

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held May 14, 2013

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:10 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Supervisors present in addition to Mr. Hawk were: William C. Seeds, Sr., William L. Hornung, and David B. Blain.

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Ron Lucas, Stevens and Lee; Todd and Debbie Gelbaugh, Meadows Bumper Cars; Ed Fetterman and Steve Dayton, RVG Management and Development Co.; Steve Fleming, Mark Levine; Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director; William Collins, Simone Collins Landscaper; Tom George, Stan Smith and Dennis Guise, Koons/Wolfersberger Park Master Plan Committee; Sandra Prahl, Bruce Senft and Tom George, Friendship Center Operating Board; Christine Hunter, Heroes Grove; and Watson Fisher and Ted Robertson, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Blain led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Comment

Mr. Mark Levine wanted to thank Mr. Blain for his service to the Township since he is not seeking reelection to the Board for the next term.

Discussion of the waiver requests for sidewalk and curbing for the Meadows Bumper Cars Subdivision and Land Development Plan

Attorney Ron Lucas introduced Todd and Debbie Gelbaugh, the owners of the Meadows complex. He noted that the business is located in the former Joe Rossi jewelers location along Route 22 where the Meadows Frozen Custard Shop is located that has been in business for three years. He noted last year the Board approved the addition of the miniature golf and batting cages. He explained that Mr. Gelbaugh recently received Zoning Hearing Board approval to build a building that would house bumper cars. He noted that the bumper cars are not like the electric

cars that you would find at Hershey Park as they are battery powered and look like a large inner tube. He noted that they don't make noise and do not run on a track.

Mr. Lucas noted that Care Street abuts the property to the west and it fronts along Route 22. He noted that there is an existing house on the property that was purchase and that is where the bumper car facility will be located. He explained that the house on that property is very close to Care Street. He noted that Mr. Gelbaugh bought the house and the gentleman who owned the house continues to rent the home. He explained that when Mr. Gelbaugh put in the prior upgrades he made some improvements to Care Street and he is not planning an additional driveway access to the complex.

Mr. Seeds questioned if a condition of approval from the Zoning Hearing Board is that the cars be electric. Mr. Lucas noted that it has nothing to do with the variance. He noted that the condition for the Zoning Hearing Board was that the doors must be closed on the building that face Care Street at 10 p.m., although the facility will be open to 11 p.m. during the summer months. He noted that the plan shows the grading and landscaping.

Mr. Lucas explained that Mr. Gelbaugh has since purchased the next property north on Care Street to the one that has the house located close to the roadway. He noted that Mr. Gelbaugh is adding a sidewalk that will connect to the existing sidewalk, walkway, parking and driveway for this use. He noted that the sole issue is that staff and the Planning Commission recommended not approving the waiver request for the widening of Care Street and installing curb and sidewalk. He noted that he proposed to widen Care Street south of the house. He noted that the house is located along the roadway and there is not much room in that location and if Mr. Gelbaugh was to install a sidewalk it would be beside the house and he does not want to risk the stability of the house.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the house is being torn down. Mr. Lucas answered no. He noted that Mr. Gelbaugh needs the house as a rental income to help pay for the property.

Mr. Lucas explained that he proposes the following condition to both the Planning Commission and to the Board: "Upon the further development of the property and demolition of the house at what is now 9 Care Street, Applicant agrees to provide additional right-of-way, as well as curbing and sidewalks if all are deemed necessary by the Township at the time of such additional land development." He noted that he hopes to demolish the home in the next five to

ten years depending on the development of the business. He noted that there is no other curbing along that area and he would not want to put the curbing in unless he has to. He noted that it is not a permanent waiver, rather a temporary waiver for when Mr. Gelbaugh redevelops the lot and does something else in that location. He noted when he demolishes the house, then he would put in the sidewalks and whatever is necessary at that time and grant additional right-of-way.

Mr. Lucas provided photographs showing the location and how close the house is to the road. Mr. Hawk questioned if the house is occupied at this time. Mr. Lucas answered yes. Mr. Hawk noted that when he drove by it, it looked empty. Mr. Lucas noted if you tried to add a sidewalk it would be right up against the house. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Gelbaugh would be doing widening of Care Street. Mr. Lucas answered that he would be widening the area south of the house to match the existing widening.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Lucas is requesting a waiver not to do any widening near the house and to the north of the property. Mr. Lucas explained if the widening was done, he would have to install a retaining wall to ensure the stability of the house, do the widening and install curb and sidewalk with an estimated cost of \$75,000.

Mr. Seeds noted that there is a blind spot driving up over the hill. He noted that there is a lack of site distance as you approach the top of the hill. He questioned if there is enough room for two cars to pass at the top of the hill. Mr. Hornung suggested there would be if it was widened three feet. Mr. Gelbaugh answered that we did widen the road. Mr. Lucas noted that Mr. Gelbaugh widened the road to the south. Mr. Hawk questioned if he agreed to widen the road to the crest of the hill. Mr. Gelbaugh answered that he has agreed to widen the road up to the hill. Mr. Lucas noted that it will not be as wide as it is to the south. Mr. Hornung questioned how many feet. Mr. Gelbaugh answered about three or four feet which takes away the blind spot. He noted if you look at the entire street, it is wide except at the crest of the hill. Mr. Hornung noted that two cars can pass but it is not comfortable to do it.

Mr. Lucas noted that the improvements are public improvements on the street and it could be widened, but he did not think sidewalks and curbing are needed today. He noted that his client is not causing the need for sidewalks by putting in the one use, so he thinks that he should be entitled to the waiver, and a reasonable compromise would be to do the widening that is shown and agree to provide additional right-of-way to the Township, widening the road and

installing sidewalk and curb when the further development is done and he tears down the house. He noted that it is a timing waiver in order to maintain revenues from the house at this time.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Fleming is present to answer any questions for the plan.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the area will be totally fenced in, and will children using the facility access it using Care Street. Mr. Gelbaugh answered that it is already fenced in along the north and other areas. Mr. Crissman questioned if children could walk out on Care Street. Mr. Gelbaugh answered that they could but there is really no point... Mr. Crissman noted that it is open and easy access for young people to be walking on that street and all they would have is do is walk on the street. He noted that he has a major problem with that. He noted that it is a health and safety issue for young people. Mr. Lucas noted that they could walk out there today. Mr. Crissman answered that they can, but now we are adding another venue which creates another opportunity for more young people to come to, and for him, it is a health and safety issue for young people.

Mr. Seeds questioned where the bumper cars will be located. Mr. Hornung answered that it would be inside the building. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would be a new building. Mr. Gelbaugh answered yes, with three barn doors. He noted that it will be located north and east of the batting cages and the batting cages are closer to Care Street.

Mr. Seeds noted that there is a walk to the batting cages. He noted that there is a sidewalk near the last batting cage near Care Street. He noted to access the bumper cars, a customer would have to use a walk that is on the east side of the batting cages.

Mr. Seeds questioned where they would park their car. Mr. Gelbaugh answered that he is putting in no additional parking and customers would park in the existing parking lot. Mr. Seeds questioned if there is enough parking to meet the code requirements with the addition of the bumper cars. Mr. Gelbaugh answered yes. Mr. Seeds suggested that people would drive to this location and walk from the parking lot. Mr. Gelbaugh explained that they have to pay at the lower lot level in order to access the bumper car area. He noted that he has a picket fence around the golf course and a six foot privacy fence that goes across the lot to Care Street. He noted that he would not be opposed to putting a picket fence along Care Street. Mr. Crissman noted that he is thinking about the health and safety of children. Mr. Hornung noted if the kids are going to

wander around they can just as easily walk out onto Route 22. Mr. Hawk noted that he has been back by the batting cages and you can drive around and access Route 22.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Gelbaugh is talking about putting a picket fence south of the house on Care Street. Mr. Lucas noted that it could be a condition of the waiver and part of the land development plan.

Mr. Lucas noted that the land development plan was recommended for approval but not this waiver. Mr. Hawk questioned if it would be five years until the house is torn down. Mr. Gelbaugh answered that there are other things he would like to do but due to the cash flow it is not feasible at this time.

Mr. Seeds noted if you put in sidewalks and curbs you would also have to install drainage as the water would flow down the hill and there are a couple of basins at the bottom of the hill on Care Street. He noted that it would take a lot of stormwater work.

Mr. Hawk questioned where they would park. Mr. Gelbaugh answered in the existing parking area. He noted that he has 80 to 90 parking spaces, more than what is required. He noted that there is a sidewalk that would lead up to the building. Mr. Seeds questioned if there have been empty parking spots in the past. Mr. Gelbaugh answered, even on Mother's Day there was parking available. He noted that there are "No parking" signs posted on Care Street.

Mr. Seeds noted that it is a nice addition to the community.

Mr. Crissman suggested that the Board needs to hear from our engineer. Mr. Fleming noted that he would speak in regards to the ordinance requirements. He noted that there are several sections of the ordinance that reference applications such as this plan for installing curbing, sidewalk and widening along the street and the previous plan was approved with waivers from those requirements. He noted, at that time, the property boundary was different and this plan is now consolidating this lot with the overall lot and the justification at that point was that there were no sidewalks in proximity. He noted that sidewalks exist on the Comcast property which is on the other side of the crest of the hill on Care Street where they widened the road and installed curbing and sidewalk. He noted that the frontage associated with this plan stretches from a point that is just less than 200 feet from the existing sidewalk and curb all the way down beyond the screenshot close to the back of the restaurant property that borders Route 22.

Mr. Fleming noted that his request was for the applicant to do widening consistent with what was previously done; to install curbing and sidewalk to the full frontage. He noted that his reasoning was not only for safety but proximity to adjoining uses such as the school, residential neighborhood, swimming pool, restaurant, and shopping center uses that are pedestrian generators. He noted that access would be for walkers that frequent the place but not for people who are driving there. He noted that Care Street was not intended to be an access for the batting cages or the Meadows Facility, rather more of an exit or secondary ingress point. He noted that you would have pedestrians walking from their homes or other establishments to use one of the facilities on this site. He noted that there are several ordinance sections that cite the requirement.

Mr. Fleming noted some history on Care Street that he learned and the reason why Care Street is so narrow, originally the development was plotted for Care Street to be two separate streets with a boulevard in between, having an ingress street to the neighborhood in the back and there was to be another street constructed for people exiting but subsequent plans irradiated that secondary street and it became a street, but not a major thoroughfare.

Mr. Seeds questioned where Mr. Fleming found that information. Mr. Fleming noted that K&W Engineers found it in the property search when they were trying to determine why Care Street was designed the way it was.

Mr. Hawk noted at the top of the hill there is Comcast to the right and Ethel Street is to the left. Mr. Fleming noted that you have Ethel, Winfield and Devonshire and then it becomes Coventry and Cove into the Development. He noted that Comcast replaced their entire sidewalk last year to make it ADA compliant.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Gelbaugh where his property ends. He questioned if it ended on the other side of the house that he is renting. Mr. Gelbaugh noted that it is an L-shaped property. He noted that he owns another house further up from that one and a trailer/house. He noted that he had provided access to that place on his property. Mr. Seeds questioned if he owned the other house on Care Street to the south of the batting cages. Mr. Gelbaugh answered no, noting that there is an old lady who is 102 years old that lives there.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Gelbaugh will widen Care Street almost up to the house to the crest of the hill but to do that he is asking for a waiver of sidewalk and curbs until the house is razed, at which time he would do further expansion and install the curb and sidewalks. Mr. Lucas

noted in concert with the redevelopment of the property at that time. He noted that it is a temporary waiver so that when the house is demolished and the property redeveloped it would provide for the widening of the right-of-way, widening of the pavement all the way out and put curbing if the Township deems it to be necessary even though there is no curbing along Care Street now, and put in the sidewalk.

Mr. Hawk noted that you will see that the sidewalks and curbing will be necessary. Mr. Lucas noted up to this point it has not been necessary, as the Meadows has been there three years and people drive there.

Mr. Seeds noted that four foot would be required for the widening, so if you only do three you will need a partial waiver. Mr. Hawk suggested where it is widened it looks to be about four feet.

Mr. Gelbaugh noted that there are only six bumper cars, not like 30 cars that are typical for other bumper car venues. Mr. Seeds questioned how big is the building. Mr. Gelbaugh answered that it is 40 feet by 40 feet.

Mr. Seeds noted that he is okay with the widening. Mr. Lucas noted that is the condition that he sent last night that the Board should have. Mr. Lucas noted that he would put this condition on the land development plan to be recorded. Mr. Hawk noted that he saw that three Board members were in agreement.

Mr. Lucas noted that K&W will submit the plan for a June Board meeting. Mr. Stine requested Mr. Lucas to add the picket fence along Care Street. Mr. Lucas noted that it would be put on the land development plan.

Request to discuss the zoning designation of a parcel of
land on Linglestown Road, between the Weis Market and Patton Road

Mr. Ed Fetterman explained that he is from RVG Management and Development Co., and is present with Steve Dayton. He noted that they both work for a commercial real estate development company located in Wormleysburg, Pennsylvania. He noted that he has been working with this parcel for some time with a goal to see if there would be any openness to making a more formal submission for a text amendment that would allow something other than a pure commercial use for this parcel.

Mr. Fetterman explained that the parcel is located next to the Weis Market near Colonial Road and fronts on Linglestown Road with the Patton Center to the east. He noted that access would be through the existing access agreements with the two adjoining properties. He noted that he looked at doing a pure commercial development, however, there is a history of the past failed plan and the traffic situation for the intersection of Colonial and Linglestown Roads as it is a failing intersection. He noted that there is not much real estate to expand the intersection at this time. He noted to be able to do that, the Township would have to raze the Weis Market, build a larger, more modern store that would occupy the ten-acre parcel that he is managing and maybe add a restaurant or some other uses to be able to afford the off site expenses.

Mr. Fetterman explained that he started to think of what would be the next best use, as cash flow is king, to make money that would not provide as much stress to the intersection since the project would not be able to afford significant improvements. He explained that he came up with retaining some commercial frontage and doing apartments or multi-family behind it. He explained that there is a large demand in this Township for quality apartments. He questioned how it could be done to have the least impact on the community as well as other Commercial Neighborhood (CN) zoned properties within the Township. He noted that the easiest thing that he could come up with would be to do a text amendment to the CN zone that permits multi-family apartments within that zone as a conditional use. He explained that the Board would have the ability to put other conditions on that plan so that it would have some control over collateral damage throughout the Township for other properties that are currently zoned CN.

Mr. Fetterman explained that he did a review to see what other properties there are and found very few undeveloped CN properties within the Township.

Mr. Hornung questioned if he owns the property now. Mr. Fetterman noted that he has a business relationship with the current owner. Mr. Crissman questioned if he owns the front property and is pending a contract for the second piece. Mr. Fetterman answered that he has a relationship with the land owner to see if his firm could come up with an idea that would work. Mr. Dayton noted that it is for the entire parcel. Mr. Crissman questioned if they were discussing the entire package, noting that the front parcel is zoned what. Mr. Wolfe answered that the entire parcel is zoned CN. Mr. Crissman stated that Mr. Fetterman knows how the property is zoned and what you can do in that zone. Mr. Fetterman answered absolutely. Mr. Hawk noted that

Harold Leibenson will be very happy if you could develop that land. Mr. Fetterman explained that Mr. Leibenson sold the land several years ago.

Mr. Fetterman noted that he has the traffic issue and cost basis for the land so it is coming together for a development that needs to make a profit. He wanted to know if there was room for further discussion with the Board to proceed with a text amendment or some other idea that the Board would allow to permit apartments or multi-family within on all or part of the property. He noted that it could be a simple text amendment but he would have to have Mr. Lucas do a through review of Section 306.B.2 of the residential uses for the zoning district, Commercial Neighborhood, changing the “N” to a conditional use. Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Fetterman was asking the Board to change what was already in existence. Mr. Fetterman answered yes. Mr. Crissman informed Mr. Fetterman that he knew what was in existence and wants it changed as it would provide a financial gain to accommodate him. Mr. Fetterman answered yes as he and Mr. Dayton are developers. He noted that Mr. Dayton lives in the neighborhood and has been trying to figure out what could be done with the property to have the least impact but provide for a good economic development for the Township and surrounding community.

Mr. Crissman noted the Township’s Comprehensive Plan was zoned accordingly and those are the rules and regulations that have been established for that piece of property. He noted that he has a difficult time when people ask the Board to make a change for a piece of land that is developed and zoned for a particular area, so they can put more money in their pocket.

Mr. Seeds questioned what you project the total number of apartments to be. Mr. Fetterman answered that we would have to abide by the current R-3 zone. Mr. Seeds questioned if he had a number. Mr. Fetterman answered that he has but he doesn’t want to spend a lot of money on engineers to come up with this plan if there is no desire to do it. He noted that he met with Mr. Wolfe and felt that it would be wise to throw it out, being completely honest with the Board for what he wanted to do. He noted for apartments dwellers, many of the services are within walking distance, coming home from work, parking at their apartment and walking to services from the Weis, Centric Bank or to the east.

Mr. Seeds questioned if R-2 would work. Mr. Fetterman answered no.

Mr. Seeds questioned how much undeveloped CN land there is. Mr. Dayton answered that one parcel is Eric Kessler's piece located behind the Sheetz, and across the street, the driving range is owned by Triple Crown. Mr. Seeds questioned how deep is that land. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it is 600 feet. Mr. Dayton noted that the driving range is zoned CN that abuts R-2. He noted that the other vacant piece of CN is behind Ollie's. He noted that there is a home on that land but it is zoned CN.

Mr. Seeds noted that he was thinking of R-2 as that is the zoning behind the property. Mr. Fetterman noted that there are characteristics to the site that would allow an area between the current R-2 and any multi-family use for a buffer. He noted that there are wetlands and a requirement for open space for a play area and he was thinking about possibly having the back area as a recreational facility if an easement could be granted with a walking path to the other neighborhood to allow those people to access the area. He noted that there are special conditions to meet for apartments, but by making it a conditional use for zoning, the Board would have more control to maximize the density. He noted that it would not be low-income housing.

Mr. Seeds noted that R-2 abuts this land and he would be willing to look at R-2 to joint the parcel behind it. Mr. Hawk questioned how many apartments you want to build. Mr. Fetterman answered that he has not gotten into the calculations. He noted that, normally, it is 12 units per acre and he has looked around the area and that seems to be the magic number. He noted that he would have to do a double in some shape and form to make a project feasible at all. He noted that he doesn't have an idea for trip counts; however, if he was able to have a right-in and right-out it would help with traffic. He noted that this intersection has issues and those issues were a factor when the Biko Plan was presented many years ago. He noted if it was all commercial he would have to install a dedicated turn lane and do something with the Arroga's as they wouldn't meet parking requirements and the site becomes economically unfeasible to do anything unless you get the 3 B's to do some combination of properties there. He noted that the project becomes very big. He noted that the cost of this would be expensive, noting that a single developer would have to buy the end piece and the golf course to be able to develop multi-properties and be able to support the improvements. He noted that it would be a ten year plan for a single developer to be able to afford to do that without owning some of those other properties.

Mr. Seeds questioned how Mr. Fleming knew that he had residential access to Patton Place. Mr. Dayton answered that they are recorded easements. Mr. Seeds noted that you may have to put a traffic light in there and they may not want to give you access for residential, and maybe they don't have to. Mr. Dayton answered that they are recorded easements today Mr. Seeds questioned regardless of the development. Mr. Dayton suggested if it is for commercial development it would also be for a lower zone.

Mr. Fetterman noted that we would have to research that before coming to the Board with a text amendment. Mr. Hawk noted that the access would be from Patton Road or Colonial Road.

Mr. Hornung questioned why Mr. Fetterman didn't apply for a rezoning. Mr. Fetterman answered that he is looking for flexibility and if he was to rezone it all to R-3... Mr. Hornung noted, not all R-3. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it would be spot zoning. Mr. Seeds noted that R-2 would not be spot zoning since there is adjoining R-2. Mr. Hornung explained that Mr. Fetterman feels that they can't make it financially with an R-2 zone. Mr. Fetterman stated that he envisions a mixed-use site development where you have certain services that you can walk to with internal flow between all the properties as the easements are there. He noted that it would reduce the strain on the road network that is already strained as there is a need and desire for multi-family within this Township. He noted from talking with other individuals there are waiting lists for some of the apartments. He noted, to build something that is quality that has good schools, good services and good for commuters; this seems like a logical place for it.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Fetterman also mentioned traffic issues and questioned how many units he wanted to build. Mr. Fetterman answered that we would have to do a traffic and engineering study and if there is no desire for this he will not spend a dime on engineering. Mr. Hawk noted if the Board says it is interested, it would cost engineering fees and if we say no you will move on and do what you had in mind.

Mr. Blain questioned how many units could be built. Mr. Fetterman answered that he would have to look at the zoning and density as there are other conditions with that. He noted that there must have green space and he does not have a number for the Board. Mr. Wolfe questioned how many acres make up the parcel. Mr. Fetterman answered that it is less than 10 acres, 9.5 acres. Mr. Wolfe noted if you are looking at 12 units per acre, it could be 120 units but

that would not work with open space and the commercial in the front. He suggested that it could be around 80 units.

Mr. Crissman noted if you are talking about the integrity of life and the piece of property that you are dealing with and the property across the road which is Mr. Kessler's and behind the driving range which is Triple Crown, was there any thought of having all three work on this together. He suggested that it would be good if all three landowners got together to work on the text amendment or are you just speaking metaphorically about those three. Mr. Dayton noted that he was speaking metaphorically about it, noting if you put three big developers in the same room it is not a good outcome. He noted that his comments were made from a cost basis to share the cost, this project by itself cannot endure what has to be done. Mr. Fetterman noted with the recent history of the Giant Store in Susquehanna Township and the \$6.5 million road project that was done, it will not happen here.

Mr. Blain noted that based upon what Mr. Fetterman is saying, he has a concern about the failing traffic intersection on Linglestown Road by the 3B's and Arroga's and he proposes to add 80 units after green space with commercial out front. He noted that it would add more stress and strain on that intersection as well as the one at Patton Road. He was not sure about this.

Mr. Dayton noted that it would be less than 100% commercial type development noting that the Biko Plan had a 150 seat restaurant, a day spa, two story operation, all of which dictates many trips per day. He noted if you had 80 apartment units, and they all go to work, at \$850 or above for rental, it would be at least two trips per day, and being a community-type neighborhood development most of them would shop in this area. He suggested that they would get their coffee at Dunkin Donuts so that the incremental trips outside of the development in a residential environment would be much less than a commercial environment. Mr. Blain noted that typically a residential home has ten trips per day figured into a traffic plan but Mr. Drayton is saying that it may only be seven or eight; however, they will have to go to work, come home from work, and not all their services will be at that location. He noted that he highly doubts that everyone will bank at Centric Bank or go to Arroga's every night. He noted that it makes sense that they may walk to Dunkin Donuts to get their coffee but if you built 80 units, it is at least six trips a day, adding another 500 trips on Linglestown Road. He noted that is his concern.

Mr. Hawk noted that he has seen people build homes on pieces of land that he had to scratch his head and say why and yet people buy them. He noted that it would not be a prime area that he would want to live but he is not a typical homeowner. He noted that he would not want Mr. Fetterman to spend a fortune advancing it. Mr. Fetterman noted if there is a definite feeling by this Board that it doesn't make sense to do it then he wants to hear that. Mr. Blain noted that his concern is the density of what you are proposing, 80 to 100 units. He noted if you want to make it like the complex to the north, that is more townhome orientated, he might be more incline to say it makes more sense.

Mr. Crissman noted that he is assuming that there would be an egress through the Weis Store onto Colonial Road and egress through Patton Place to Patton Road as well as a direct route onto Linglestown Road. Mr. Fetterman noted that he threw in a proposal for a right-in, left-in, and right-out center turn lane, that would be a shortcut for the apartments. Mr. Crissman noted that it helps with traffic flow that everyone is not using the main artery, using Patton and Colonial Roads as well.

Mr. Hawk noted for the little shopping center, Giotti's, Mutual Fund Store and Hong Kong Ruby do well, and he is sure that Dunkin Donuts does well also. He noted that you can put a bank anywhere and it will do well. Mr. Crissman noted that you have PinnacleHealth to the rear of those businesses.

Mr. Hawk suggested that Mr. Fetterman should provide a sketch to see what happens. Mr. Fetterman noted that he could come back to another workshop and do another informal. Mr. Seeds noted that he is not interested in R-3 but he may look at R-2. Mr. Hornung noted that his problem is with the text amendment, knowing that the other developers who own the other pieces of land would love R-3. He noted that even though it is a golf course it is a lot more lucrative as an R-3, and if he was sitting on a driving range and the Board changed the text amendment, within a year the driving range would be gone. Mr. Blain noted that Triple Crown has stated that the driving range is only a temporary use. Mr. Hornung explained that is the problem that he has with a text amendment as too many other people who own those lands that love R-3 and he does not want all that R-3 in that area. He noted adding 40 to 50 units would be too much. He noted that he feels bad that Mr. Fetterman is on the hook for that intersection as it is not fair but he is not sure how to resolve it. Mr. Fetterman noted that typically, the first developer in has to pay

their way. He noted that we develop a lot of shopping centers and spend millions on PennDOT roads and know that it will be expensive. He noted without a plan like the one he is suggesting, it will never get done. Mr. Hornung questioned how Sheetz got in there. Mr. Fetterman noted that they built a long time ago, and it is located in wetlands. He stated that Sheetz would not be able to build that store in that location today. He noted that he could have an engineer put a plan together and bring it back, and the Board could look at it. Mr. Hawk noted that you could do that. Mr. Seeds noted that he would not be interested in a text amendment. Mr. Fetterman noted that he would have to go in another direction. Mr. Hornung noted that he would be more agreeable towards a rezoning.

Presentation by Mark Levine regarding
flood control through storm sewer improvements

Mr. Mark Levine explained that he does not like coming to a meeting to be a complainer, rather he would like to provide solutions to the problems. He noted that due to relationships that he has had with people he is aware that the Township has flooding problems during heavy rains. He noted that one occurred last spring with people coming to a Township meeting that he was in attendance and the next thing he knew, he decided to come up with a better mouse trap regarding their issues. He noted when he starts a project, he knows his plan A but he always has a plan B and C and normally he ends up doing Plan C.

Mr. Levine noted that HRG is doing an analysis for sewer flooding.

Mr. Levine noted that he is an engineer and had to determine what the problem is, questioning if we want to fix, reduce or eliminate the problem. He noted that he questioned what happened to the house that used to be located on Linglestown Road at Ranger Road. He noted that the house disappears and in 1972 the water was up to the roof at that time. He noted that the Township has a stormwater problem and questioned what caused it and is it still causing the problem. He noted that the answer from an engineer's standpoint is efficiency. He noted that we try to do everything to perfection, to improve everything and we do an excellent job of taking water off the streets and getting rid of it. He noted that is the problem. He noted that the HRG study is based on the premises of efficiency because that is Engineering 101. He noted that HRG will probably suggest widening the banks of the existing streambed, putting rocks in and going ahead to make the pipes bigger to get rid of the water faster with estimates of over \$100 million.

Mr. Levine noted that the regulations have changed as you are not allowed to accumulate ponds like the Karns Shopping Center, that has a large piece of concrete, and a large pipe; however, there is no standpipe as it is not a detention pond, just an accumulation pond with all the water going into the pond, into the pipe and then to wherever it goes and heading downstream. He noted that we don't allow direct stormsewer for streams or dry beds any longer. He noted that is the way it is along Goose Valley Road and all over the place. He noted that we have to be less efficient to slow the water down, keep the pipes with less water in them and distribute the water that comes off the roadbeds slower into the pipe and slower into the streams. He questioned how we do that.

Mr. Levine noted that the City of Chicago has a plan that is called the Rain Blocker Program. He noted that it consists of a round restrictor valve that has an inlet with a serpentine that goes out into the stormsewer. He noted that they installed over 200,000 of these and reduced the water that was flooding Chicago from the six foot level to the two foot level. He noted that it still floods, but less since using the restrictors.

Mr. Levine noted that he has a different idea, something that is an improvement over that and in his variation, it is a storm sewer closet, with a grate on top and sidewalk and if you look inside there is a box that has two inlets that go into the storm pipe that goes to the storm drainage. He explained that you allow water to accumulate in the storm sewer jacket or closet with some going into the smaller hole and to the stream, however it restricts the amount of water that is allowed into that pipe so water will accumulate until it reaches the top then it will pour down from the top and keep it from flooding the street. He noted that each one of the little storm sewers would become a detention pond, slowing down the amount going into the streams.

Mr. Levine noted it could be installed during the storm sewer clean outs using Township employees to run a pilot program.

Mr. Levine noted that Karns has the concrete block with grass around it and water goes into the pond through the pipe. He noted that you should put something in there that will allow the water to accumulate in the pond until it reaches a certain height which would be below the top of the concrete to let it drain down into the pipe. He noted water could drain into the ground and slow the amount of water going into the storm sewers

Mr. Levine noted for Ryan and Clermont Drives, it was mentioned that there was flooding when a certain hotel was built and there was an interest in placing a detention pond for that area. Mr. Seeds noted that they fixed that problem. Mr. Levine noted if they installed the restrictors it would help those people out.

Mr. Levine noted that anything that crosses Lockwillow Avenue in the area of Dr. Guise's place, has a stream and all of a sudden it goes underground. He noted that the Village Knoll apartments has a lot of parking space and grates and all that storm water goes into the little piece of outlet and it causes a lot of problems. He explained that it is pretty much located to one area. He noted that it would make a good pilot program for Curvin Drive, Harman Drive, Top View Drive, Creek View Drive and Brightbill Park and Devon Manor. He noted that it would include the intersection where the little stream is, and the neighborhood to the north of Brightbill Park. Mr. Seeds noted that it would be in the area of Carolyn Street. He noted that all the water from this neighborhood is dumped into the normally dry bed and it would be a perfect place to put restrictors. He explained that he concentrated on two legs of the branch that flooded Earl Drive back in the spring.

Mr. Levine noted the way to fund it would be the Chesapeake Bay Commission, the Susquehanna River Basin Commission and any other organizations that want to save the Susquehanna River. He suggested that it might be a good way to do something that would be relatively inexpensive, easily maintained along the river and they might fund the pilot project for the Township.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Levine put a lot of thought into his presentation but the Board is not in a position to evaluate it. He requested Mr. Levine to type up his presentation and have the Board submit it to the Public Works and Sewer Department to have them take a look at it. Mr. Levine suggested that it should be presented to HRG, especially if they are doing a study, as he thinks they will come back with a huge monstrous bill for widening, stones and big pipes that will cost millions, where this might be a less expensive way to go about it. Mr. Levine noted that he would do that.

Mr. Seeds suggested that someone should look at what they did in Chicago as it might work in some places.

Mr. Hawk called for a recess at 7:19 p.m.

Mr. Hawk reconvened the meeting at 7:21 p.m.

Presentation of the final draft plan for
Development of Wolfersberger and Koons parks

Mr. Brian Luetchford noted that Mr. Bill Collins of Simone Collins Landscape Architecture is present to discuss the master plan study for Koons Park/Wolfersberger Park. He noted that it has been a month or so since he was last present to discuss this plan and he would like to present the final draft plan to the Board. He explained that more input needs to be completed but Mr. Bill Collins will discuss the draft.

Mr. Collins noted that the two parks are considered to be sister parks by the Township and that is how they are addressed in the master plan. He explained that he will show the ideas that were provided by the Community and how the Township might be able to phase some of the improvements. He noted that his intent is to design safe access for the two parks and improve access to Koons Park to relieve some of the demands on Koons Park.

Mr. Collins noted that the last time he made his presentation, there was discussion to move some of the fields to Wolfersberger and the plan would do just that. He displayed the project schedule noting that only one public meeting remains with an additional Committee meeting, and after this meeting he will start the key person interviews.

Mr. Collins noted that much has changed since he presented the last draft and he will go over the basic changes. He noted that there are improvements along the Laporte Street as well along Balthaser Street and stormwater improvements within the site noting that everything would have to be developed in stages. He noted that the basketball courts and the service building are the only buildings to remain as the salt building is moved and the football field will be improved, the Teener field is moved to the corner, lighting would be move to the core area away from the perimeter, and several playground facilities will be added in the promenade in the middle of the park. He noted that this plan shows a completely revised pool. He noted that the idea is that the corner area would continue to serve as the location for the existing pool as the community wanted to see a pool inside the park. He noted that he revised parking and access and the addition of a promenade that serves as a central public space to provide an open square for the community use adding a gazebo. He noted that volleyball and sand volleyball was included and parking was increased in various areas to include Raspberry Lane.

Mr. Collins noted that the central area would have drop off zones so that everything is not happening out on the street, noting that the promenade goes across the park and serves as a pedestrian walkway. He noted that stormwater would be run underground in perimeter areas so the entire site would drain in one direction to the outlet in the southern end of the park.

Mr. Collins noted that he wanted to share some of the amenities that the design phase could bring about. He noted that it could provide trails and plantings. He showed a street crossing in Bethlehem that had a trail crossing, gateway signage, appropriate paving, murals, parking lot and a trail system.

Mr. Collins noted that the promenade could be used for impromptu games to allow kids to come and use it as a palate. He noted that the use of furniture and gazebos, bandstand, sculptors are all ideas that could be incorporated into the plan.

Mr. Collins noted that the southern end would be open space to house the storm water system that would increase the volume it could contain, and is linked hydraulically for stormwater access sites. He displayed a picture of the pool with zero dept entry and a new pool building, and concession stand that could be accessed from the promenade. He noted that it could become the central plaza with a pavilion. He showed concepts of how the stormwater would integrate into the park so it doesn't look like a detention basin, such as a pond or a rain garden and it could become part of the green infrastructure for the site. He noted that the lighting would be placed in the central area of the site, providing lighting for the Teener field and the main football field. He noted that it is not that other areas could not have lights.

Mr. Collins noted that the Committee tried to break out the cost by logical phases and because some of the improvements at the Wolfersberger Park are contingent on the improvements made at Koons Park we linked the phases. He noted that the phases can be broken into sub phases, but every time they did a phase one improvement it included recreation, parking, access, and stormwater improvements. He noted that the Dauphin County Conservation District will want to see the stormwater improvements so Phase 1 includes fixing the Laporte Street entrance and parking, to include changing the flow of traffic, adding parking and new dedicated entries for cars to pull off the street for loading and unloading. He noted that it would be linked to Phase 1 stormwater improvements. He noted in Phase 2, the salt dome would be moved to the southern side of Wolfersberger Tract and it would have its own service road access. He noted

that Phase 2 includes removing the street parking off of Balthaser Road, adding street crossings and stormwater improvements and two fields. He noted that Phase 3 is the core work to include parking with Phase four finishing the football fields. He noted that Phase 5 would add parking along Balthaser Street, build the promenade and lawn game pavilion and remove the old Pony Field. He noted that Phase 6 concerns pool improvements. He noted that Phase 1 and 2 are linked to the Wolfersberger Park as you need to keep the fields on line to move the salt dome. He noted that they could be broken out in various ways to be more specific when the money is available.

Mr. Collins noted that many groups expressed ideas for the Wolfersberger Tract both for the north and south parcels. He noted that it was suggested to put an entrance off of Warren Avenue through a development. He stated that he had a preliminary meeting with the owner and will have another meeting with surrounding owners but the idea was not rejected. He noted that it may become the entrance to the park as it would be much safer. He noted that the other entrance, across from the apartments would provide a southern entrance. He noted that the salt dome would be located to the south and would require some grading. He noted that there is a good place to cross the waterway so he tried to keep a road in this area to prevent from dividing the space up too much. He noted that the wetland and riparian area are near the dog park located closer to the neighborhood with some parking providing for two terraces to provide for multiuse fields. He noted that is a change from the last presentation trying to keep some of the natural woodland in the southern area noting that there is not a lot of high value park area. He added tennis courts, a public garden, and playgrounds in the southern part. He noted for the northern part, there is a request for a paintball field that would use the flat area under the power lines, noting that it looks like a small soccer field. He noted that there is a trail system that parallels the perimeter and uses some of the boardwalk ideas to cross the wetlands. He noted that the topography could be incorporated into making playgrounds with climbing areas that could include hillside slides and a children's garden. He noted that there could be community gardens in the southern portion using raised beds and plots. He explained that the dog park would be in the southern section, noting that there are now standards for dog parks, noting that it should be a two acres fenced track with one area for large dogs and one for small dogs. He noted that it should have a double gate entry with benches and a water fountain and trash receptacle. He

noted that you have to stabilize the entry area and perimeter pathway and also have shade trees. He noted that it could be done early in the process as it is not an expensive item and it would provide for pedestrian access to the park and trails that could be extended from that area.

Mr. Collins noted for the northern part there would be two parking areas, one possibly developed through the private parcel if the residential street could be extended with some parking to connect up to the northern trails. He noted that the paintball would be located in this section and everything else would meander through the wetlands using a boardwalk type trail with educational signage. He noted that the woodlands are generally conserved and the paint ball would be in the open areas and would require some grading. He noted that the trail system would cross the stream and not disturb too much land. He noted since the canopy is more mature this is where we would provide the passive recreation and it would not take too much to do that. He noted if there is a connection from another community that is developed it could connect to this road.

Mr. Collins displayed some examples of interpretive nature walk signs that were made of recycled plastic with a boardwalk design. He noted that he would grade a terrace for the paintball with the obstacles that are reversible, inexpensive and easily inflated and deflated. He noted that there currently is a working agreement with the paintball people. He noted that soccer fields and paintball fields could be made under the power lines working with the utility companies to determine the distance needed to the power lines.

Mr. Collins noted that Wolfersberger Park shows four phases for development with the first one developing safe entries into the park system, not having to redo the entryways. He noted that it would be a very important negotiation with the adjoining property owner and it could be built by the Township to provide access through Warren Avenue so people could walk into the park. He noted that it takes the entry off the major hills on Wenrich Street, noting that they are an accident zone. He noted if that could happen, part of the parking would be built in that location with a new trail system and the dog park walk, with the salt dome and maintenance located at the other entrance. He noted that they would be done in the early process to get the park started. He noted that people could walk the undeveloped areas if they chose so in the early phases. He noted that you could work on both parcels together if possible to get the terrace, rest of the parking, tennis courts, and all the grading that is necessary for the paintball fields for

Phase 2. He noted that Phase 3 would be parking, the gardens, play area and start construction of the wetland walkways with Phase 4 finishing the perimeter and trail system and moving the terrace to the south. He noted if the construction of that terrace was moved up it could be moved up to Phase 3. He noted that all of it is contingent on the available funding.

Mr. Collins noted that this was the community consensus and the Committee did an excellent job as it was one of the best he ever worked with. He noted that they evoked responses from the community, noting that this would be a master plan and items would change as time goes on, but it is a strong vision for where to go and would take at least 12 to 15 years to phase it, providing time to find partnerships and funding to build it piece by piece.

Mr. Hawk questioned, other than bond issues, what would be the best way to fund this project. Mr. Collins noted that the State is pushing the fracking money as funding for recreation and open space. He noted that Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) is the historic source for funding however gaming money has been provided to both school boards and municipalities in the different regions of Pennsylvania. He noted that the agreement is written differently for each region and it can be used since it is public infrastructure. Mr. Hawk suggested that fracking money would be very slim as Dauphin County is not a hotbed for fracking. Mr. Collins explained that the money is distributed around the state, and in Buck's County where he lives, they have no fracking but they received funds. He noted that they are distributing funds even though some counties don't have fracking providing an attempt for fairness since the impact is state-wide. He noted that sometimes you have to get in line for funding and it would be his recommendation to make the application right away and continue to do so every year. He noted if you don't make the application you are not in line for funding. He noted if you plan to apply to DCNR, then you need to talk to their advisors. He noted if you are seeking fracking or gaming funds you need to speak to the State Legislature and County Commissioners noting that the Township's ideas will be competing against other ideas within the county. He noted that he is not sure if transportation enhancement funding could be applied to pay for some of this project, noting if a major transportation improvement was made and a trail linked to it.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the cost to revitalize Koons Park was. Mr. Wolfe answered that it was about \$12.5 million. Mr. Collins noted that \$5 million of that is earmarked for the

pool. He noted that the pool needs its own feasibility study to access that market specifically to determine what kind of pool should be built, who will use it and other items. He noted that there was a very strong response from the community that they want to keep some type of pool in that location. He noted that that the Friendship Center is maxing out on its pool usage but it is a different type of pool as it is an indoor pool

Mr. Seeds questioned if there was that much interest in paint ball. Mr. Collins noted that he saw a very strong response from paintball people, as they were at every meeting. Mr. Seeds questioned it was the people who run the business or his customers. Mr. Collins answered that it was the man who runs the business plus other supporters. He suggested that there was little harm in building one for interim use. Mr. Hornung noted that a lot of people frequent that establishment. Mr. Collins suggested that it is a use that could generate income.

Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Collins if he has worked with DCNR before. Mr. Collins answered that every year he writes the applications that are due in April to DCNR, writing about three to five for his clients. He noted that he tries to work on whatever projects get funded. He noted that a project must compete within its region and then it goes to the State office and they make the final decision for funding. He noted, if you have any contacts, it would be good to make contact with them as people are working on projects and come February, DCNR is totally booked as they must come out to view what your projects look like before you can submit the application. He noted that the summer or fall would be a good time to have representatives view the project area.

Mr. Seeds questioned if anyone spoke to the owner of the Auto Body Shop in regards to buying the land. Mr. Luetchford noted, in the early stages of the plan, Mr. Collins showed parking in that area, but we have not had discussions with him. Mr. Seeds suggested if we have the money we should buy that land for additional parking. Mr. Collins noted that we spoke to that but didn't want to show it on the plan; however, we did have discussions with Mr. Richard Yingst who has property located next to the Wolfersberger Park. He noted that Mr. Yingst met with Mr. Luetchford and Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Seeds noted that the plan looks beautiful but he doesn't know if the Township has the money to build it. Mr. Hawk noted that it would only take \$18 million. Mr. Collins explained

that the pool could be its own fundraiser, having partners such as high schools who want to use it. He noted that it could be rented in the evenings for events to generate income.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the intention of the draft plan was to seek input from the Board members noting that he has a Committee meeting next Thursday night and key person interviews will be conducted, and then there will be a final presentation for the plan. He noted this is an opportunity to provide comments.

Mr. Luetchford noted that this is what the public is looking for as they were involved in the planning discussions held for the past 8 or 9 months. He noted that there is more work to be done such as compiling the online survey. He noted that this is the draft plan with an expectation that some minor changes will be made to it in the future. He noted that the Board's input could also change the plan as well.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there are as many baseball fields in the new plan as there are now. Mr. Luetchford answered that the two softball fields that are in use would be relocated to Wolfersberger Park. He noted that there is a multi-purpose field that would not be used by softball but an additional field. Mr. Seeds questioned if there are as many baseball fields. Mr. Luetchford answered yes.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Committees met with the football people as there are three teams and they have two practice fields. Mr. Luetchford noted that they will actually get fields better suited for football than what they have now as they would gain a practice field. Mr. Collins noted that he would not be able to revamp an existing park with any disruptions but the general phasing plan tried to minimize it as some fields will take a season to revamp.

Mr. Hawk noted that Wolfersberger Park has one baseball field. Mr. Collins noted that Wolfersberger Park shows two multi-use fields that overlap for softball and open fields. He noted that Cricket was well represented during the meetings. Mr. Seeds questioned where the tennis courts are located. Mr. Collins answered that tennis courts were moved from Koons Park to the north side of Wolfersberger Park. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would be the same amount of courts. Mr. Luetchford answered that it would be the same providing four courts. Mr. Collins noted that the stormwater, parking, street and crosswalks improvements may be found in another budget. He noted that for Phase 1 and 2, the work along Balthaser and Laporte Streets may be

able to fit into the Township budget for improvements that would have been made at a later time that could be moved up in time.

Mr. Crissman thanked Mr. Collins and all who were involved in this process as it was a lot of data to collect and analyze to get to this point to put this proposal together. He noted when he looked at the 12 to 15 year time line with an \$18 million price; it works out to roughly \$1 million a year if it was extended out to 18 years. He noted that there will be changes and modifications as we move forward. He noted to lay out a long term plan; he applauds the effort of all who worked on it. He noted for the dog park, there is a committee in the Township that provided the money to do the first dog park and if asked, they will raise the money for the second dog park. He noted that there are people and organizations that the Township can reach out to as we move forward with the plan.

Mr. Tom George noted that it is the estimated cost for what Mr. Collins would project at today's prices.

Mr. Collins noted that he would try to interview the key people on the same day as the next Committee and public meetings. He noted that the plan has changed much since its inception with the input received from many parties. He noted that the Committee went back and forth trying to determine the best use and it is a really good mix and there seems to be a way to accommodate almost all of it.

Mr. Seeds noted that Wolfersberger Park is so close to West Hanover Township and many of their children participate in the football programs. Mr. Collins noted that it would be a good idea to go to Dauphin County and say that the Township is providing for activities not just for the Lower Paxton community. He noted that it should also be shared with DCNR for a municipal project. He noted, the last time he was in he took a step backwards to determine what would happen in the future around the park and started to design future development. Mr. Seeds suggested that many kids from West Hanover Township play soccer. Mr. Blain noted that it is all through the Capital Area Soccer Association (CASA). Mr. Collins noted that there will be soccer games and practice areas.

Mr. Seeds noted that people from West Hanover Township will utilize both parks... Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Seeds if he was thinking of asking West Hanover Township for

financial support. Mr. Seeds answered yes. Mr. Collins noted that it would strengthen the application if it was an intermunicipal use.

Mr. Hawk noted with planning, so many times you are restricted by the what is there and it makes it harder to get it done and he applauds the Committee for stepping outside the box and coming up with creative ideas that make a lot of sense.

Mr. Collins noted that it has been great working with the Committee to get through the difficult moments in the public meetings by talking as it is a real skill. Mr. Seeds noted that many people want to live in our Township due to the parks and all the benefits as we have always been the leader in services thanks to the Committee, especially all the past boards and committees.

Mr. Hornung noted that it is exciting and he is a nuts and bolts-type person and anticipates seeing fields that were cramped into the land as it seems to be the big thing that people want as they feel we don't have enough fields, but it would be a lot easier to raise money for something that looks like this with all the ideas that were put into it noting that it was a good sacrifice of land to put in the aesthetic value of it. He noted that some parks look like ours and others look like this conceptual plan and it is very different and it would provide a light for the kind of Township we have.

Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Wolfe if the concept plan could be put on the Township's television station. Mr. Wolfe suggested that we wait until we have an adopted plan then people would think it is what will be done. He noted that there are more steps to complete and the plan will change; therefore, it wouldn't be good to have an older document along side a revised document. Mr. Collins noted that you could advertise the next public meeting on the Township television station. Mr. Hornung noted that it would be good to get some of this on television to raise support noting that we may have to look at options to adopt a temporary tax to help facilitate the formation of the park with an ending date for the tax. He noted the more you get it out to the public the more excitement it may raise.

Mr. Collins noted that the next step is what we want to do and what we can do. He noted what the priorities are and once that is determined, then you have to raise the money. Mr. Hawk noted that there is something in this plan for everyone as it is not just directed to one phase of sports. Mr. Collins noted that we came about this by linking it to each other and taking it out to

the community so all the thinking is done. He noted that we need to reach out to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Luetchford explained that we discussed speaking with Mr. Yingst, and the land owners surrounding the park looking for property. He noted that he spoke with Mr. Dennis Guise with the idea of talking to the Planning Commission to see if they want to proactively plan the area, looking at the area as a plan in coordination of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the overall cost to Wenrich Street improvement was discussed. Mr. Collins answered that it is included in the plan. Mr. Luetchford noted that it was a consideration and the reason for taking the traffic off of Wenrich Street to use Warren Avenue. He noted that it must be addressed over time regardless of the park or development going in. Mr. Collins noted that the Planning Commission might say that we have to address the access to the park and the fee-in-lieu could go to the park. He noted from some of the development that might occur around the park there is the possibility that some resources could go to the park.

Mr. Hornung questioned if you are considering the allowance for businesses to do some naming of fields. Mr. Wolfe noted that this group would not make that decision; it would be the Parks and Recreation Board who would discuss the policy and make a recommendation. Mr. Tom George noted that they are looking at all angles and it would be their responsibility to lay them all out to the Board of Supervisors to make that decision.

Review of proposals to provide consulting services for the analyses of the Financial impact of six conceptual program-facility modifications at the Friendship Center

Mr. Hawk noted that we will review proposals to provide consulting services for the Friendship Center (FC).

Mr. Wolfe noted with the Friendship Center Operating Board (FCOB) members are in attendance and that you have been provided with a copy of the Request for Proposal (RFP). He noted, at the direction of the Board, staff has requested proposals from five consulting firms that do economic analyses. He noted that they were asked to provide a proposal to analyze six specific program modifications for the FC. He noted that we have talked about modifying the social hall to use it in a different capacity. He noted that the modification would be easy, but it is unknown what the economic impact would be; therefore, the purpose of the proposals is to inform staff what the economic impact would be. He noted that the RFP is an economic analysis

of the expansion of the fitness center into the social hall, or the gymnasium, or a building addition, as well as a consideration to convert the open air patio abutting the natatorium into a splash pad, as well as modifying the menu of programs to offer those that maximize revenues over expenses as opposed to a community based program that is currently being done, He noted that the final recommendation is to implement a premium membership alternative that includes the cost of all programs or significant programs within the overall membership fee.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the RFP was sent to five consulting firms and four responses were received. He noted that the costs of the RFP's were provided to the Board members. He explained that Ballard King's total cost was be \$15,500; Sports and Facility Advisory, an organization out of California, was \$18,500; Brailsford and Dunlavey Inc. who did the original market analysis for the FC fifteen years ago cost was \$38,130; and lastly, Sports Manager Group at a cost of \$45,750. He noted that Sports Management Group stated that their reimbursable costs would be over and above the quote; however, they did not identify what they would be. He noted that the other three quotes were total costs to include their reimbursement fees.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he and Mr. Luetchford reviewed the proposals and questioned how to proceed, noting that he would provide their recommendations. He noted that he distributed two proposals that he would recommend to be considered, and ask that the other two not be considered. He noted that both he and Mr. Luetchford ruled out Ballard King and Sports Management Group, having the Board consider Brailsford and Dunlavey and Sports Facility Advisory. He noted that he was distributing abridge copies of the two proposals to make it easier to review.

Mr. Blain noted that we should eliminate Ballard King even though they provided the lowest cost proposal. He noted that Ken Ballard is an operations person and not a true economist. He noted that Ballard has the most experience with the FC; it could be detrimental to the process as it would be good to have new eyes looking at the FC. He noted that Ballard was involved with the FC in the beginning and has been rehired twice to provide reports and is a very good operations person and knows how to run a facility but he is not comfortable with Ballard doing the economic analysis.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he and Mr. Luetchford ruled out the Sports Facility Advisory at \$45,750 because of the cost plus other fees. Mr. Luetchford noted to clarify something Sports

Management is the \$18,000 quote and Sports Facility Advisory is \$45,000 plus. Mr. Wolfe noted that they threw out to two high quotes based upon the price.

Mr. Wolfe noted if you look at the description of services and compare the remaining two, they are very similar and detailed in how they would approach the project and consider the market area for the FC, demographic and costs, competition and specifics of the proposals. He noted that they would look at existing budgets and fee structures and methods of operations. He noted that both proposals have a clear understanding of what is needed for a final outcome. He noted that he and Mr. Luetchford do not have a recommendation for either firm, although staff has knowledge of Brailsford and if you look at the background of the people doing the work, the personnel are top notch economists. He noted if you look at their resumes for the two men that are listed on the project one has a M.B.A. from Johns Hopkins University and a M.S. in Real Estate and the other has a B.A. in Business Economics and Public Policy from George Washington University.

Mr. Wolfe noted with the Sports Management Group they equally answered the RFP; however, the qualifications of the personnel performing the work are not as specific in regards to economic analysis. He questioned if the qualifications alone are worth the extra cost to go from one to the other. He noted that is where he and Mr. Luetchford are in reviewing the proposals today.

Mr. Blain noted that Brailsford did the initial analysis on the building before it was built. Mr. Wolfe noted that was the initial market analysis. Mr. Blain noted that it is on Mr. Turner's resume. He understands the facility and has some experience with it. He noted that both are pretty even and are saying all the right things when it comes to benchmark analysis, fees, rate analysis, and revenues projects. Mr. Seeds noted that Brailsford's cost is \$20,000 more. Mr. Wolfe noted in the process you would see more of them as they are from Virginia as the other firm is from California. He noted that the Sports Management Group would visit one time and everything else would be done by telephone. He noted that is what is stated in their proposal. He noted that you don't need to be in the area much to do a market analysis.

Mr. Blain noted that he looked at project experience and most of the experience for Brailsford is on the East Coast versus the other side of the country.

Mr. Luetchford explained that Brailsford completed the plan for the multi-sport group that was looking for space in the area, for the Dauphin County Department of Community and Economic Development. He noted that they have been in the area looking for space for outdoor recreation.

Mr. Crissman noted that Brailsford's client list includes Hamden Township and Allentown. He questioned if we could check with them to see how they performed. Mr. Wolfe explained that they did not build anything in Hamden Township only providing an economic analysis. Mr. Blain agreed. Mr. Wolfe noted if you can select a finalist, staff can do due diligence the remainder of the week and a vote could be scheduled for the meeting on Monday night.

Mr. Stine noted since it was an RFP it is a competitive negotiation.

Mr. Crissman noted that we have eliminated Ballard because they are too close to the project, but because Brailsford has been involved with the FC once before do we want to rule them out. Mr. Wolfe noted that we eliminated Ballard because the response was operational and they did not have the in-depth knowledge. Mr. Crissman noted if we want a clean face, do we want Brailsford. He noted that it doesn't make a difference to him.

Mr. Bain noted that it doesn't make a difference to him; however, they have been removed enough from the project so there would be no perceived conflict. Mr. Seeds noted that they did the feasibility study. Mr. Wolfe noted that it was a market analysis.

Mr. Blain agreed that staff should call Hamden Township and Allentown to determine what information they could provide, but more importantly, a call should be made to Dauphin County. Mr. Wolfe noted if this is the number one choice, staff will do the due diligence.

Mr. Blain noted that Brailsford is the better option, even though they are more expensive, noting at the end of the day there is too much at stake in regards to what we are doing with the FC to be nickel and dimed for whom the consultant should be.

Mr. Hornung noted that many market analyses run in the \$30's, so he would question what we would get for \$18,000. Mr. Crissman noted that we need to do it right the first time. Mr. Blain noted that Brailsford has a lot of positives as they have been involved before with the Township, understand the facility, and will be more in tune with the market conditions in the area since they are East Coast-based. He noted they will be more regional, with the ability to

meet with them if warranted. Mr. Wolfe noted we could also go to Virginia if needed as it would only be a two hour drive.

Mr. Hawk noted that he likes Brailsford.

Mr. Crissman noted that he would like to hear from the members of the FCOB. Ms. Prahm noted that we were pleased with their original work. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is hard to be pleased or displeased with someone who is doing a market analysis which is an academic exercise that tells you to go forward or not. He noted that you make the decision and then you forget about them. He noted that they produced on time. Mr. Bruce Senft noted that he has not looked at the proposals in any detail and is not an expert in market analysis but he likes the resumes from Brailsford and the fact that staff has already worked with them it provides for some comfort level, something you don't have with the other firm. He noted that working for the U.S. Marine Corp must have required some detail expectations and the fact that they are East Coast as opposed to West Coast provides a comfort level. He noted that it would be worthwhile to talk to the Dauphin County Redevelopment Authority.

Mr. Hawk noted that it is a desk top project in many respect and if a question comes up it is much easier to get information from Virginia rather than California. Ms. Prahm noted that Brailsford has experience working with the Hughes Group, the original architect and have probably continued that relationship. Mr. Tom George noted that it is important to check references that are close at hand. He suggested that these are the important things to take under consideration.

Mr. Wolfe noted if that is the Board's desire, staff will do the due diligence and present it to the Board for action at the next business meeting.

Mr. Hornung suggested to Mr. Wolfe that he should check to make sure the listed principals will be working on the project. Mr. Wolfe answered that he would.

Review of proposed License Agreement with Cedar Realty Trust for the use of parking spaces in Colonial Commons to accommodate Heroes Grove

Mr. Luetchford noted that he has a license agreement written by Mr. Stine in response to questions for parking for the Heroes Grove project. He explained that he spoke with the Cedar Realty Trust, noting if we plan to build an amphitheater on the border of the Brightbill Park area, we will need parking for anything that may occur in this area. He noted that it would be

appropriate for Lower Paxton Township to enter into an agreement with Cedar Realty Trust who represents Colonial Commons. He noted that Christine Hunter is present who is the architect for the Heroes Grove project.

Mr. Stine noted that he tried to keep it very simple as the goal is to have the people who want to go to Heroes Grove to be able to use the parking area next to where the amphitheater will be built. He noted that he has compiled license agreements before and cut and pasted those to come up with the draft that is in front of you. He noted that it does not impose much in the way of liability on the Township for the use of the parking area but will make it desirable enough for Cedar Realty Trust to want to provide the license to use the parking area.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the hold harmless language is applicable. Mr. Stine noted that he took it out, noting that there was one that would go to the license, noting that the Township is not physically using the land; it is only seeking permission for the patrons of Heroes Grove to be able to park their cars on that property. Mr. Crissman noted that he does not want a person who attends an event and sustains damage to their car to assume that they could sue the Township. Mr. Stine answered that it is not the Township's parking lot.

Mr. Crissman noted if the lease agreement involves the Township... Mr. Stine answered that it is not a lease agreement it is a license agreement, noting that the Township has no interest in the real estate. Mr. Seeds questioned if there is a fee. Mr. Stine answered no. Mr. Wolfe noted that it provides for permission to use the parking area.

Mr. Hawk noted that it is a non-exclusive use. Mr. Stine answered that it has to be non-exclusive as it is their parking lot and they will want people to be able to come to the shopping center to park and shop.

Mr. Seeds noted that he has not seen many cars parked in that area. Mr. Stine answered that it is not a heavily used area for parking. Mr. Crissman noted only during playoff events.

Ms. Hunter noted that Cedar Realty Trust's main concern is liability if they agree to let the Township use their parking. She noted that this would protect them from liability in some measure. Mr. Stine answered not really, noting that the Township is not willing to hold them harmless and indemnify them from anything. He noted that he would never recommend doing that and because of immunity you can't do that. He noted that it doesn't deal with liability, it give the Township the ability to use the spaces but Cedar has control over that area noting that

paragraph six states that they have sole discretion to terminate or postpone the use of it, and if you look at paragraph three, the patrons have to obey their rules and regulations. He noted that they have complete control over it.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Cedar has seen the license agreement yet. Ms. Hunter answered no as Mr. Luetchford wanted to ensure that it was acceptable to the Board. Mr. Seeds questioned if Ms. Hunter has had preliminary discussion with Cedar. Ms. Hunter answered yes and they were very open and wanted the Township to send what it wants for their review. Mr. Crissman noted that they will have their counsel review the document.

Mr. Robertson questioned if this is a necessity for the project to proceed. Mr. Blain answered yes as we need to have a guarantee for some parking. Ms. Prah noted that people park in that area now for sporting events. Mr. Blain noted that as well. Ms. Hunter noted that she understood that but did not bring it up as she did not want to open a can of worms

Mr. Crissman questioned if this document would be a problem. Mr. Blain noted that there are many people who park their cars on that side parking lot who walk down to the fields in Brightbill Park. Mr. Crissman noted that they park in that area now and maybe it is best to let sleeping dogs lie and do nothing. Mr. Luetchford noted that we could do that as there is parking there now but if you have a large scale event with 200 to 300 people you could easily generate over 100 cars, and if baseball is going on at the same time there would be many more cars. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township can not ignore the issue at this point; because if you are going to have an amphitheater and Cedar Reality is not agreeable they could post the area for parking and tow vehicles. He noted that it would not be a good practice to invest millions of dollars into an amphitheater and not have parking. Mr. Stine noted for the license agreement, if they see how things are going and they don't like it, they can terminate it with 30 days notice. He noted that paragraph six permits Cedar to terminate the agreement on 30 days notice as a license does not provide a guarantee.

Mr. Seeds noted that it would be bad public relations for them if they did do that. Ms. Prah noted that it will also bring customers to their shopping center.

Ms. Hunter noted for paragraph three, the last sentence, "The exercise of any privilege of entire risk", she noted that she felt that this language protected Cedar. Mr. Stine noted that the agreement is between the Township and Cedar and a third party can say that they did not sign the

document. Mr. Hawk suggested that it is a park-at-your-own-risk type issue. Ms. Hunter noted that we are trying to say, through this language, that we are not assigning any liability. Mr. Stine agreed that we are not doing that; however, they may have responsibility on their own besides that. He noted that it would be that way for anyone who parks in their shopping center. Ms. Hunter noted that she is hopeful that it will make Cedar Reality more comfortable and that there is some kind of recognition that the Township is not holding them responsible. Mr. Stine answered that was correct.

Mr. Crissman noted that there could be a concert and people who park in that location could dump all their trash resulting in Cedar coming back to the Township and saying that your people are making such a mess in the parking lot, that they will no longer allow people to park there and they have the right to do that.

Mr. Stine noted, at some point in time, there could be an issue with loitering. Mr. Crissman noted that all kinds of issues will develop.

Ms. Hunter suggested that it is a starting point and her guess is that they will have more comments on the document. She questioned if the Board was okay with submitting the form as a starting point. Mr. Crissman noted that they may hand the agreement back and state that they don't want to be a part of it. He suggested submitting the document to see what happens.

Review of Key Indicator Reports – Year-end 2012 and 1st Quarter 2013

Mr. Wolfe noted that the General Fund (GF) at the end of the year with State Aid included had a surplus of \$1,263,759. He noted that it was the first surplus of any substance in five years since the great recession. He noted that the Township has been living off of its Fund Balance to satisfy year-end deficits. He noted that \$1.2 million year-end seems big but the Board borrowed for capital projects and funded them through a Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank (PIB) Loan and a bond issue inflating the year-end savings. He noted that the GF Balance at the end of the year was \$2,000 less than \$6 million. He noted that the Township is over the 25% threshold of annual operating revenues for the fund balance.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the General Improvement Fund (GIF) expenditures were a little over two million dollars and it was funded through reimbursements from PennDOT for the

Linglestown Road project that closed out, PIB Loan financing, and bond financing for capital projects.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Fire Equipment Capital Fund ended the year with a balance of \$787,298 and the Length Of Service Awards Program (LOSAP) ended with a balance of \$295,874.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Friendship Center Operating Fund ended the year with a deficit of \$150,000 noting that it has been the topic of discussion for some time.

Mr. Wolfe noted the Authority ended the year with surplus of \$1.4 million accumulating funds for future projects. He noted that capital projects for 2012 for the mini-basin programs totaled over \$9,164,686, and at the end of the year, the Authority had cash on hand of \$35,742,061.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the pension funds performed very well with the Police Pension Fund having a year-end balance of \$16,615,194 and the non-uniformed fund with \$10,665,651. He noted both funds had an annualized return of around 10%.

Mr. Wolfe noted that we had a very good year in 2012 as compared to the past five years. He noted that the 2012 budget was the first time we added to the fund balance in several years and we had a 7% increase in revenues. He noted that expenditures were only 2% higher than in 2011. He noted that expenditures have been at 2% or less for the past five years and the year ended well with the detail for individual line items contained in the report.

Mr. Blain questioned when the first quarter numbers would be completed. Mr. Wolfe answered that they were due for this meeting but due to the interviews for the financial management system, staff was delayed in preparing those documents. He noted that they should be ready for the next meeting.

Mr. Seeds noted that the FC fund balance is \$3,257,241. Mr. Wolfe noted that it includes the capital assets, the value of the building. Mr. Seeds questioned that it was only \$3.2 million. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is the depreciated value. Mr. Blain noted that is why it is necessary to get an appraisal for the building. He noted that he wants to determine the market value. Mr. Seeds stated that he hopes that it is not correct. Mr. Blain noted that it is correct for book purposes as you have to have depreciation, but that is not to say that is what the market value would be, so

that is why we are getting a market appraisal as it would provide for a better understanding for what that value would be.

“Otta Know” Presentation: Status of recommendation
regarding selection of a financial management solution

Mr. Crissman noted that that the Audit Committee has met with two consultants and provided questions for clarification for them to do their final analysis. He noted when the Committee receives that information it would be prepared to make a recommendation and it is possible to have a recommendation for the Monday night meeting.

Mr. Blain noted that the interviews conducted with Dallas Data Systems and Edmunds was very good and both products are very good; however, the Committee is focused on one vendor and it wants to see what they do with their final cost analysis.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the financial management system is an expenditure that will be more than \$100,000 and it is a bond funded item from the 2012 bonds. He noted that he hopes to have a recommendation for the Monday night meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Blain made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary