single family housing or mobile homes. This section of the background analyzes the current housing situation based on past trends and recent field information. The analysis deals mainly with single family and mobile home units.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The 1970 U.S. Census reported a total of 294 housing units in Summerhill; 240 were occupied by the owner and twenty-three were renter occupied. Of the remaining thirty-one residences, twenty-three were vacant, three were vacant seasonal units, three were for rent and two were for sale. There was an average of six rooms per unit and approximately 3.7 persons per occupied unit. Twenty-six units did not have a complete kitchen and thirty-five were not equipped with indoor plumbing facilities. The average market value for owner occupied units was $9,029.

Table 15 is a compilation of the results of an exterior field survey conducted by the Crawford County Planning Commission in the summer of 1970 to assess the quality of area housing and to determine the extent of dilapidation of the County's housing resources. It should be noted that this survey was a "windshield" survey done on a county-wide scale. It does, however, give a valid comparison of what the housing conditions were like during 1970 in the Conneaut Valley area compared to the rest of the County. Residential structures were rated in one of three classifications: sound (good), deteriorating (fair) and dilapidated (poor).

A house was considered to be dilapidated if the original construction was inadequate; if any major structural flaw was observable; if it lacked a foundation or if an accumulation of minor deficiencies was observed. Minor deficiencies included a lack of normal maintenance of things such as painting, replacing windows or broken steps, roofing and the like. Three or more minor deficiencies observed in any one structure would place that structure in the dilapidated classification.
# TABLE 15

## SUPPLY AND CONDITION OF HOUSING

### CONNEAUT VALLEY AREA - 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BEAVER TWP.</th>
<th>CONNEAUT TWP.</th>
<th>CONNEAUT-VILLE TWP.</th>
<th>SPRING TWP.</th>
<th>SPRING-BORO</th>
<th>SUMMER-HILL TWP.</th>
<th>CONNEAUT VALLEY AREA TOTAL</th>
<th>CRAWFORD COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING SUPPLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Units</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>31,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Round Units</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>27,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEAR ROUND VACANT UNITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Percent Vacant    | 14.2%       | 18.3%         | 6.1%                | 8.6%        | 1.1%        | 9.6%             | 10.1%                      | 8.6%            |
*Percent Available | 2.6%        | 2.3%          | 2.8%                | 1.0%        | .0%         | 1.7%             | 1.8%                       | 2.6%            |
| **CONDITION OF HOUSING** |       |               |                     |             |             |                  |                            |                 |
| Percent Deteriorating | 66.8%       | 53.6%         | 27.7%               | 47.1%       | 22.0%       | 41.2%            | 44.4%                      | 25.2%           |
| Number Deteriorating | 155         | 277           | 100                 | 195         | 40          | 121              | 888                        | 7,840           |
| Percent Dilapidated | 22.0%       | 27.9%         | 8.9%                | 11.8%       | 11.5%       | 19.0%            | 17.7%                      | 10.9%           |
| Number Dilapidated | 51          | 144           | 32                  | 49          | 21          | 56               | 353                        | 3,390           |

**NOTE:** Residents of the Conneaut Valley do not normally consider Conneaut Township as part of the "Valley" area.

**SOURCES:**
- U. S. Census - 1970;
- Crawford County Comprehensive Plan; data compiled by Crawford County Planning Commission staff.

* Percent Vacant and Percent Available do not include seasonal units.
Deteriorating structures were those where one or two minor deficiencies were noted. Structures were classified as sound if no major structural deficiencies or minor problems were observed.

Adequacy of internal features, however, was simply disregarded as there was no way to easily judge them. It can be assumed that an interior inspection would have increased the number of structures considered to be deteriorating or dilapidated.

In Summerhill Township, 121 structures were considered to be dilapidated. The fact that 236 homes were built before 1940 would lead one to assume that deterioration of housing has continued since 1970. Recent field observations (but not an actual survey) in 1979 and 1980 indicate, however, that deterioration is not the trend. Nonetheless, the condition of housing should not be ignored. Township Officials should monitor the housing stock from time to time so that potential problems can be identified and prevented.

The availability of housing for sale or rent in rural areas is generally much lower than in urban areas. However, when fewer than one percent of all housing units are available for turnover, the choices for people seeking housing become very limited. At the time of the 1970 Census, there were two housing units available for sale and three for rent in Summerhill. Obviously the selection was limited. Although the 1970 figures are now ten years old, the situation in the Township has not changed significantly since then.

GROWTH INDICATORS

According to the 1979 County Planning Commission land use survey, there were 397 residences in the Township. Of these 295 were permanent homes, 95 were mobile homes, 3 were vacant and 4 were abandoned. This is an addition of 103 residences in ten years - an increase by 35 percent. Such growth makes it difficult to predict present housing availability and we must therefore wait for the 1980 Census to gauge the availability market. A more complete breakdown of area growth can be seen in Table 16 which is a summary of housing permits issued in Summerhill Township since 1974.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NEW HOMES</th>
<th>MOBILE HOMES</th>
<th>HOME ADDITIONS</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL SPACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: County Assessment Records
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

INTRODUCTION

This section of the Background for Planning provides an opportunity for the collection of up to date information on facilities and services which are currently available to the Summerhill Township Community. Such facilities and services include: municipal government services; fire, police and emergency services; schools; utilities; recreation; social and health care opportunities; transportation facilities; etc.

Appreciable population growth beyond what the Township accommodates today will mean increased demands on community facilities and services. Most likely, expansion of these services will be required at some point. The information gathered here provides the basis necessary to assess current facilities and services and begin to plan for change where the need exists.

MUNICIPAL GOVERNANCE

Summerhill Township is a Second Class Township under Pennsylvania law. As such, all powers lie with a Board of Supervisors consisting of three Supervisors elected at large by the Township residents for six year staggered terms. The Board of Supervisors meets at the Township Building on the first Saturday of each month at 9:30 a.m. to conduct the business of the Township. At the present time, the Township employs a part-time secretary, a wage tax collector and a sewage enforcement officer on an "as needed" basis. The Township is part of 24th U. S. Congressional District; the 50th State Senatorial District; the 5th State Representatives District and the Magesterial District 3-1.

The Township has several ordinances related to community development:

1. A building permit ordinance requiring the issuing of building permits in compliance with federal and state flood management legislation.
2. An ordinance governing the collection of garbage and rubbish.
3. A sewage enforcement ordinance.
4. An ordinance governing road encroachment.
5. An ordinance regulating junkyards and the storage of junked autos.

6. An ordinance creating a planning commission.

There are no zoning, subdivision, or land development ordinances in the Township; however, subdivision and land development activities can be regulated through the regulatory program of the Crawford County Planning Commission.

Summerhill Township has a relatively new township building located on Crozier Road between Pa. Route 18 and Smith Road (T-406). Four bays of its garage were built in 1973, a meeting room was added in 1976 and two bays were added to the garage in 1979. The garage houses a grader, a loader, two International plows, a tractor and mower, a truck and a spreader.

This expensive equipment is used to provide one of the most important services of municipal government - road maintenance. The Township Supervisors are responsible for the maintenance of all Township roads and bridges. Of course, in our climate, snow removal adds to that responsibility. The entire transportation system of the Township is discussed in the last portion of this section of the Background.

The Summerhill Township Planning Commission is also part of the municipal government function. It consists of nine volunteer residents appointed by the supervisors to staggered four year terms. Commission meetings are held on the third Thursday of each month and are open to the public. It is the function of the Planning Commission to undertake many responsibilities as provided in the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, Act 247 and to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

FIRE AND POLICE PROTECTION

Fire Protection. Summerhill Township residents are provided with fire protection by three volunteer fire companies: The Conneautville Fellows Club Volunteer Fire Department, the Hayfield Central Hose Company and the Harmonsburg Fire Company. Generally, the Harmonsburg Company handles any fire occurring south of Dicksonburg and the Hayfield Company handles any fire occurring east of Inlet Road. The remainder of the Township is served by the Conneautville Department. For this service, Summerhill Township donates annually to the Conneautville Volunteers and has just begun to donate money to the Summit and Hayfield companies.

The following equipment is maintained by these companies:

- **Conneautville**
  - 1 Pumper/Tanker (730 GPM/1000 Gal.)
1 Pumper (1000 GPM)
1 Grass Fire Vehicle
1 Equipment Van

Harmonsburg

1 Pumper/Tanker (1500 GPM, 1000 gal.)
1 Pumper/Tanker (500 GPM, 750 gal.)
1 Pumper/Tanker (250 GPM, 1250 gal.)
1 Grass Fire Vehicle *
* In the process of being converted to a rescue unit.

Hayfield

1 Pumper (1000 GPM)
1 Tanker (1500 Gal.)
1 Front Mount Pump (750 GPM)
1 Front Mount Pump (500 GPM)
1 Grass Fire Vehicle

Police Protection. Present police protection for Summerhill residents is obtained from the Pennsylvania State Police out of its Meadville Barracks. Their ability to respond quickly, particularly at night, has been questioned by residents.

SCHOOLS

Current Status And Needs

Summerhill Township is included in the Conneaut Valley School District. The Conneaut Valley Elementary School and the Conneaut Valley High School north of Conneautville on Route 18 provide educational opportunities for children from Summerhill and other "Valley" Communities ranging from kindergarten to the twelfth grade. Outside of the basic educational programs these facilities also provide special education programs for both handicapped and gifted children through the services of Intermediate Unit No. 5. Existing facilities are analyzed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Age And Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>584*</td>
<td>15 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Built 1959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>583*</td>
<td>20 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Built 1954)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The elementary school includes a multi-purpose room, a cafeteria, a library, a health room and an outdoor playground. The high school includes shop facilities, a cafeteria, library, health suite, gymnasium, music and art rooms and athletic fields.

* These figures include students enrolled in special and vocational - technical education.
The following needs are identified by educators for these two facilities. Elementary School: additional space for library and for special and general classrooms. High School: additional space for library, seminar use, individual instruction, large group instruction, music activities, laboratory study and indoor recreation facilities. These needs are said to exist without special population impacts. Crowded conditions are primarily the result of program increases — not pupil increases.

The Crawford County Planning Commission staff has written a paper entitled "The Public School in the Community: Issues But Perhaps No Choices". This paper can be found in the appendices of this report. It discusses in general the Pennsylvania Public School System, the powers and responsibilities of the local school district, the role of the Intermediate Unit, Federal and State Program Mandates, and the issue of the neighborhood school. Since schools are too often taken for granted, and because they are such an important part of community life, the authors think it appropriate to include this paper as a supplement, in hopes that it will be of interest and value to parents, school officials and local government decision makers.

RECREATION

Summerhill Township has two recreation facilities within its boundaries; one is public and the other is private. The public facility, the Conneaut Valley Recreation Association Park, or Shaw Park, is located along the west side of Conneaut Creek, just south of Conneautville. The facility is owned and operated by the Conneaut Valley Recreation Association and has received financial support from the United Fund.

This park provides a variety of recreation facilities for the residents of Conneaut Valley Area. Facilities include: 1 basketball court; 2 permanent pavilions with picnic tables; 2 swing sets; 2 slides; 6 teeter totters; a monkey bar set; spinning wheel; softball field; and 2 horseshoe pits. The facility also includes a swimming area in Conneaut Creek with a diving board and 2 slides. However, swimming is permitted only when water quality is good, since the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources has monitored Conneaut Creek and found occasional high harmful bacteria counts.

The Conneaut School District provides playground supervision services at the Park and the Conneaut Valley Recreation Association provides bussing services. This is a well kept facility but there are problems: (1) water quality must be monitored on a daily basis during swimming season; (2) very poor access exists into the park with railroad tracks and a stream which must be forded posing problems. This access route is owned by the Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad.
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The private recreational facility is the Indian Mound Campground located on Fish Road just west of Conneaut Creek. There are twenty-one campsites equipped with electric and water hookups, a public restroom and an area for more campers without water or electric hookups. This facility is not likely to be open much longer, however, since the owners are considering closing the campground by August, 1980, unless business improves over the previous few summers.

LIBRARY

Public library facilities are available to Township residents from the Stone Memorial Library located near the center of Conneautville Borough along the east side of Water Street at its intersection with Main Street. Operation of the library began in 1904 and is governed by a seven member Library Board. This library is freely open to Township residents by virtue of the fact that the Board of County Commissioners has created a County Library Board and provides funding on the condition that all county residents obtain free service in all participating libraries. Stone Memorial participates in this system as well as the inter-library loan program sponsored by the State Library Board which makes it possible for one to obtain virtually any book from large metropolitan library facilities.

The collection of over 5,000 books in the facility are managed by one librarian. Hours of operation are as follows: Tuesday and Thursday 2:00 to 5:30 p.m., Friday 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. and Saturday 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon. The facility has one main problem, a lack of space due to the condition and size of the library building.

UTILITIES

Sewage Disposal

In Summerhill Township sewage disposal is handled by individual on-lot septic systems, with two exceptions: The Rolling Fields Nursing Home and Country Side Mobile Home Estates. Rolling Fields Nursing home was tied in at their own expense to the Northwest Crawford County Sewer Authority system which serves Conneautville Borough. Country Side Mobile Home Estates, has it's own private sewage treatment system.

Private residential connections with the Sewer Authority system are not currently available to the residents of Summerhill and small "package plant" sewage treatment systems, such as at the mobile home park, are expensive. Thus it is reasonably safe to assume that most future development in Summerhill will use individual on-lot septic systems. This is not to say, however, that the area immediately around Conneautville might not someday be included as
an extended part of the areawide Northwest Crawford County Sewer Authority system. (See section on Natural Resources for information on soil capability for on-lot sewage disposal systems.)

Water

Summerhill Township has no public water system. Most residents obtain their water from individual wells. (See the Natural Resources section for information on ground water.) Residents who live close to Conneautville, however, have sometimes found it less expensive to hook up to the Conneautville water system than to drill their own wells.

The Rolling Fields Nursing Home has an eight inch pipe directly connecting it to the Conneautville water tower. The Country Side Mobile Home Estates also has a private line connection to the Conneautville Water System. Also, two houses on Shermansville Road in Summerhill are served by the Conneautville system as well as four buildings on Canal Road. These lines are all private lines built at the expense of the owner, who also pays for the water used.

Electricity

Electric power is provided to Township residents from two sources: The Pennsylvania Electric Company (Penelec) and the Northwestern Rural Electric Cooperative Association (REA). A great deal of the Summerhill area is served by regular, single phase lines (7.2 K.V.) which provide sufficient energy for normal use but not enough to run anything larger than a five horsepower motor.

Penelec and REA have some lines in the Township also capable of providing three phase (7.2/12.47 K.V.) service which can provide sufficient energy for larger motors and industrial plants. These three phase lines are located along Pa. Route 198 from Conneautville to Norrisville; along L. R. 20042 from Hayfield Township to Route 18 then north along Route 18 to Wiseman Road and west along Fish Road to Conneaut Township; along L. R. 20047 from Norrisville to Spring Township; and along the western border of the Township from Summit Township along Shaw Road and L. R. 20038. There is also a double phase line along Canal Road to Dicksonburg and there is a three phase 34.5 K.V. line along the Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad tracks. This 34.5 K.V. three phase line is the best line in Summerhill Township for industrial use.

Penelec and REA have defined jurisdictional areas governed by Pennsylvania's New Territorial Act of 1975, and neither company can encroach on the other's territory. The Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission (PUC) requires that each company must be capable of serving increased demand within their service areas. Both companies are able to do this very adequately.
OTHER FACILITIES AND SERVICES

**Telephone**

The Mid-Penn Telephone Corporation provides phone service to Summerhill Township. The present system can handle a reasonable amount of growth without needing improvements. Any large scale development in outlying areas, (areas some distance from Route 18) however, would require improvements to the system.

**Gas**

There is no gas service in Summerhill Township. Domestic gas needs are generally met by local propane and fuel oil distributors or by individual sources, i.e. those who have their own gas wells.

**Solid Waste Disposal**

The Township does not provide garbage or trash pick up services for its residents. As there are no dumps in the Township or in the surrounding area, most residents either arrange for private refuse services or handle the waste disposal on their own property. Those choosing the second alternative must abide by state regulations. It is felt that there is a countywide solid waste disposal problem primarily because none of the many governments in the county are financially able to provide a solution to the problem on their own.

**Medical and Emergency Services**

The only medical facility in the Summerhill Township area is the Conneaut Valley Health Center located in Conneautville. This Center began operating in August of 1977 after several years of dormancy due to the lack of a practicing physician in the area. It now operates under the direction of Community Health Services of Crawford County Inc., a private nonprofit corporation.

The Health Center provides several much needed services in the area. It is responsible for the medical care of all the residents of the Rolling Fields Nursing Home as well as the residents of Bethesda House. The Center also performs all of the required physical examinations for the students of the Conneaut Valley High School and Elementary School. The Center also provides "fee for service" medical care to the general public five days a week. It's staff includes a physician as medical director, a nurse practitioner, a registered nurse, a family health specialist, and receptionist. Primary care services are emphasized along with emergency service, x-ray and lab work, nutritional programs, public health screening, mental health counseling, drug and alcohol abuse service and referral.
The Health Center staff has several future goals which can greatly benefit the surrounding communities. They wish to expand into medical specialties such as podiatry, gynecology and allergy treatment. They would also like to expand the school physical examination program and give more extensive physicals to the students and establish low cost medical screening. They are also trying to interest other health related groups to get involved in their programs. These projects and any others proposed by the Health Center will need the financial support from area communities as well as a better understanding of the Center's function.

Ambulance and Rescue Service

The Conneautville Fire Department provides ambulance and rescue service with backup from Albion. Less serious emergencies are taken to the Conneaut Valley Health Center during the hours when the center is open while serious and after hours cases are taken to Meadville hospitals.

Nursing Home Services

The Conneautville Nursing Home moved in April 1979, from Conneautville to a new facility in Summerhill Township just a few hundred yards from the old home. The new facility owned by Mr. & Mrs. Duane Braham was renamed the Rolling Fields Nursing Home. Established in order to provide skilled nursing care for the elderly, the Home is licensed for 121 beds and is usually filled to capacity with a long waiting list. There are 114 people on the staff who provide both intermediate and skilled care for the patients. All state requirements have been met by the home including adequate facilities, physical therapy and speech therapy.

The average age of the patients is 75, but ages range anywhere from 65 to 100. The majority of these patients come from Crawford County. Approximately eighty percent of the residents are women, which is due to the fact that women generally live longer than men.

At present, there are no plans for expansion of the facility to accommodate more people. However, a pond is being constructed near the home which will be stocked with fish and easily accessible to residents. There are also plans to convert the old nursing home building in Conneautville into residential quarters for the elderly.

The Rolling Fields Nursing Home not only provides a needed service to the area's elderly, it also provides tax revenues to the Township and job opportunities to area residents.
Social Services

Summerhill Township residents can participate in Project Head Start which is located in the Springboro Community Center. This federally funded program takes care of Conneaut Valley pre-school children from ages 3 to 5. The teachers and support staff serve the educational, health and emotional needs of these children from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. during the school year. Programs include active parent participation and are available free of charge to eligible families. Federal guidelines require that ninety percent of the participating children be from low income families, ten percent from middle to upper income families and at least ten percent must be physically or mentally handicapped.

Meals On Wheels, a service which delivers meals to people who have difficulty making meals for themselves, is also available to Summerhill Township residents who live close to Conneautville. Since the meals for this federally funded program are delivered by volunteers from Conneautville, the service has difficulty delivering meals to people who live over a mile away from the Borough.

There are many other federal and state social services available to residents at the county level.

Churches and Social Centers

There is currently one active church within Summerhill Township. The Dicksonburg United Methodist Church in Dicksonburg. Township residents also attend the Norrisville United Methodist Church in Hayfield Township on Route 198 near the Summerhill Township boundary or the churches in Conneautville. The Conneautville churches are: the Conneaut Valley Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, the Church of Christ and St. Peter's Catholic Church.

Residents of Summerhill Township are also active in the Springboro Lions Club which meets at the Springboro Community Center.

TRANSPORTATION

Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad

The Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad runs from Conneautville to the Summit Township border in Summerhill Township. The railroad exists primarily to serve the U. S. Steel Corporation, but as a public carrier it will serve areas along the railroad which have sufficient demand to justify the expense. This railroad could be important to future growth in the Township.
Road System

One of the most important services provided by the elected officials of the Township is the maintenance of a large segment of the road system within the Township. Summerhill’s road system is extensive and its most important public investment. There are a total of 59.45 miles of roads, of which 34.45 miles are Township roads and 25 miles are state roads. On a percentage basis the Township maintains 58 percent of the roads and the State 42 percent.

All Township roads are unpaved gravel roads except for a small segment of Canal Road just west of Route 18. State roads have either a tar and chip pavement or a bituminous surface, except for Carr Road (L.R. 20048) which has an oiled surface. Township roads vary in right-of-way width from 50 feet to 33 feet, and the cartway, or travelway, varies from 16 to 18 feet. State roads all have a 50 feet right-of-way and a pavement or cartway width from 18 to 22 feet. The following is a list of Township roads by name, route number, right-of-way width and miles:

- Abbot Road T995 33 ft. R-O-W .60 mi.
- Atroskin Road T364 50 ft. R-O-W .30 mi.
- Canal Road T402 40 ft. R-O-W 4.20 mi.
- Cemetery Road T906 33 ft. R-O-W .20 mi.
- Center Road T420 50 ft. R-O-W 2.70 mi.
- Cooper Road T747 50 ft. R-O-W .25 mi.
- Crozier Road T727 50 ft. R-O-W .50 mi.
- Fish Road T693 50 ft. R-O-W 1.90 mi.
- Hill Road T691 33 ft. R-O-W 3.70 mi.
- Inlet Road T454 50 ft. R-O-W 4.20 mi.
- McDowell Road T404 50 ft. R-O-W .70 mi.
- Mershon Road T418 50 ft. R-O-W .70 mi.
- Morris Road T456 50 ft. R-O-W 2.10 mi.
- Robinson Road T647 50 ft. R-O-W 1.40 mi.
- Shaw Road T360 50 ft. R-O-W .70 mi.
- Shermansville Road T382 & 392 50 ft. R-O-W 2.70 mi.
- Smith Road T406 50 ft. R-O-W 1.10 mi.
- Wing Road T489 50 ft. R-O-W 5.40 mi.
- Wiseman Road T695 50 ft. R-O-W .70 mi.
- Woodring Road T428 33 ft. R-O-W .40 mi.

Besides providing year around maintenance for these roads, the Supervisors must also maintain all ditches, culverts and bridges on Township roads. There are nine bridges maintained by the Township, two bridges maintained by the County and seven state bridges. All Township bridges are in good condition however five of these are single lane bridges. Both county bridges are single lane bridges and the one on Smith Road just south of Cooper Road only has a four ton limit. The state bridges appear to be in good condition, however,
there is one narrow bridge on Dicksonburg Road crossing Inlet Run. PennDOT recently constructed a new bridge on Route 18 just south of Conneautville.

Posted Roads and Bridges Up to the present time the Township has not found it necessary to post weight limits on Township roads. However, the Township bridge over Conneaut Creek on Wing Road is posted at 14 tons. The State has no posted roads or bridges. Both bridges maintained by the County are posted. The one on Fish Road over Conneaut Creek is posted at 14 tons, and the other on Smith Road has a 4 ton limit.

The County bridge on Smith Road is a one lane steel truss bridge with a wood plank deck. It is well maintained by the County Commissioners, but the four ton weight limit prevents school buses, heavy trucks, fire trucks or Township plow trucks from crossing. For this reason the bridge is a bottle neck in the road systems of both Summerhill and Spring Townships.

Railroad Crossings There are three at grade road crossings with the Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad. Two of these are unprotected crossings on Wing Road and Fish Road. The third is the Dicksonburg Road crossing (L.R. 20042) with the Bessemer at Dicksonburg. The railroad improved the crossing and installed a signal light and gate system at Dicksonburg early in 1980. Maintenance of the crossing surface on all roads is up to the railroad. Their maintenance has been generally acceptable.

Worth Mention There is private road and bridge in the Township worth mention. The road goes north from the curve at the north end of Canal Road, crosses a timber bridge and the Bessemer tracks giving access to a house on the west side of the tracks and to Shockey Park, the Conneaut Valley Recreation Association park. This short section of road and the bridge are owned and maintained by the Bessemer Railroad. The bridge is a sturdy timber bridge built by the railroad approximately three years ago.

Average Daily Traffic (ADT) The Average Daily Traffic count is a system for expressing the number of vehicles which use roads on a daily average. PennDOT keeps ADT statistics for the important roads in its system. The following are ADT's for state roads in Summerhill Township as updated by the Crawford County Planning Commission in cooperation with PennDOT for 1978:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>ADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 18</td>
<td>2,486 (Conneautville to Dicksonburg Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 198</td>
<td>2,599 (Dicksonburg Road to Harmonsburg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicksonburg Road</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.R. 20038 to Route 18</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.R. 20047</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Federal Functional Classification System  The Federal Government through staff assistance from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) maintains a classification system for all roads throughout the State. This system is called the Federal Functional Classification System. Federal funding and in many cases state funding priorities for highways are allocated according to this system. The categories listed below show how the roads in Summerhill Township are classified under the Federal System:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Route 18</td>
<td>(L.R. 295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>Route 198</td>
<td>(L.R. 85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Collector</td>
<td>L.R. 20038</td>
<td>(Shaw Road to Conneautville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>L.R. 20047</td>
<td>(Boundary with Hayfield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All remaining state and Township roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to realize that Minor Collector and Local roads do not receive federal funding assistance for upkeep; but Minor Arterial and Major Collector roads are eligible for such aid. Minor Collector and Local roads must be maintained through state and local money. The one exception to this rule is the Federal Off-Systems Funding Program which does make federal money available through the State for specific projects on Minor Collector or Local roads. At the present time most of this Off-Systems money is going into bridges. Also, to qualify for the Off-Systems program any road must have a minimum cartway width of twenty feet. The Federal Functional Classification System is an important guide to planning for the level of service on roads, and thus is an important factor in planning for future use of land.

Problem Analysis  An analysis of the existing transportation system in the Township for safety concerns, road alignment and general maintenance has raised several concerns. These concerns are listed below as determined by the Planning Commission.

TOWNSHIP ROADS

- A hazardous condition exists at the intersection of Hill and Inlet Roads because the line of sight is blocked by trees. Even though there is a stop sign on Inlet Road, the trees sometimes make it difficult for drivers to see oncoming vehicles.
A hazardous condition exists on Shermansville Road (T-382) just north of Fish Road where there is the combination of a hill, sharp curve and a narrow bridge at the bottom of the hill.

- Abbot Road (T-995) is narrow and has a blind vertical curve (hump).

- Robinson Road (T-647) where it intersects with Route 18 can be hazardous, particularly in the winter, because of its steep grade.

- The Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad crosses two Township roads at unguarded grade crossings. Each of these is a potential hazard.

The Township does a good to excellent job of maintaining its gravel roads and its bridges. There are weather conditions in the spring which make maintenance of gravel roads very difficult, but most residents accept this temporary inconvenience as just part of rural living.

STATE ROADS

- There is a vertical curve on Route 198 just east of the Smith Road intersection which makes it difficult for a vehicle stopped on Smith Road to see oncoming traffic on 198 in time to make a safe entry onto or cross Route 198. This situation combined with a hill and curve near the mobile home park on 198 make this stretch of Route 198 potentially hazardous.

- The S curve on Route 198 just west of Norrisville is a hazard because of sight distance, narrow pavement and the intensity of the curve itself.

- The pavement width of Route 198 through most of the Township is too narrow to facilitate safe passing of wide vehicles, such as; semi-trailers.

The normal maintenance of state roads is inconsistent and allows far too many dangerous pot holes to exist, particularly in the spring of the year.

COUNTY BRIDGE

- The county bridge on Smith Road (T-406) has a weight limit of only four tons and could be a potential safety hazard.
NATURAL RESOURCES

INTRODUCTION

Aside from the human resources and the existing man-made environment, there are also the gifts and potential problems which the natural environment has bestowed upon the Township. As one will quickly see in driving through the Township, it is the natural resources; such as, the hills, valleys, streams and trees which combine their beauty to give Summerhill Township its cherished rural character. This section will briefly look into these natural surroundings to determine how they influence development. Such areas as soils, water resources; flooding problems; gas and oil resources and other natural resources will be discussed.

Mans' future use of these resources will determine the character of the Township in the years to come. The information provided here will, hopefully, lend itself to being useful in future decisions by residents and Township Officials. To ignore the effect of future land use decisions on the natural environment will be to ignore the very essence of rural character.

SOILS INFLUENCING DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

Soils influence development, or mans’ use of the land, in two significant ways. First of all soil conditions are significant to agricultural development. In many instances the soil alone will determine whether or not farm land will be productive. Secondly, the soil conditions determine whether or not residential development which depends on on-lot sewage disposal can be accommodated. In many areas of Northwestern Pennsylvania standard on-lot sewage disposal systems, or septic systems, will not work properly because of poor soil conditions.

The following section investigates the various soil conditions in Summerhill Township and their influence on development. Soils information was taken from the recently published Soil Survey of Crawford County, Pennsylvania completed by the U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service. Maps showing Agricultural Quality and On-Lot Sewage Capability in the Township have been prepared at a scale of 1 inch equals 1,000 feet from information in this soil survey. Copies of these maps can be seen at the Township Building or at the office of the Crawford County Planning Commission. (See Appendix 2 - Supporting Material.)
Agricultural Quality

Soils throughout the nation have been classified by the Soil Conservation Service according to eight "capability classifications" for agricultural use. Soil limitations for crop production become progressively greater as the classification numbers increase. To simplify things in this report the eight soil classifications were grouped into three major categories: good (Classes I and II), fair (Class III), and poor (Classes IV through VIII).

Summerhill Township has no soils in the Class I soil group, but there are several pockets of "good" Class II soils. These soils are well drained and fertile. They are found almost exclusively within the Conneaut Creek Valley and along the slopes forming the Valley. There are also some small pockets of these good soils found along Rundelltown Creek, Inlet Run, Pine Creek and to the north of Fish Creek. On a percentage basis these soils comprise only about five percent of all soils in the Township.

Soils considered "fair" for agricultural production are found in about eighty percent of the Township, mostly in areas away from the stream valleys. These soils have definite limitations for the farmer, but with good conservation and management practices they are capable of supporting profitable agricultural operations. Dairy farming, which is prevalent in the Township, can adapt well to these soils.

The remaining soils in the Township, or some fifteen percent, are considered poor for agricultural use. They are either poorly drained, have a high water table, are susceptible to flooding or are located on steep slopes. Not surprisingly, most of these poorer soils are also located in the stream valleys where there are steep slopes or danger of flooding.

On-Lot Sewage Suitability

The capability of the soil to properly filter sewage effluent is the most critical land constraint on development in rural and unserved areas. Filtering capability is based on: (1) soil permeability, (2) depth of the soil to bedrock or some other impervious layer, and (3) the slope of the land. The suitability of soils in Summerhill to adequately handle on-lot sewage disposal systems (septic systems) has been taken from Chapters 71 and 73 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources rules and regulations. They are as follows according to their limitations:

Slight - Soils that are suitable for on-lot sewage disposal using a conventional system.

Moderate - Soils that may be suitable for on-lot disposal through the use of alternate designs for disposal systems.
Severe - Soils which are not suitable for use due to impervious water restricting layers, high water tables, periodic flooding or other limiting characteristics.

Hazardous - Soils generally not suited for use due to the probability of ground water pollution. (These are generally gravelly soils which drain too quickly.)

In Summerhill the vast majority of soils, or approximately eighty percent, have a severe limitation for on-lot disposal use. Many septic systems in the Township were installed before any soil survey work was completed and before modern technology for on-lot disposal was available. Thus, there are many older systems which cause periodic problems, particularly during rainy periods or during periods of high use. Fortunately most of the population is spread out enough so that these problems usually only affect the users of the system.

When the Pennsylvania Sewage Facilities Act - Act 537 - became effective in 1968, it exempted "rural residences" on ten or more acres of land from the requirement of a permit for on-lot septic systems. As a practical matter this has meant that there is no regulation over the installation of septic systems on more than ten acres of land. This does not, however, mean that a septic system for a "rural residence" on poor soils will work properly, and it does not exempt property owners from the legal obligation not to pollute the waters of the Commonwealth.

The map of the Township (see reference in Appendix 2) showing large expanses of soils with "severe" limitations can be used only as a general guide, just as the official Soil Survey is only a general guide. There may in fact be pockets of good soil in these areas which could easily support conventional systems. In order to be certain of what actually exists, persons considering development on less than ten acres, and even over ten acres, should conduct a thorough field investigation of the soil conditions on their property.

The On-Lot Sewage Suitability map shows no area with good soil for on-lot disposal. Areas with only moderate limitations are found generally in the Conneaut Valley and along Rundelltown Creek. Areas having a hazard potential are located almost entirely along the Conneaut Creek Valley. Each of these groups comprise approximately ten percent of all the soils in the Township.

In considering future development in the Township one can see that soil conditions play an important role. Consideration may want to be given to the preservation of Class II agricultural soils so that they will still be available to the farmer of the future. Consideration must also be given to areas which will best support residential development based on soil constraints.
to on-lot sewage disposal. There are other soil related factors which should also be considered. Most of them are engineering considerations for homes with basements, new roads, erosion, sedimentation control, etc.

GROUND WATER RESOURCES

Introduction

In Summerhill Township, as in nearly all of Crawford County, water for domestic uses must be obtained from the ground. Thus, the availability of ground water throughout the Township should be considered when developing a plan for growth. Good information is available on ground water resources in Western Crawford County from a recently completed geological report entitled: Geology and Groundwater Resources of Western Crawford County, Pennsylvania. The material in this section is based entirely on that report.

Geologic Features

Ground water resources in Summerhill are directly related to the geologic features underlaying the surface upon which we live. These features are broken down into two major geologic formations: glacial drift and bedrock formations. The entire Township is covered at the surface by glacial drift and by different types of bedrock below the glacial drift.

Glacial drift is the term given to all material deposited by the glaciers which once enveloped our area. The drift varies in depth from two to twenty-six feet except in major stream valleys and low places where it can be more than a hundred feet deep. There are two types of glacial drift: outwash and till. Material deposited directly by the glaciers without any sorting is called till, which could be anything from clay to boulders. Firm till is called "hardpan" by well drillers. In some cases till deposits were sorted by the water from the melting glaciers which carried along the lighter till deposits (sand and gravel) and deposited them all together. These deposits of sand and gravel are called outwashes.

The second major geologic formation is the bedrock under the glacial drift. Before the glaciers did their work the bedrock was deposited in fairly uniform layers; one formation on top of the other in sandwich fashion. The glaciers carved much of the original bedrock away leaving more of one kind in one place and less in others. Thus the hills are places where more layers of bedrock were left and the valleys places where bedrock formations were deeply cut. Once the glaciers melted and receded the drift (rubble from bedrock) was left behind. Less drift was left on the hills as the water from the melting process carried material into the valleys leaving the
outwash deposits. If one could scrape all the earth off of the bedrock, a layer cake effect of different types of exposed bedrock would be found. Some would be sandstone, some siltstone and some shale. Each of these bedrock types has different water bearing capabilities.

The deepest bedrock found in Summerhill Township is a shale known to geologists as a Devonian Shale. It underlies the Conneaut Valley and has no other bedrock on top of it in the Valley area. In the higher areas of the Township, particularly the eastern half, the Devonian Shales are covered by several different varieties of Mississippian group bedrock formations. These include sandstones, siltstone, shales and mixtures of each.

The accompanying map, Glacial and Bedrock Deposits - Summerhill Township, shows the layer cake effect of the different bedrock deposits with the location of the glacial outwash deposits. The areas not covered by outwash are covered by glacial till deposits.

Available Ground Water

Now that we have a basic understanding of the geology affecting Summerhill Township, it is possible to examine the available ground water resources in the Township and to identify the best areas for obtaining these resources.

The average person in the United States uses between sixty and seventy gallons of water per day, and the average household uses between 200 and 250 gallons per day. Normally this usage can be supplied by a well pumping on demand if a three gallons per minute (GPM) capacity exists. Where a household can obtain only one GPM this will suffice if storage facilities are available and the household exercises care in water use. Thus, for a household to be sufficiently supplied with water, its well should have at least a three GPM pumping capacity. If water is needed for other uses such as farm irrigation or industry, a much larger pumping capacity would be necessary. Keeping this in mind, let us discover the areas in the Township best able to supply water for potential residents.

Generally, the best source of water is found in glacial outwash. In Summerhill Township there is a strip of glacial outwash along the Conneaut Creek Valley which is approximately a mile and a half wide. There are also small deposits of outwash along Rundelltown Creek and along Inlet Run. Around sixteen percent of Summerhill Township's 110 recorded wells have been completed in glacial outwash with an average yield of 12.6 GPM. One of the wells completed in this outwash produces 650 GPM and supplies the Ohio Rubber plant. Although wells in glacial outwash do not usually go deeper than a hundred feet, in Summerhill the average depth of these wells is
135.5 feet. Two of these wells are below 250 feet. The Ohio Rubber Plant well, however, is only seventy-three feet deep.

Till deposits are normally poor sources of water. In western Crawford County one fifth of the wells completed in till deposits yield less than three GPM; two thirds yield less than ten GPM; and the highest reported yield is only twenty GPM. In Summerhill Township, two wells have been recorded completed in glacial till. One of these wells, which is thirty-five feet deep, produces twelve GPM and the other, which is twenty-eight feet deep, produces five GPM. Since most of the glacial drift in Summerhill is till, well drillers usually must drill through the till and into the bedrock formations to find adequate water supplies.

Of the wells completed in bedrock in Summerhill Township thirty-seven were recorded as done in the Conewango Group of Devonian Shale. This is generally a poor aquifer in which many wells are unsuccessful. In the western county area about one fifth of the wells completed in this bedrock yield less than three GPM. In Summerhill, the wells which were successfully completed in Conewango group produce an average of 5.9 GPM. Of these, however, twenty-seven percent produce less than three GPM and sixteen percent produce less than one GPM. Another problem with wells completed in Conewango Devonian Shales is that the water can become salty and usable if the well is drilled too deeply. Most of the wells completed in this type of bedrock are located along and west of Shermansville Road and along the northern border of the Township. The average depth of these wells is ninety-seven feet.

The type of bedrock in which the second largest number of wells have been completed in Cussewago Sandstone, part of the Mississippian Group. This is the best bedrock aquifer in the western County but it can be poor where it is thin and cemented. In Summerhill Township thirty-three wells were recorded as completed in this type of bedrock. Of these, the average depth was 91.2 feet and the average yield 16.5 GPM. The wells completed in this bedrock was generally in the uplands east of Center Road or in the southwest corner of the Township. Only one of these wells yielded less than three GPM; it gave two GPM.

Eleven wells were recorded as completed in Berea Sandstone which is found above the Cussewago Sandstone. This is generally a good aquifer except where it is thin. In the western County it has always supplied more than three GPM but rarely yielded more than twenty-five GPM. In Summerhill, these wells averaged 83.3 feet in depth and a yield of 11.6 GPM. Most of these wells are located in the uplands east of Center Road.

Of the remaining wells recorded as completed in Summerhill, seven were in Sharpsville Sandstone which is the second best bedrock aquifer in the western County. These wells average 83.3 feet in depth with an average yield of 11.6 GPM. Most were also completed
in the uplands east of Inlet Road. Three wells were completed in Orangeville Shale also in the uplands. Their average depth is 60.3 feet and the average yield is 7.3 GPM. One well was completed in the Conneaut group of the Devonian Shales, but its yield was not recorded.²

In conclusion, Summerhill Township has adequate supplies of ground water for household use. The only area in the Township where obtaining sufficient ground water could be difficult is west of Shermansville Road north of L. R. 20042. In this area, well drillers can only complete wells in glacial till or Devonian Shales, neither of which have a good percentage of success. Any industrial development or other types of growth which would require large amounts of water could be adequately served by drilling near Conneaut Creek in the glacial outwash.

A map at a scale of 1 inch equals 1,000 feet has been prepared on which the following information is displayed:

1. Topographic contours of the various bedrock formations.
2. The extent of the outwash deposits.
3. Locations of 110 wells for which well log data is tabulated.
4. Fracture trace lines.

Item 4, fracture trace lines, indicate a subsurface fracture in the bedrock. An ideal point to drill a well is at the intersection of two traces. Fracture trace zones range in width from fifteen to sixty feet. Copies of this map can be seen at the Township Building or at the offices of the Crawford County Planning Commission, Court House, Meadville, Pennsylvania.

SURFACE WATER AND FLOODING

Surface Water

The major surface water features of Summerhill Township are the many creeks and streams which crisscross the Township. These were discussed in detail earlier in the section entitled "Physiographic Description". Other water features include dozens of natural and man-made ponds scattered throughout the area. There are three man-made ponds which are over two and one half acres in size. Two of these are located on tributaries of Conneaut Creek - one south of Abbot Road and the other just west of Route 18 between its inter-

sections with Smith and Wiseman Roads. The third large pond is located in the northeastern area of the Township south of Carr Road and west of L. R. 20047. It was constructed on the eastern branch of Rundelltown Creek.

Flooding

Due to the fact that there are so many streams in Summerhill Township, it is not unusual that periodic flooding should occur. The area having the greatest problem is the Conneaut Creek Valley where in many cases the stream banks are low and the adjacent land is flat. Fortunately there is not a great deal of development along this stream.

The Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad follows Conneaut Creek and for the most part is located in the flood plain. If flood waters rise over the railroad bed, flooding will occur in adjacent fields and homes. This has occurred in the past, particularly in the Dicksonburg area. There are records of flood occurrences in the Borough of Conneautville just north of the Township, however, no records exist for areas along Conneaut Creek in the Township.

There is also evidence of flooding on all other streams in the Township. A flood prone area map has been prepared for the Township and appears as part of the Land Use Plan map accompanying this report. Flood prone areas were determined from soils information found in the U. S. D. A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey of Crawford County, Pennsylvania. These soils, which are susceptible to periodic flooding, have been deposited over past centuries. There is no way to know with any certainty, but such soil deposits probably represent the extreme limits of flooding which might occur at a frequency of once every hundred years or greater. Thus, unless a storm is severe, flooding will probably not reach the flood limits shown on the map. The flood prone areas were made part of the Land Use Plan map because they indicate areas with limitations for future development.

Summerhill Township has recently (in 1980) become certified to qualify its residents for flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs and the Federal Insurance Administration. This certification entitles residents owning property within designated flood areas to qualify for federally subsidized flood insurance. It also aids persons selling or buying property within flood areas to obtain a mortgage from a federally insured lending institution, because flood insurance can be guaranteed. Previous to Township certification, most banks would not lend money on floodable property without such an insurance guarantee.

As part of the Federal Flood Insurance Program an Official Flood Hazard Area map was published by the Federal Insurance Administration.
The map differs slightly from the map in this Plan because it was compiled using generalized engineering calculation formulas for the watershed area run off of each stream. The map is probably accurate enough for flood insurance purposes, but it may not give a true picture of flooding over the long term. The only way to accurately establish existing and potential flood areas is to have long term records or to conduct and extensive, and expensive, engineering field survey.

GAS AND OIL RESOURCES

Introduction

The current fuel shortage and the resulting high prices have caused exploration for gas and oil to be more economically feasible in our area of the country. Previously, the high cost of completing a well (approximately $170,000 as of December 1979) along with the chance that the well might never actually produce any gas, discouraged investors. Recently, however, several large companies have increased their explorations in the Crawford County area. According to interviews with a local geologist and a drilling company representative, several companies are planning large scale drilling operations in northern Pennsylvania. Some of this drilling can be expected in Summerhill, as the Township has already shown itself to have profitable wells. Most of the gas and oil wells in western Crawford County are located in either Beaver, Conneaut, Spring or Summerhill Townships. As of the end of 1979, according to the Oil and Gas Geology Division of the Pennsylvania Geological Survey, Spring Township had the most wells with 127. Summerhill ranked second with 44 wells, and Beaver and Conneaut Townships ranked third and fourth with 39 and 20 wells respectively. This section of the Background considers some of the advantages associated with gas and oil production. This is important to Summerhill because of the relatively large number of wells in the Township.

Wells in Summerhill

Of the forty-four wells in Summerhill Township fourteen are gas producers; twenty-six produce both gas and oil; two are dry holes with a show of gas, and two are dry holes. An oil producing well can be distinguished by nearby storage tanks and sometimes by an oil derrick. Though oil is not produced in great volume, it is significant enough to make its recovery profitable.

Most wells are concentrated in the northeastern portion of the Township bounded approximately by Spring Township, Inlet Road, Route 198 and Center Road. In this general area there are thirty-
Drilling Operations

A company interested in drilling uses a geologist to study the rock formations and select an area which is considered to have gas potential. Then, a small piece of land (usually 100' x 150') is leased from a landowner. The actual drilling is supervised by an engineer and constantly monitored by a geologist who examines the different samples of rock brought up during the drilling. It is only after the drilling is completed, however, that the capacity of the well can be tested.

The danger of explosion or fire during the actual drilling process is minimal since several safety precautions are used. One is the insertion of casing to about two hundred feet sealed in concrete before the well is even drilled. This prevents leaks either from above or below. Also, most drillers are extremely careful in the selection of personnel and materials for drilling because carelessness or use of inferior materials could endanger the entire operation. If a well is poorly constructed, the gas could either be trapped beneath the surface with no way of extraction, or it could be released too soon or too quickly. Either problem could result in the loss of that well.

Aside from safety precautions by drillers there are also Pennsylvania laws which help to insure safe and environmentally sound drilling operations. These laws regulating well drilling are respected by most operators as being common sense regulations geared toward insuring safety. Since careless construction of wells invites both legal and financial trouble, Township officials probably will not need to adopt any additional regulations concerning the actual drilling process.

Existing and Potential Problems

There are however, some problems which the Township should consider. One such difficulty is the fact that in many cases the drillers must use Township roads to move heavy equipment to and from drilling sites. This equipment can do great damage to roads, particularly during spring thaw. The Township should consider ways of addressing this problem.

Another problem is the danger posed by exposed pipelines. When a drilling company leases land from a landowner, there is generally
an agreement which entitles the landowner to free use of gas produced by the well for home heating. If a productive well is drilled, the landowner may run his own pipeline from the well site to his home at his own expense. These pipelines are often above ground and are of materials varying from steel pipe to rubber tubing. There is no state regulation governing these private pipelines. The danger is clear; a broken pipeline could mean an explosion or a fire.

The drilling company itself runs a pipeline from the drilling site which connects to a main pipeline. This main pipeline transports the gas to major collection points from which the gas is sold or distributed. These pipelines, however, are metal and are located underground below plough level, causing few if any problems.

Another possible problem stems from the fact that in most drilling operations around this area a lot of salt water, or salt brine, is extracted during the drilling process. In most cases this salt brine is pumped into storage pits at the drilling site until it can be hauled away and safely stored or properly disposed of. If, however, the storage pits are not properly constructed or are improperly used the salt brine can leak into the soil or the water table below. It could also get into streams and kill fish or vegetation. Although this activity is regulated by the State, the Township may want to investigate current methods of salt brine disposal being used by drillers in the area to assure that there are no problems. As part of a solution to salt brine disposal the Township might even consider using the liquid salt for dust control on roads or ice control in the winter.

Other problems which the Township should consider are: Access roads to drilling sites which may have erosion problems or improper sluice pipes; set backs from the road for storage tanks and other equipment; and maintenance (particularly painting) of holding tanks and equipment.

The recent flourish of gas and oil extraction appears to be profitable to all concerned. The Township, however, must look beyond the blessings of these profits. It must also evaluate the short term and long term environmental, social and economic impacts such drilling may have on the community. An honest evaluation could determine whether any local policies or regulations need to be adopted to minimize any potential negative impacts.
OTHER NATURAL RESOURCES

Sand and Gravel

There are two soil types found in Summerhill Township which can be used as a source of sand and gravel. These are called Chenango Series and Wyoming Series soils. They are found exclusively within the glacial outwash of the Conneaut Valley. Some of these deposits, particularly to the east of Smith Road near its intersection with Abbot Road, are currently being mined for gravel. A map entitled Sand and Gravel Deposits has been prepared at the 1 inch to 1,000 foot scale and is available for inspection at the Township Building or the Offices of the Crawford County Planning Commission.

Vegetation and Wildlife

As illustrated earlier in the Existing Land Use section of this report, woodlands and brush covers over fifty percent of the land in the Township, and roughly two thirds of this is tree cover. Most tree stands are hardwoods where maple, oak and beech predominate. Some of this timber is harvested for lumber and some finds its way into the family woodstove or fireplace.

The woodland and brush areas serve as habitat for many species of wildlife typical of this part of the State. Although there are no gamelands or game preserves in the Township, there are several areas where wildlife can coexist with the farmer and the rural resident.

Conneaut Creek is stocked with Trout by the Pennsylvania Fish Commission. One doesn't need too much imagination to guess how Fish Creek got its name.
MUNICIPAL FISCAL ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

This analysis presents a summary of previous trends in receipts and expenditures for Summerhill Township as well as a summary of assessed valuation and tax millage rates in past years. The intent of this analysis is to determine the Township's financial capability to handle existing and future programs and services.

TOWNSHIP REVENUE SOURCES

A listing of revenue receipts for the Township from 1975 through 1979 is presented in the Appendix 3 of this report. Table 17, "Summary of Receipts and Expenditures-Summerhill Township 1975-1979", is a simplified version of this listing. Total receipts have fluctuated throughout this five year period; however, within that time there was a net increase from $70,296 in 1975 to $88,400 in 1979. This is a 25.7 percent increase over five years or an average yearly increase of 5.1 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP 1975 - 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>$25,240</td>
<td>$26,302</td>
<td>$28,360</td>
<td>$30,373</td>
<td>$31,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>$2,453</td>
<td>$5,225</td>
<td>$6,207</td>
<td>$7,297</td>
<td>$6,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$32,603</td>
<td>$38,161</td>
<td>$39,208</td>
<td>$36,996</td>
<td>$36,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Revenue</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$37,818</td>
<td>$4,138</td>
<td>$13,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Total</td>
<td>$70,296</td>
<td>$77,188</td>
<td>$111,593</td>
<td>$78,804</td>
<td>$88,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Years Balance*</td>
<td>$42,506</td>
<td>$40,002</td>
<td>$59,925</td>
<td>$60,840</td>
<td>$67,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RECEIPTS</td>
<td>$113,802</td>
<td>$117,190</td>
<td>$171,518</td>
<td>$139,744</td>
<td>$155,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$27,077</td>
<td>$8,775</td>
<td>$14,953</td>
<td>$16,270</td>
<td>$28,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>$29,315</td>
<td>$38,626</td>
<td>$62,754</td>
<td>$49,399</td>
<td>$52,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$2,808</td>
<td>$2,124</td>
<td>$2,193</td>
<td>$2,589</td>
<td>$3,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Government</td>
<td>$14,600</td>
<td>$7,740</td>
<td>$30,679</td>
<td>$4,138</td>
<td>$13,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>$73,800</td>
<td>$57,265</td>
<td>$110,579</td>
<td>$72,396</td>
<td>$87,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Township Audit Reports

* Includes Securities and Investments Held
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Receipts are classified in two different categories, revenue receipts and non-revenue receipts. Revenue receipts such as taxes, grants, or fines increase net assets without increasing debt liabilities. Non-revenue receipts include all income which does not alter the Township’s net value, such as sale of property, securities, and equipment as well as transfers of money from other township funds. Revenue receipts comprised the vast majority of receipts averaging eighty-three percent of the Township’s total receipts, while non-revenue receipts averaged only thirteen percent. Figure I shows the relative importance of one type of revenue to another.

Revenue Receipts

Tax Revenues  The Township receives it’s tax revenues from four different sources: a real estate tax, a wage tax, a per capita tax and a real estate transfer tax. The real estate tax rate for the past five years has been thirteen mills, or .13 cents for each dollar of assessed property value. Property is assessed by the county and is currently set at thirty percent of the replacement value in 1971 dollars.

Revenue from real estate taxes averaged 14.6 percent of the total revenues received for the five year period. The dollar amount of this revenue increased fairly steadily from 1975 to 1979. These real estate tax trends can be better understood by examining the table "Trends in Assessed Valuation and Millage Rates."

### TABLE 18

TRENDS IN ASSESSED VALUATION AND MILLAGE RATES
SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP 1973 - 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ASSESSED VALUATION</th>
<th>MILLAGE RATE</th>
<th>100% TAX YEILD</th>
<th>ACTUAL YEILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>$ 822,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$10,686</td>
<td>$10,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>$ 843,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$10,959</td>
<td>$10,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$ 873,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$11,361</td>
<td>$11,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>$ 911,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$11,848</td>
<td>$12,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$ 930,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$12,098</td>
<td>$13,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>$ 978,050</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$12,715</td>
<td>$12,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>$1,002,250</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$13,029</td>
<td>$13,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Assessed Valuation is computed at 30 percent of replacement value using 1971 dollars.

SOURCE: Township Audit Reports and records of the Crawford County Assessors Office.
This table shows that although the millage rate of thirteen mills has remained constant over the seven years, the total assessed valuation has increased steadily from $822,000 in 1973 to $1,002,250 in 1979, an increase of twenty-two percent.

The Wage tax brings in revenue from all working Township residents. Currently, each worker is taxed at one-half percent by the Township and the same amount by the Conneaut School District. Persons who work outside of the Township have their tax deducted by their employer who pays it to the local government where the person is employed. Summerhill Township, and the school district must then request this money from that local government.

The per capita tax amounts to $5.00 for every resident eighteen years of age and older. This tax can be seen in relation to other Township, school district and county taxes in the subsequent section entitled "Overall Tax Burden." The real estate transfer amounts to two percent of the sales price of real estate, but is only collected when real estate is transferred. One percent of this goes to the State, one-half percent to the Township and the remaining one-half percent to the school district.

The wage tax and the per capita tax provided 18.6 percent of total Township revenues from 1975 to 1979. Within this time the yearly figure fluctuated, (see Appendix) but there was a net increase of over twenty-seven (27.3) percent during the five years. The fluctuations in wage tax revenues are probably best explained by such factors as changes in wages and employment and improved collection techniques.

Grants Outside revenues from the federal, state and county governments are by far the largest source of income for Summerhill Township. Together they averaged 43.1 percent of the total receipts for this five year period. In 1974, grants were a greater percentage of total revenues than in any other year. This was due to a large grant from the County of $6,918 in that year. After 1974 the amount increased moderately, experiencing a slight decline in 1978.

In each of the years analyzed, state liquid fuels grants made up the largest share of such monies. These grants, which are paid for by taxes at the gas pumps, averaged 72.9 percent of all grants from 1975 to 1979. Such monies, however, must be used by the Township strictly for road related expenses, such as; road maintenance, improvements or snow removal. They are distributed to each municipality in Pennsylvania by means of a formula based on local public road mileage and population.

The federal government was another major contributor with Federal Revenue Sharing funds which added 20.4 percent or $37,589 to the total grants over the five year period. Another federal source was the Anti-Recession fund which contributed $4,876 from its inception in 1976 to 1978.
Other Revenue  This category contains revenue from such sources as licenses and permits; fines and forfeits; interest and rent; and miscellaneous revenues. During the five years studied, the average annual receipts were 6.6 percent of total revenues. The largest source of this revenue was interest and rent which provided 2.9 percent of total receipts.

Non-Revenue Receipts

Non-revenue receipts, or funds which do not alter the net value of municipal assets, came either from transfers from existing Township, state, or federal funds or from sale of Township property. These averaged $14,580 for each of the five years, or 17.1 percent of the total annual receipts. These amounts were extremely varied, however. In 1976, total non-revenue receipts were $7,500 and in 1977 they were $37,818. Practically all of this money was transferred from other funds. Securities and investments held by the Township are not considered to be revenue receipts nor are they non-revenue receipts. They are simply investments which the Township has made in previous years. Summerhill has gradually gained a substantial amount of securities and investments. By 1980, for example, Summerhill held $46,548 in securities and investments.

Previous Cash Balance

The previous cash balance is the amount of cash left over from the year before. It is made up from several sources: cash left in the general fund, in State Liquid Fuels, in Revenue Sharing and in Anti-Recession funds.

TOWNSHIP EXPENDITURES

Total expenditures, like total receipts, fluctuated over the five year period, 1975 to 1979. This was mainly due to large capital improvements, and non-governmental expenses which varied from year to year. Expenditures showed a net increase of $24,146 which is a 32.8 percent increase. There are two different categories of expenditures, governmental and non-governmental. Governmental expenditures are those that cover the actual cost of government services, such as: maintenance, administration, salaries, fire protection, roads and capital improvements. All expenditures which do not relate directly to governmental operation, such as: repayment of debts, investments and transfers to other township funds are classified as non-governmental expenditures.

Governmental Expenditures

As Figure I shows, governmental expenditures made up the majority of expenses comprising 82.9 percent of the total expenditures over the five year period.
FIGURE I

Average Revenues and Expenditures
Summerhill Township, 1975 - 1979

REVENUE SOURCE

Interest & Rents
Fines & Forfeits 1.8%
Licenses & Permits 0.8%
Miscellaneous 1.1%

14.6%
REAL ESTATE TAX

17.1%
NON-REVENUE

43.1%
GRANTS

2.9%

18.6%
WAGE TAX

EXPENDITURES

Miscellaneous
Tax Collection
Fire Protection 1.4%
Health & Sanitation 0.6%
Special Services 0.4%
Interest 0.2%

17.1%
NON-GOVERNMENT

56.5%
ROADS

10.5%
MUNICIPAL BUILDINGS

3.3%

1.5%

8.5%
ADMINISTRATION
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Administration  All salaries, wages, materials and other expenses incurred during the operation of the Township are included in this category. An average of about one tenth of total expenditures were spent on administration. Between 1975 and 1979, administrative expenses rose slowly and steadily, yet they realized a 103.6 percent increase in the five year period for a total increase of $4,514.

Tax Collection  This expense averaged around $1,000 for each of the five years and was used to pay for the Wage Tax Collector's commissions and materials.

Municipal Buildings and Offices  This category includes all expenses incurred for the maintenance and repair of municipal buildings and offices. It averaged 8.8 percent of total expenditures for the five year period but fluctuated quite a bit within that time. This expense was the highest in 1975 when the meeting room was added. It was also high in 1979 due to the addition of two bays to the garage.

Fire Protection  This category covers Township contributions to the Conneautville Fire Department. This annual contribution averaged around one and a half percent of the Township's total expenditures, although it was doubled in 1976 and in 1979 it tripled as more money was given to the Conneautville Volunteers and money was also donated to the Summit and Hayfield Volunteers.

Health and Sanitation  This broad category covers health related services ranging from sewage inspection to the Board of Health Services. Most of this money was used in support of the Board of Health Services. This expense, however, was a negligible portion of the yearly total. Over the five years, health and sanitation expenses averaged only 0.6 percent of the yearly total.

Roads  This category includes all expenses incurred in the maintenance, snow plowing and improvement of Township roads. This was the largest expense by far, averaging over fifty-six percent of total annual expenditures. In 1977 it was exceptionally high because of major equipment replacement.

Interest  This category includes all interest paid on debts incurred for governmental purposes. Summerhill paid off all of it's debts by the end of 1975 and has not incurred any new debts. Therefore, after 1975, no expenditures were incurred in the interest category. Interest averaged only 0.2 percent of total expenses over the five year period.

Miscellaneous  This category includes any expenditures that do not fit into the above categories, such as employee payroll taxes and insurance. These expenses averaged 3.3 percent of the total for the five year period.
Non-governmental Expenditures

Non-governmental expenditures, as stated earlier, are expenditures which do not relate directly to governmental operation. For Summerhill Township, the majority of these expenditures were simply transfers to other funds within the Township's control. Most of the money received in the Revenue Sharing Fund was simply transferred to the general government fund. The one other major non-governmental expenditure occurred when Summerhill repaid its debt of $14,600 in 1975. Non-government expenditures averaged 17.1 percent over the five year period.

Summary of Receipts and Expenditures

Several points can be made from the preceding analysis:

Summerhill received a total of $426,281 and spent a total of $412,017 in the five year period between 1975 and 1979.

By 1979, Summerhill had saved $46,548 in securities and investments and $11,222 in cash.

The amount of tax revenue from real estate increased substantially from 1975 to 1979 due to an increase in total assessed valuation from real estate.

Grants were the major source of revenue receipts comprising 43.1 percent of the five year total. The largest single source of grants was the State Liquid Fuels.

The major expenditure between 1975 and 1979 was for highway services. This expense averaged 56.5 percent of total expenditures. (Refer to Table 17.)

DEBT LIMITATION

The Local Government Unit Debt Act, Pennsylvania Act 185, restricts the amount of debt that a local municipality can incur. According to the Act, a township can incur a debt, without voter approval, of up to 250 percent of the arithmetic average of total revenues, not including grants, for three years preceding the debt. Using 1980 as an example, the debt limitation for Summerhill Township is $94,479 (2.5 times the average of total revenues from 1977 through 1979). Since Summerhill Township has no debt at the present time, it is evident that the Township could finance desired programs and projects by incurring a debt.
OVERALL TAX BURDEN

The individual tax burden upon each taxpayer in a community is an important consideration in any review of local finances. As discussed previously, a 13 mill tax on real estate was levied through the five year period from 1975 to 1979. The Township also has a per capita tax and a one-half percent wage tax which must be paid by all working residents. The following list shows these taxes as well as school district and county taxes that Summerhill Township residents were subject to in the five year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxing body</th>
<th>Real Estate Tax</th>
<th>Per Capita Tax</th>
<th>Wage Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>13. mills</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>64 mills</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>13 mills*</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90 mills</td>
<td>$ 25</td>
<td>1.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 11 mills before 1976

The following example shows how Township taxes affect the average resident. These figures represent the 1978 tax burden using a hypothetical family of four (two adults and two children under 18 years old) earning the mean family income of $15,320 (1970 U. S. Census plus seven percent per year) and living in an average $21,290 home (mean value for owner occupied units, 1970 U. S. Census plus ten percent per year) assessed at thirty percent or $6,387.

TABLE 19

EFFECT OF TAXES ON AVERAGE FAMILY
SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWNSHIP TAXES</th>
<th>Real Estate Tax (.013 x $6,387)</th>
<th>$ 83.03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wage Tax (.005 x $15,320)</td>
<td>$ 76.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Capita Tax (2 adults x $5)</td>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$169.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT TAXES</th>
<th>Real Estate Tax (.064 x $6,387)</th>
<th>$408.77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wage Tax (.005 x $15,320)</td>
<td>$ 76.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Capita Tax (2 adults x $15)</td>
<td>$ 30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$515.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY TAXES</th>
<th>Real Estate Tax (.013 x $6,387)</th>
<th>$ 83.03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Capita Tax (2 adults x $5)</td>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 93.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1979, discounting inflation, the tax burden for the typical family shown above increased by another $172.45. This was due to a school district real estate tax increase of twenty-five mills (159.67) and a county real estate tax increase of two mills (12.78) for 1979.

CONCLUSION

Summerhill Township appears to be operating on sound financial footing. There is no Township debt and a considerable amount of money has been saved. This situation suggests that there is no immediate need for the Board of Supervisors to raise taxes. It also suggests that, within sound budget limitations, the possibility for increased government services exists. Areas where such services might be provided will be explored in the Plan section of this document.
OPPORTUNITIES AND PROBLEMS

INTRODUCTION

The process of gathering information for the "Background for Planning" and subsequent discussions by the Planning Commission have resulted in an awareness of several opportunities and problems. Some relate to the physical growth and development of the Township, but others deal with social and economic situations. The list below is a summary of the important opportunities and problems which could help or hinder future growth in Summerhill Township; They will become key elements in the development of future planning policies and programs for the Township.

Opportunity or Problem

The possible construction of a giant U. S. Steel industrial complex on Lake Erie could mean job opportunities or other economic benefits for Township residents. I could also mean more people and more housing requiring more services over a relatively short period of time. The extent to which such new growth becomes an opportunity or a problem will depend largely on the growth management policies of the Township's government.

Opportunity

Summerhill has its own special rural character based on the attractive landscape, its past history and existing development.

Opportunity

The price of land is relatively inexpensive, and there is ample space for development.

Problem

Housing is limited for both home buyers and renters.

Opportunity

Conneautville Borough, which is close at hand for most residents, provides needed services; for example, stores, fire protection, medical facilities, post office, library, etc.

Opportunity

The closeness of the northwestern area of the Township to Conneautville may provide the opportunity for expansion of public water and sewer systems into this area at some future date. With such facilities available land could be easier to develop for industrial, residential or commercial uses.
Opportunity

There is land near Conneautville, Route 18 and the railroad which would be well suited for industrial use.

Problem

State roads in the Township, particularly Routes 18 and 198, are not constructed or maintained to handle heavy traffic as might be produced from the U. S. Steel development.

Problem

Safety hazards exist to motorists along some Township roads, particularly the curve on Shermansville Road; the intersection of Hill and Inlet Roads; and some narrow bridges.

Problem

There are two unguarded railroad crossings.

Problem

Police protection offered by the Pennsylvania State Police is inadequate.

Opportunity/Problem

Gas and oil well drilling can offer economic gain for some Township residents, however, there are some safety and road problems associated with this drilling.

Problem

Most of the Township has soils which will not generally support on-lot sewage disposal systems.

Opportunity

Most soils throughout the Township are considered fair for agricultural production.

Opportunity

Groundwater sources are adequate in most areas for residential use.

Problem

Most housing was built prior to 1940.

Problem

Limited medical and dental services are handy to residents.
Problem

Many commercial or shopping needs are a considerable distance.

Problem

Employment opportunities within the Township are few.

Problem

Solid waste disposal is not provided as a municipal service.

Opportunity or Problem

The potential for increased residential, commercial, industrial and institutional development is great to the east of Conneautville along the Route 198 corridor.
Regional Context
REGIONAL CONTEXT

INTRODUCTION

Any truly comprehensive analysis of a community must look into how that community relates to the region which surrounds it. By virtue of its location and its rural nature Summerhill Township fits into the regional puzzle in its own unique way. The puzzle has many pieces, each of which directly or indirectly affect the Township. Among the regional relationships to be considered are: land use relationships; transportation links; social and economic ties; and institutional ties.

LAND USE RELATIONSHIPS

Local Conditions and Planning

Land use patterns are oblivious to municipal boundaries, particularly when there are no land use controls in most of the communities which surround Summerhill Township. Except for the Conneautville area, the land use patterns in Spring, Hayfield, Summit and Conneaut Townships immediately adjacent to Summerhill are essentially the same. Farm uses predominate interspersed with patterns of woodland and scattered residential development.

In the Norrisville area of Summerhill, where one finds a crossroads village, the village pattern extends along the roads into Hayfield Township. People who live there consider themselves first as residents of Norrisville and secondly as residents of either Summerhill or Hayfield Townships.

As one approaches Conneautville Borough bordering on the northwestern area of the Township changes begin to occur in land use patterns. To the rural landscape are added more homes situated closer together, a mobile home park and a nursing home complex. As one enters the Borough, the houses grow much closer together, there are industrial and business uses, all the streets are paved and there are sidewalks along the main streets. Similar types of development have not yet occurred in the Township, with the major exception of the nursing home.

The Land Use Plan map, which accompanies this Plan, shows the future land use to the south and west of Conneautville as being a "Community Development" area. Since this area relates so closely to the Borough and is along the major traffic arteries leading to
the Borough, the potential for similar types of development is there. Evidence of this already beginning to occur can be seen in the recent development of the Rolling Hills Nursing Home, expansion of an existing mobile home park and a proposal for another mobile home park close to the Borough near the nursing home. More extensive residential development, and perhaps industrial and commercial development, will almost certainly occur if water and sewer systems are extended into this area of the Township. In the case of the nursing home this has already been accomplished through the private sector.

Mention of the Summerhill Land Use Plan brings up the question of compatibility with planning in adjacent municipalities. Spring Township and Conneautville Borough to the north are the only adjacent communities with existing land use plans. At this writing, only the Borough has adopted a zoning ordinance.

Compatibility with the community development areas in both the Conneautville and Spring Township land use plans is maintained through the continuation of this pattern in Summerhill along the Route 18 corridor and east along Route 198.

The "Rural Development" area as planned in Spring Township continues in Summerhill Township east of the Conneautville community development area and southeasterly along the Route 198 corridor. The "Rural Development" area to the west of Conneautville in Spring Township was not continued in Summerhill because of the existing rural/agricultural nature of the area which seems to relate more to similar uses in Conneaut Township to the west than to the village influence of Conneautville. The resulting planning decision, after due consideration, was to delineate this area as "Agricultural" on the Summerhill Land Use Plan. A similar designation was made in the northwestern portion of the Township south of the Village of Rundell in Spring Township. This area has several Amish farms and the "Agricultural" designation makes it compatible with a similar designation and uses in Spring Township.

County-wide Planning

The county-wide Land Use Plan was updated in 1979 by the Crawford County Planning Commission as part of an effort to update the Crawford County Comprehensive Plan completed in 1973. The Township Plan was completed after this 1979 update with the result that a few deviations were recommended by the Township Planning Commission.

The County Plan projects rural residential development all around Conneautville Borough and along L. R. 20038, Route 18 and Route 198. The Township planners felt that because of the topography and existing land uses, rural residential development would not occur to any great extent along Route 18 and L. R. 20038. They did
agree, however, that such development will occur along Route 198 which is the major east-west link between Conneautville and Routes 98 and I-79 to the east.

The Township planners also felt that community development, such as medium density residential, institutional, commercial and industrial uses were likely to locate to the south and east of Conneautville. A similar type area is shown to the north of Conneautville in Spring Township on the County Plan, but it does not extend south of the Borough into Summerhill. The County Plan shows the remainder of the Township as being "agricultural" which is in agreement with the Summerhill Plan. Given the fact that the County's Land Use Plan has yet to be formally adopted by the County Commissioners, the County Planning Commission may wish to reconsider its plan idea for Summerhill Township. A change of the County Plan map to agree with the Township Plan would alleviate possible confusion.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

As part of the County's contribution to the Appalachian Regional Commission's U. S. Steel impact planning program, a major highways plan update was undertaken by the County Planning Commission. This update was also part of the County's Comprehensive Plan and addressed the entire County. Because of the significant impacts U. S. Steel's development might have on transportation systems, particular attention was paid to the Conneaut Valley area and Pa. Route 18. This route, which runs through Summerhill Township, is considered to be the major transportation link between the U. S. Steel site in Erie County and most of Crawford County.

The County's Highways Plan update recommends one significant change which affects Summerhill Township. That change is to upgrade Pa. Route 198 from a Major Collector highway to a Minor Arterial highway on the Federal Functional Classification System. In light of the U. S. Steel potential this change is considered necessary because Route 198, as mentioned previously, is the first major east-west link between Route 18 and Routes 98 and I-79 leading to Meadville and the eastern part of the County. Two other important highways in Summerhill, Route 18 and L. R. 20038, would remain the same under the Federal System. Route 18 is classified as a Minor Arterial and L. R. 20038 as a Major Collector. Summerhill's Plan element on transportation is in complete agreement with the Highways Plan update of the County Comprehensive Plan.

In August of 1979 the Northwest Pennsylvania Regional Planning and Development Commission completed a Highway Improvement Plan for the U. S. Steel Impact Area. This Plan looks at transportation needs for the Crawford-Erie County U. S. Steel Impact area. The only significant recommendation of the Plan in relation to Summerhill
Township is the same recommendation to upgrade Pa. Route 198 from a Major Collector to a Minor Arterial highway classification. Thus the regional plan, the County Plan and the Township Plan all agree on the importance of Route 198 in Summerhill's future.

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND INSTITUTIONAL TIES

As pointed out in several sections of the Background for Planning, Summerhill residents have close social, economic and institutional ties to the region around them. Conneautville, Linesville, Harmonyburg, Springboro and Meadville are all centers providing various social, religious and fraternal contacts.

From an economic standpoint Summerhill is totally dependent on the surrounding region. Farms in the Township market their products to nearby urban areas. As pointed out in the Economic Analysis section few residents are actually employed in the Township and very few goods and services are available in the Township. Meadville and Conneautville provide almost sixty percent of all jobs to residents. Conneautville, Linesville and Meadville are major suppliers for goods and services. Conneautville, for example, is the major center for groceries, banking needs, automotive services, library facilities, medical facilities and fire and emergency services.

Institutional ties are probably most visible through the schools and churches. Children in Summerhill attend schools in Spring Township just north of Conneautville. They are part of the Conneaut School District which covers all of the Conneaut Valley communities. Since there is only one church in the Township, most residents attend churches located in other communities, such as; Conneautville, Springboro or Linesville.

Government institutions are less noticeable, but the Township Government and its residents are closely tied to various county, state and federal government services and functions. Two state government functions are well known to Township residents - state highway and State Police services. Though these state functions may be less than desirable in many minds, they are nonetheless important elements of the regional picture.

In formulating the Plan policies and programs which follow this section, the Township's relationship to the region around it was both consciously and unconsciously meshed into the planning process.
THE PLAN

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The meaning of a plan - a comprehensive plan which is the term in common usage today - is sometimes hard for persons to understand. Oftentimes those responsible for helping municipalities make plans are not as helpful as they should be in making the meaning of a plan clear. Let it be said that the plan is reflected only in part by a map of the Township on which the most desired uses of land are established. This is normally called a land use plan. Such a plan is part of this report. A mapped plan should also show the proposed location for community facilities; such as, highways, park areas, municipal buildings, schools, sewer and water transmission lines, etc. In Summerhill Township, however, there are not many discernable needs for much in the way of additional facilities in the foreseeable future. (See the previous population forecast section.)

In proposing land uses and facilities a time period needs to be introduced. Most plans are based on 20 year periods, and this plan is based on 20 year time period thinking - but with qualifications. The U. S. Steel plant proposal is so elusive that the plan developed should be considered a "first cycle" effort. Growth, needs and trends should be evaluated again no later than five years from the present date. Also one might say - very convincingly - it is impossible to establish land use and facility plans 20 years into the future because of ever present uncertainties. A mapped physical plan of land use and facilities for a period of 20 years plus or minus has its limitations. One way to handle these limitations is to concentrate plan making on establishing meaningful objectives and policies - to in effect make a policies plan. This report combines both approaches. There is a land use plan map and there is a heavy emphasis on establishing policies which can guide township decision making over a period of at least five years into the future, especially in the areas of growth and development.
A plan for the growth and development of the Township translates to one important word "direction". This section of the comprehensive plan is the key to all of the work appearing heretofore. The following narrative in the truest sense is the Township plan. In the objectives and policies spelled out here the Township should find its compass. Projects and programs are listed here also in order to show how the general directions translate to specific action.

**ISSUE - GROWTH**

**Objective**
To be prepared for new growth such that adequate community services and facilities can be provided, and to maintain limited control over the location and type of new growth such that the "rural character" of the Township will be preserved to the fullest extent possible.

The Township sees new growth as inevitable and it sees active full time farming almost gone by the year 2000. Yet it believes it is important to preserve the rural character of the Township by directing the majority of the growth to the area which will be a community development area. The community development area, as indicated on the Land Use Plan map, should be developed with relatively high density residential uses and accommodate concentrations of institutional, industrial and commercial uses. The remainder of the Township, even though it may not retain strong, productive agricultural production, should maintain its rural character.

**ISSUE - THE USE OF LAND**

**Objective**
To assure that land in the future is used most effectively and that the Summerhill Township Land Use Plan is the guide for future development. This Plan designates areas of the Township which are best suited for various uses, and which are intended to maintain the Township's rural character as much as possible.

The comprehensive plan includes a land use plan which designates desired uses of Township lands. This plan is based on resident preferences, analyses of the existing uses of land and of land
and public facility constraints, and on identified future needs. The designated uses are purposely general in nature but serve to indicate a grouping of uses according to major activity category so that conflicts between very different activities can be reduced or eliminated and so that the public sector can serve the private sector more efficiently. A separation of some land uses from others can serve to protect property values and to create more efficient, attractive settlements.

According to preliminary 1980 Census figures, as seen in the previous Population Forecast section, the Township has gained 130 new residents other than nursing home residents since 1980. Even without U.S. Steel, if trends continue, the Township could gain between 140 and 260 new people by the year 2000. At an average of 3.07 persons per household this would mean between 46 and 85 new dwelling units in 20 years. The Planning Commission feels the need to guide such development into suitable areas of the Township.

**Policy**

**To preserve existing productive agricultural land and encourage expansion of agricultural activities.**

Agriculture historically has been the most important industry in the Township and has been the predominant user of land. Thirty-nine percent of the land area in the Township is in agricultural use either as cropland or as pasturage. The relative importance of agriculture in the Township's economy has declined in recent decades. Only 9 percent of the employed work force was engaged in agriculture in 1969. This figure probably has declined even more in the past decade. Yet the agricultural industry still exists in the Township and establishes its dominant character and attractiveness.

**Policy**

**To accept low density residential development in the rural and agricultural areas of the Township.** Lot sizes in these areas should be no smaller than two acres.

**Policy**

**To encourage the formation of community development areas where the potential for public sewer and water systems exist.** Such areas might include higher density residential development than in the rural areas as well as opportunities for industrial and commercial uses.

Soil conditions in Summerhill Township are such that uses cannot locate relatively close to one another forming neighborhoods and communities if sewage treatment facilities must be placed independently on each lot. A public system for sewage treatment is necessary for community development densities. In the Conneautville section of the Township a public sewer-
age system is available for future use. Also in this area of the Township there are more plentiful supplies of water lodged in so-called "outwash" deposits containing sorted gravels and sands. The land use plan map of the Township demonstrates that it is in this area of the Township that many of the institutional and commercial uses serving the Township would be best suited to located.

Policy

To encourage future industrial use while at the same time assuring that such uses are located in areas where public sewer and water needs can be provided and where they will be compatible with surrounding uses.

Policy

To accept future commercial growth at locations compatible with their environment and which do not create traffic or other types of congestion.

Policy

To assure that the extraction of minerals and natural resources such as: gas, oil, gravel and timber is carried on with the health, safety and welfare of residents in mind.

Since the extraction of natural resources is of economic importance to many people in the Township, these uses are encouraged. The intent of this policy is to prevent problems which could develop. Examples of such problems are: conflicts with existing uses; safety hazards; destruction of Township roads; unnecessary erosion and sedimentation problems; and other environmental concerns. Where such operations occur, land reclamation should be required.

Policy

To prohibit all construction in flood hazard or floodway areas.

This policy conforms to an existing Township ordinance as part of the National Flood Insurance Program. The Planning Commission should reevaluate this policy if it appears that some kinds of non-habitable structures might be suitable in flood areas.

ISSUE - COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Objective

To provide, support and/or maintain the community facilities and services to meet the present and future needs of residents.

The idea here is to assure that such facilities and services as roads, township buildings, recreation facilities, police protection, fire protection, emergency services, sewer and water services, garbage and trash disposal, and all services which are the responsibility of the Township government are well maintained or provided for as the need arises in future years.
Policy

To maintain and improve existing roads, where possible, and to insure that new roads meet standards of construction, safety and efficiency acceptable to the Board of Supervisors.

The maintenance of the Township's system of roads is by far the biggest service provided today by the Board of Supervisors. A quick look at the budget expenditures over the last five years shows that over 56 percent of all Township expenditures went into roads. The road system will continue to be the major service for many years to come. Therefore the policies and projects which follow concerning roads are extremely important.

Project

The Planning Commission should work to develop a set of road design and construction standards which can be used by the Supervisors for the acceptance of new roads.

Policy

All state roads classified as "collector" roads should be returned to the Township for maintenance, providing the state contributes a fair share of the funds for upkeep of these roads, and that the roads are improved to a condition acceptable to the Township Supervisors at the time of transfer.

There are two main reasons for this policy. One is that if some state roads were taken over by the Township, they would most likely be maintained in much better condition than they are presently. The second reason is that the state has far too many roads to maintain - a situation which has sorely stretched its resources. Perhaps if enough roads are taken over by local governments, the state can afford to do a better job with the roads they have left.

Policy

In order to help maintain its rural character, the Township discourages the construction of any new roads within the "Agricultural" areas of the Township as delineated on the Land Use Plan map.

New roads within the agricultural areas will mean more houses, more traffic, smaller parcels of land and will erode the rural character of the area.

Policy

Existing gravel roads within the Township shall be considered for paving, finances permitting, when: the density of development reaches an average of one use activity for each 400 feet of road frontage per mile. All new roads constructed in the Township shall be built according to township standards and paid for by the developer.
This policy is meant to serve notice that roads will not be paved until such paving can be justified by the density of population along a road. Once it is determined that population density can justify paving; funds must be available for such a project. Also, the Township does not feel that taxpayers should pay for the construction or paving of any new roads.

Policy

The Township will insure that road names are marked and are not duplicated within the Township. It shall also explore the possibility of road name changes where the same road changes names as it crosses municipal boundaries.

Policy

To maintain, where they exist, and to promote to the extent possible on new roads, tree planting at or near the road right-of-way lines.

Characteristic of many roads in the Township is the planting of shade tree lines. These trees give the road a sense of its own space and present an attractive appearance in the rural landscape. New plantings, however, should be done with care so that trees are spaced far enough apart and are not too close to the edge of the road.

Policy

To maintain close coordination with the Board of County Commissioners, the Crawford County Planning Commission and PennDOT in connection with the listing of projects qualifying for funding under the Federal Off-Systems program.

The Federal Off-Systems program is a "no strings attached" aid program which can send federal assistance directly to assist local governments with existing road and bridge problems. Project priorities, however, are established by the County and the State. So if there is a clear need for help on a specific project, the Township must take the first step to see that the project is considered by the County Planning Commission and PennDOT. (Refer to page 50 in the Background for Planning.)

Policy

The Township adopts the list of transportation problems found in the "Problem Analysis" at the end of the Community Facilities and Services section of the Background for Planning. Solutions to these problems shall be sought by the Township itself, and through the aid of the County and PennDOT.
The Planning Commission shall establish priorities for the Township and State road problems, and assist the Supervisors in working toward solutions to these problems on a priority basis.

The Federal Functional Classification System shall be accepted as the appropriate system for the classification of roads in the Township, with one exception and one additional local classification category. The exception being that this plan recommends that PA Route 198 be upgraded from a Major Collector highway to a Minor Arterial highway under the Federal Classification System. The addition to the classification categories is that a new classification called "Local Access" be added for certain very local roads.

The Federal Functional Classification System defines the hierarchy of roads in the following way:

**Minor Arterial** - A road which serves interstate and intercounty travel, and where trips are normally of long duration. (Example: PA Route 18)

**Major Collector** - A road serving intercounty and intracounty travel and which connects development centers within a county. (Example: L.R. 20038 - Shaw Road to Conneautville.)

**Minor Collector** - A road which collects traffic from the local road system and funnels it to the major collector and minor arterial systems. (Example: L.R. 20047 - boundary road with Hayfield.)

The three categories described above include roads which have reasonable continuity. The following two categories demonstrate a difference in the continuity characteristic, especially the local access road.

**Local (Collector).** This category of road named local in the Federal System and it includes all Township maintained roads and some state roads, (Dicksonburg Road for example.) However, from the perspective of local people most Township roads have continuity throughout the municipality and serve many acres of land. Other roads could easily be built "out from" the so-called Township roads serving...
newly formed subdivisions. If this were to happen it would be easy to demonstrate that the so-called local roads are collector roads. Consequently in this plan the normal Township road is called a collector if it has reasonable continuity.

Local Access. This is the true local road, a road which would never - even with full development on it and around it - carry appreciable through traffic and which primarily serves as access for abutting property owners. (This classification is in addition to the Federal system and is simply a Township designation. Summerhill at this time has no such roads except perhaps Cemetery Road, T-906, in Dicksonburg. However, this designation may prove important in the future if cul-de-sacs develop or other very local roads develop.)

Besides providing a convenient way to organize one's thinking on the Township road network, the Federal Functional Classification System has another important characteristic. It denotes the amount of financial help the federal government will supply to a particular road category. To a lesser extent it also is a key to relative road importance and to major improvement priorities. Minor arterial and major collector roads qualify for the substantial federal aid programs. Minor collector and local (collector) roads do not participate in the conventional federal aid programs. They do, however, qualify for the Federal Off-Systems Aid Program. (Refer to pages 50 and 78 for further discussion.)

Policy

To continue financial support of the volunteer fire companies which serve the Township.

Program

The Township Planning Commission shall develop a fire and emergency services plan for the Township.

This plan would help to resolve territorial disputes among the volunteer fire companies which serve the Township. It might also consider future emergency service needs of the area.

Policy

To seek increased police protection from the Pennsylvania State Police or other police agencies.
There is concern that police protection presently provided by the Pennsylvania State Police is inadequate, particularly at night. Some effort—perhaps along with other municipalities—needs to be made to provide better police protection.

To consider initiating financial support to the public library in Conneautville so that they can strengthen their services to the residents of Summerhill Township.

The Conneautville Library participates in the County Library System under which it is obligated to serve all Summerhill residents whether or not the Township contributes to the library. The County Library System is new and seeks to convince all municipalities in the County to also contribute to local libraries in their area. Perhaps in consideration of some contribution the Township could request some sort on increased library services within the Township to better serve patrons. Yet in requesting this extension of service the Township should be aware that the library is operating from inadequate facilities and minimal staff. The first priority of the library should be to use the funding to strengthen its basic facilities.

To continue to provide some financial support for the Conneaut Valley Medical Center which provides medical services to township residents.

The "Valley" Medical Center in Conneautville fills an important clinical and emergency medical care need. The Center has found it difficult in past years to maintain these services because of insufficient financial support. A community service of such importance should not be allowed to discontinue because it cannot find enough local financial help.

The Township shall seek to assure that public recreation needs of its residents are adequately met.

The Township provides no direct services to its residents in the area of recreation. Many residents use the facilities and programs available in Conneautville. The scope of study in this plan has not permitted time to investigate recreation needs.

The Planning Commission shall investigate whether there are any unmet needs in the area of recreation programming or facilities for Township residents.
A survey should be taken of resident needs and attitudes in connection with recreation programs in order to see if the Township itself should consider providing or contribute funds to existing programs in Conneautville and other areas.

The Planning Commission should appoint a special committee to conduct this survey. A written report should be developed and transmitted to the supervisors.

**Project**

To request the Northwest Crawford County Sewer Authority to adopt policies and plans for the extension of its sewage system in Summerhill so that extensions may assist in implementing the Township Plan.

This plan once it is adopted by the Township as its official guide for development should be transmitted to the sewer authority. In terms of managing growth in the Township, the handling of collection line extensions to the sewer system is a vitally important factor. Through plans and actual line construction, items of action the authority can undertake, responsible growth can be expedited.

**Policy**

To participate in the initiation of discussions with Conneautville Borough on the organization of a joint water supply system which can extend public water service into the area of the Township near the Borough.

Water supply in the Township is generally not good. However, in the Conneaut Valley area there are glacial outwash deposits which can provide sufficient water for considerable growth. Industrial uses in particular, should they be sought to strengthen the Township's tax base, normally need large amounts of water. This water can be delivered more economically and in the quantity and quality needed if one system serves the entire Conneautville Area. However, it should be recognized that the borough cannot be expected to participate in such a common system if it lost development which should normally occur within its boundaries. The vitality of the whole Conneaut Valley could be strengthened by an intermunicipal water system.

**Policy**

To support responsible efforts by higher levels of government to improve solid waste disposal services and to insure that such services will be available at reasonable cost in future years.
Recent regulations enforced by PennDER have caused all of the sanitary landfills to be closed in Crawford County. None of these landfill sites were large enough or operated on a large enough scale to meet stiffer environmental standards. Solid waste in Crawford County is hauled to adjacent counties for disposal. The future of reasonably priced disposal services is questionable. There is no one municipality in the County large enough to be able to afford to open a new landfill and other methods of disposal appear too costly.

Project

The Board of Township Supervisors should pass a resolution requesting: (1) the Board of County Commissioners to take a leadership role in proposing a satisfactory solution to solid waste disposal problems, and (2) the County’s Solid Waste Management Plan be revised and in so doing local municipalities be involved in the revision process.

ISSUE HOUSING

Objective

To assume a role in assisting the construction of new housing for all age groups in the Township and in channeling into the Township federal funds for housing loans and grants for new housing and rehabilitation of existing housing.

More and more the construction of new housing for persons of average income is becoming impossible without some form of federal or state subsidies. Programs are available for securing these subsidies but most of the programs require, in the case of rural townships, that an administrative structure be lodged at the County level. No detailed housing survey was completed in this planning study. However, from cursory observations two facts are fairly clear about the housing situation, (1) there is an extremely low vacancy rate for rental or dwellings for sale, and (2) many houses are relatively old and in need of rehabilitation work if the existing housing stock is to be retained in a creditable state.

Policy

To encourage the Board of County Commissioners to reactivate the County Housing Authority in order to channel federal aid into housing rehabilitation loan programs in the Township.

Summerhill Township is not able to participate directly in housing rehabilitation loan programs. It must work through a county-wide authority in order to make low interest rate rehabilitation
available to its residents. The County created a housing authority in years past, but currently it has no appointed members and is not functioning.

**Project**  
The Board of Township Supervisors should pass a resolution showing its support for the Crawford County Commissioners to activate the County Housing Authority, enabling this organization to "pass through" loan and grant money for housing rehabilitation.

**ISSUE**  
MUNICIPAL FISCAL IMPROVEMENT

**Policy**  
The Township shall endeavor to improve its financial capabilities through the initiation of a capital improvements program.

**Program**  
The Planning Commission, working with the Board of Supervisors, the Township Auditor, and the Crawford County Planning Commission, shall develop a capital improvements program for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.
Appendices
THE PLAN AS A CONTINUING PROCESS

The Message in this section will be brief. It is to underscore something which the writers of this plan hope is already in the reader's mind. That the policies which are set forth in the Plan section are not "chiseled on stone tablets."

The Plan, it is true, has taken clear stands on important issues of concern to the Township. It should do this. It should take positions on the issues. Everyone, perhaps, will not always agree with these positions because the plan cannot be all things to all people. If it were, it wouldn't be worth reading. As private and public actions occur over the weeks, months and years ahead, new realities will be introduced into township life. Peoples' attitudes will change and this could change the Plan's objectives and policies. To be meaningful to the Township it must change in some regards. The Plan is a guide for community growth and development; but a flexible guide. As Plan changes are introduced in the future, hopefully, they will be well thought out and not willy-nilly.

Many persons who work in the community planning field full time will say that more than anything else "planning is a process." That the day after any plan is adopted it begins to become out of date because new events are always occurring - especially through the individual development decisions of the citizenry. These planners say that the orderly problem solving process which was used to create the plan, the coming together of township people to thrash out issues and make decisions, that this process is the most meaningful thing. The writers of this report are unwilling to stretch the concept of flexibility this far. It is felt that there are objectives and policies in this plan which will be true and good for the Township for years ahead. But this extreme position on plans and planning by some professionals is meaningful because it emphasizes that a plan is evolutionary and can change and should change in some respects over the years ahead. Good community planning is a continuing activity; it is not a "once done then over" situation. The Township Planning Commission, the Supervisors and Township citizens are urged to use this document hard, to mold and shape it so that it is always important and useful in Township affairs. The Planning Commission has the key role and responsibility in keeping the Plan "alive" and they should undertake a major reassessment of this document and the Land Use Plan map at least once every five years.
THE PUBLIC SCHOOL IN THE COMMUNITY: ISSUES BUT PERHAPS NO CHOICES.

Public schools play a vital role in our social structure. They educate our children; provide a place of social growth and interaction, and set the stage for the leaders and the followers of the next generation. In addition, school facilities are of unique importance in community development. They are focal points for community life; their size and location has great effect on the organizations of our communities. It is important for citizens and those interested in community planning to know about their school system. This discussion is included in this plan report because sooner or later the issues explored here will be of concern to township people.

In Pennsylvania, under the School Reorganization Act of 1970, many smaller school districts were consolidated into larger districts of between 3,000 and 3,500 students. There are approximately 500 school districts in the state. Crawford County is served by seven school districts only one of which, the Conneaut School District, does not cross into neighboring counties.

The Pennsylvania School Code, Act 24, is the basic enabling legislation which governs public schools throughout the Commonwealth. It establishes the Pennsylvania Department of Education which is responsible for assuring adequate education statewide. It provides for school districts; each district is to be governed by a school board made up of nine members elected at large for staggered six year terms. Within the regulations established by the State, the school board is entirely responsible for the education of our children. They, for the most part, determine what programs and what facilities our children will experience. (However, there are hidden conditions on this power as will be explained later in this narrative.)

Our planning effort in Crawford County is mainly concerned with land use planning and the social and economic consequences of land use decisions. Thus, when considering schools we tend to look mainly at the location of existing and future facilities trying to make sure they fit into our communities.

What are the options the local school board has relative to these facilities and what is mandated by the State? Technically speaking, a school board has considerable power. It has complete authority to build facilities where and how it decides as long as certain safety and space requirements are met. The board also has the power to decide on the type of educational programs to be offered, and it has the power to tax. These powers in reality, however, are tempered by the ability of the district to finance its facilities and programs. Very few districts in Pennsylvania, and none in Crawford County, can afford to "go it alone" without requiring outside help. Thus we find strong influences from the State and Federal Governments in our local schools, since they are the major financial contributors.
The subject of State aid needs to be introduced here. A school district which cannot completely support itself (very few can) is eligible to receive substantial state subsidy. Depending on the need, a school district may receive up to seventy percent state subsidy for its annual operating budget. However, the state aid system is extremely complex, so only the very basic elements will be explained here.

First of all the "aid ratio" granted to any school district depends on that district's wealth. It is the determination of such wealth that becomes complicated. Several factors enter into the aid ratio formula; they are:

1. The overall population density of the district expressed as the number of people per square mile. As the system now operates, sparsely populated districts and densely populated districts are eligible for more aid than are medium density districts. There are no densely populated districts in Crawford County (500 people per square mile), and all districts except Crawford Central are considered sparsely populated (50 or less per square mile) under state regulations.

2. The market value of real estate in a district based on actual property sales during the previous year. This should not be confused with assessed valuation which only increases when property is reassessed or new structures are added. If, for example, market values overall in a district rise due to inflation, and at the same time population declines, the state will consider such a district to be wealthier and allow less subsidy (more tax money and fewer people).

3. The average daily attendance for a district during the school year. This figure is important because the state limits how much it will aid any school district to approximately $750 per student per year. Thus a poor district which, based on other factors, may be eligible for a seventy percent subsidy may not receive this amount because of the per capita limit. This policy places a "cap" on the aid ratio formula.

4. The state, in recent years, has also attempted to determine the wealth of a school district based on income tax records. Perhaps you recall a question on your state income tax return asking in which school district you live. This approach has not been entirely successful because many people don't bother to answer this question.

In its very simplest terms, the more a district can afford to pay itself, the less it will be subsidized by the State. However, this basic theory has become very complicated by gradual legislative and regulatory changes.
As mentioned previously, the size and location of school facilities are important factors in community development. In theory, a school district has a great deal of flexibility when it comes to facilities. They can build just about anything they want, if they can afford it without outside help and still meet the State's safety and area requirements. However, very few districts, and none in Crawford County, can afford a new school facility on their own. Even if they could, there are still three basic state requirements which must be met before construction on any new school facility can begin. These are: (1) Proof of need, (2) proof of ability to finance, be it local or state aid, and (3) site and building plans approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry. Of course, if local financing is not available for the completion of the entire facility, then financial aid from the State will most likely be required. This changes the picture of local control significantly, since the State may require different plans and will only subsidize facilities considered essential, i.e. classrooms, library, cafeteria, multi-purpose space, etc. Facilities such as, swimming pools, student lounges, plush interiors, etc. will generally not be funded. Also, the State will only subsidize a portion of the entire project based on the district's ability to pay; the rest must be provided by the district itself.

Thus, when it comes to new school facilities, school boards must weigh many factors in choosing the location and type of facility. Among these factors the four most important are probably: economic feasibility, location, design and size of the building, and public acceptance. In terms of economic feasibility and size, larger schools make more sense for several reasons. It is generally less expensive to build a larger facility than it is to build two or three smaller ones to accommodate the same number of students. The larger school requires proportionately less staff, and maintenance, and gets maximum use of expensive common facilities such as the gym, cafeteria, health unit, music room, etc. A larger school can be more efficient because of its built-in space flexibility. In such a school where there are more classrooms, one room can easily serve different uses. In a school with only 6 or 7 classrooms, it is difficult to adjust space if there are sudden fluctuations in enrollment from year to year. If, for example, there were enough first graders to fill two classrooms where only one was needed the year before, in a small school there would be no room for the new first graders since all the other classrooms would be occupied by other grades. A grade school of at least twelve classrooms could normally provide some needed flexibility.

At the high school level, experience has shown that a facility should be large enough to handle between 800 and 900 students. This size minimum affords ample classroom flexibility and can justify extra facilities such as; swimming pools, playing fields, gymnasiums and specialized rooms and equipment. The larger school also allows for social experience with a more diversified group of students and teachers. Such school can offer a wider choice of programs in areas such as; language, art, music, special education, etc.
Public acceptance of the larger or consolidated school is, however, another matter. All too often school administrators and school boards tend to down play or overlook the importance of this acceptance in favor of financial and functional considerations. Or, if public opinion against the consolidated school concept is such that it cannot be ignored, school decision makers tend to claim that they have no choice because of state and federal mandates. Such claims may seem to be the easy way out, but, as we shall see, there is some validity to this argument.

Many citizens, at least in rural parts of the country still place great importance on the concept of the "neighborhood school". The importance of the school, and particularly the elementary school, as a focal point for community life is a fact that should be considered. Some parents prefer an existing or new, smaller and less equipped neighborhood school over a new, larger and better equipped school, simply because of their strong ties to a neighborhood. Perhaps parents who hold out against change to a more consolidated and "progressive" system are in reality expressing what they feel is their last hope of maintaining local control over the education of their children. It appears they believe that, if their children go to a larger school further away they will have less to say about how the school is run. There is also the belief that their children at the elementary level will receive just as good an education in a small "neighborhood" school as they would in a consolidated school. Parents may also resist having their neighborhood lose the identity it has with a public school located in it.

The cost of education today is much greater than it was ten or fifteen years ago. Teachers' salaries, for example, are considerably higher. Educational programs have expanded greatly, particularly at the elementary school level. In one sense the expanded programs, if this is the correct term, are the result of an increasing specialization in the educational process. Learning disability, retarded, handicapped and exceptional childrens programs are required. Programs for this type of youth have been broken out from the traditional classroom setting and are set up specially. These programs require additional classroom space. This is the "critical issue" it would seem in terms of decisions by school districts to, on the one hand, retain older and normally smaller schools and perhaps build small schools - 12 to 15 classrooms - or, on the other hand to build large consolidated schools with 20 or more classrooms.

Speaking only of the elementary schools, if the school district is to go along with the current program trends, established in no small part by the professional educator, they have virtually no choice but to go with the larger school. They could not afford to duplicate all of those expensive space requirements in a series of small schools for a wide range of programs, such as; art and music rooms, a well-sized gymnasium and many athletic opportunities; a health suite, room for the gifted, the educable mentally retarded, those with learning disabilities, or the physically handicapped, let alone a full library facility, a teachers' lounge, assembly room and cafeteria. The school district's decision on the range of its programs in a relatively sparsely settled area such as Crawford County, will decide
whether or not the traditional neighborhood school, serving one or two neighborhoods and relatively small and close to "home", can exist at all into the future. Viewing the trends of the recent decades one is led to the conclusion that people want such a wide range of programs, and they have accepted the educational theory that groups of special students must be "separated out" so to speak instead of main streamed in order to be helped adequately. If this is the case the small school and more intimate neighborhood relationships are things of the past, principally because of financial realities.

But is this the situation? Do the school directors and the public have a realistic choice on program content, and thus indirectly the size of their elementary schools? Is it true that all the local districts must do for their youth relative to the physical school facility, as mentioned earlier in this section, is to make sure it meets state safety and health regulations? If this is the case, then a decision for a narrow range of school programs could make the small elementary school feasible. Smaller schools could be renovated to meet the currently stiffer safety regulations and these schools could remain as physical and emotional centerpieces of historic neighborhoods.

Alas, the issue is not so simple. The expanded school program is a reality which is complex and not easily understood by most people. The answer lies in a quagmire of state and federal laws, rules and regulation. We shall try to shed some light on the issue here, but in the end it is the value system of the citizens and their elected school representatives which will, based on existing realities, determine the stance taken in the school district.

The State and Federal Governments have progressively increased demands on public schools through a wide range of previously non-existent programs. In some cases these programs are mandated by law, and in some cases they are mandated by the "purse strings". This purse string mandate for Crawford County, and most of Pennsylvania, might as well be a legal mandate. Programs and choices which are mandated include:

The three basic criteria dealing with new facilities, mentioned previously: proof of need, proof of finances and approval of building plans.

Chapter 22 of the Pennsylvania School Code outlines basic curriculum requirements, to include the 180 day school year and minimum hours of instruction in the basic curriculum. On the elementary level English, social studies, science, reading, art, music and physical education must be offered in grades one through six - Kindergarten, however, is not a requirement, but once initiated it is almost impossible to discontinue.

Library facilities are required with minimum standards for the number and categories of books - However, there is local discretion as to the physical set up of the facility, i.e., whether it is self-contained in the classroom or in a "central" library.
The Education of All Handicapped Act (P.L. 94-142) is federal legislation designed to help all kinds of handicapped students. The Act requires that all school districts provide a "least restrictive environment" for the education of such students. This means that a school district must, within reason, make the physical and educational facilities as accessible as possible to the handicapped. Thus, we see wheel chair ramps, special toilet and transportation facilities, classes for the blind and hard of hearing, and special staff or facilities for other types of handicapped.

State and federal regulation also mandate that a school district must provide "special education" programs. These are specific programs which must be offered some of which are: the Individualized Education Program (I.E.P.) for handicapped students; psychological testing; speech therapy; learning disabilities; programs for socially/emotionally disturbed pupils; and programs for gifted students.

The Equal Opportunity Act requires that citizens be given equal educational opportunities. This, as most know, has led to integration plans and bussing for many school districts.

A school district, according to Pennsylvania law, must provide transportation to all students in its district who do not live within walking distance from their school. This law includes non-public school students as well.

These are the bulk of the existing state and federal mandates which must be provided by school districts whether or not they accept any outside financial aid. If a school district can afford to meet all these requirements on its own and still have money left over to do what it feels necessary, it can then be very independent. Of course none in Crawford County can afford to "go it alone". They must accept state subsidies and help from intermediate units in order to fulfill state and federal mandates.

What about the facilities issue - the neighborhood school? There is nothing in state or federal mandates which specifically require school consolidation. However, when state aid is used for new facilities it must be used in the most cost effective manner. In most cases this means consolidation in one form or another. Nonetheless a school district with citizens willing to pay the price to keep smaller schools could do so if, once again, it could meet all mandates relating to facilities, special programs, and curriculum within its smaller schools. Unless this approach is accepted as a local financial responsibility, or unless these mandates can be "turned back" - the school districts have no choice but to build larger consolidated schools.

The issue of mandates for new and more specialized educational programs introduces the subject of the intermediate unit. After the reorganization of local school districts as a result of the School Reorganization Act of 1970, a gap was left between the
new school districts and the Pennsylvania Department of Education. The gap was one mainly of liaison between districts and the state, and of services to local school districts which were previously provided by the "County Superintendent". To fill this gap, the State created a system of intermediate units which would cover larger areas than the County Superintendent system, and which would have much greater service capability. There are now twenty-nine intermediate units operating throughout the Commonwealth. Although the intermediate unit is a creation of the state, it acts somewhat like a non-profit corporation.

In this part of the State the Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit, Number 5 (I.U.-5) located in Edinboro, provides the needed specialized functions. The Unit serves seventeen school districts in Crawford, Erie and Warren Counties. The only district in Crawford County not under the wing of Unit 5 is the Jamestown School District in the extreme southwestern corner of the County.

In terms of organization, Intermediate Unit Number 5 has a board of directors with thirteen members from the seventeen school districts which it serves. The directors make major policy decisions which are then carried out by a sizeable professional staff under an executive director. The Intermediate Unit is funded primarily by the state and federal governments, which combined contributed 96.9 percent of the 1978-79 budget of 9.6 million dollars. Local school districts contributed 3.1 percent to the budget, based on the services they need and their ability to pay.

Services which the Unit provides are extensive and include: special education, management services and instructional services, to name only a few. Special education is by far the Unit's largest responsibility, accounting for forty-three percent of the total 9.6 million dollar budget. There are fifteen programs within the special education field, some of which include: psychological testing for students with speech, vision, hearing, physical and mental handicaps; programs for gifted students, and socially/emotionally disturbed students. Special education staff personnel from the Unit either travel to locations where they are needed, or are assigned to a particular district to help run these programs.

The intermediate unit plays a vital role in aiding school districts, especially in rural areas where districts find it difficult to pay for ever increasing program demands from the state and federal governments. These pressures from state and federal sources have become increasingly more frustrating to local school boards, school administrators and tax payers. Even the leaders of the Intermediate Unit Number 5 who receive outside funds for, and administer such programs are feeling the pressure. John T. Willow, from the Fort LeBoeuf School District and President of the Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit Board of Directors, expressed these concerns in his message published in the Unit's 1978-79 Annual Report:
Time after time, members of our Board have been faced with state and federal regulations that are so complex, so costly and so contradictory as to be ludicrous and appalling to all of us. When taking action on some of these matters, I know that each of the Board members in all good conscience is tempted to vote "no" on many occasions, until we are reminded by our solicitor that we are sworn to uphold the laws of the Commonwealth and of the nation and therefore must implement action on programs with which we may not agree.

What's happening? It seems that many special interest groups in the field of education are successful in getting the kind of legislation they want, or in forcing court decisions that interpret the law in their favor. The net result is that an increasing number of special services must be provided. Local districts are being told what they must do and, because the Intermediate Unit can do it more effectively and efficiently, districts are more frequently asking that the I.U. provide these special services. Unfortunately, the services are generally to be performed in ways dictated by people far removed from "where the action is", frequently resulting in a tangled wasteland of ridiculous procedures and systems.

Consider the field of special education. Local school districts are constantly asking for more from the Intermediate Unit because of legislative and judicial mandates, yet we are told that we can expect no more money next year than we received during the current fiscal year. Is this realistic in the face of steadily escalating costs? It appears that our legislators and courts are putting us into a practically impossible situation.

All of us recognize the impact of Proposition 13, but it goes without saying that the increasing mandates imposed on educators and school districts are incompatible with the noble goal of reducing costs and taxes.

There will be an increasing need for the services of an Intermediate Unit in the years ahead. Local school districts simply cannot afford to provide many of the services and programs which the laws now require. The Intermediate Unit, as a service unit, can provide those programs and services much more efficiently and effectively than the individual district. But the increased demands on the Intermediate Unit for such services and programs carries with it the need for more local support of the Intermediate Unit in all those areas where local districts request such assistance. This is particularly true in the areas of management services, instructional materials services, curriculum planning, policy development, federal and state liaison and others where the Intermediate Unit has substantial expertise and is truly able to help the local districts reduce their own costs. What is the alternative? One that certainly does not appeal to many of us - letting the State do it for us.
Mr. Willow's words clearly express the realities of a dilemma faced by school districts in Crawford County. Of course one may question whether the I.U. can provide additional programs "more efficiently" as Mr. Willow states. But the fact remains that the cost of education and the mandates from "outside" are becoming increasingly difficult to deal with. Parents, citizens and planners must be more cognizant of this situation as they relate to decisions made by school boards. School boards and school administrators, for their part, must stay well informed and encourage open communication with their constituents and with the world around them.
APPENDIX 2

SUPPORTING MATERIAL

This Appendix contains a listing of mapped studies developed as background to the Plan which could not be entirely included in this document. However, this important supporting information is on file either with the Summerhill Township Officials or in the Offices of the Crawford County Planning Commission.

1. Agricultural Quality; Summerhill Township
2. Alternative Land Use Plan Idea; Summerhill Township May 1980
4. Flood Plains; Summerhill Township January 1980
5. Full-time Farm Operations; Summerhill Township 1980
7. Inventory of Residents of Summerhill Township by Property February 1980
8. Land Use Accounts - Grid Breakdown - Summerhill Township
9. On-lot Sewage Suitability, Summerhill Township 1980
10. Road Information Map: Drainage Structures and Road Surfaces, Summerhill Township - April 1980
11. Roads Management Idea - Proposed Road Surfaces and Classifications Policies Erie and Crawford County April 1979
12. Road Mileage Summerhill Township - February 1980
13. Sand and Gravel Deposits, Summerhill Township - February 1980
14. Topographic map for Summerhill Township (colored) 1980
15. Gas and Oil Well Locations, Summerhill Township 1979
APPENDIX 3

TOTAL MUNICIPAL REVENUES
SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP 1975 - 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>11 197</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>12 349</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13 042</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Tax</td>
<td>14 043</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13 953</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>15 318</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses &amp; Permits</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1 200</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2 623</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>32 603</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>38 161</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>39 208</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1 263</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest &amp; Rents</td>
<td>1 608</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2 019</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2 611</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>60 296</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>69 688</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>73 776</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Revenue</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>7 500</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>37 818</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RECEIPTS</td>
<td>70 296</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>77 188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>111 593</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX 3

**TOTAL MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURES**  
**SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP 1975 - 1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1978</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>5 YEAR % AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4 356</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5 296</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6 049</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8 607</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>8 870</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Collection</td>
<td>1 048</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1 086</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1 183</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1 334</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1 337</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Bldgs.</td>
<td>19 448</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>1 029</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4 120</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4 586</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14 284</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2 862</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Sanitation</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>29 315</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>38 625</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>62 754</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>49 399</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>52 652</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2 808</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2 124</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2 193</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2 589</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3 720</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Government</td>
<td>59 201</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>49 525</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>79 900</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>68 258</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>84 533</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Government</td>
<td>14 600</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>7 740</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>30 679</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>4 138</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>13 444</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>73 801</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>57 265</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>110 579</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>72 397</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>97 977</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH LEFT</td>
<td>17 509</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>41 789</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19 532</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25 790</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11 222</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITIES LEFT</td>
<td>22 493</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18 136</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>41 408</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>41 557</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>46 548</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Annual Audit and Financial Reports for Summerhill Township.