# COLLEGE TOWNSHIP PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE

## REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

**Monday, January 9, 2023**

**7:00 PM**

1481 E. College Avenue State College PA 16801

Hybrid Meeting (In-Person or via Zoom)

| ATTENDED BY – P&R COMMITTEE: | Earl Moore, Chair  
David Schulte, Vice Chair  
Derek Kalp  
Kathy Matason  
Judi Sittler  
Sue Smith  
Stephen Spoonamore  
Janet Sulzer |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCUSED:</th>
<th>Jude Simpson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| STAFF: | Amy Kerner, Public Works Director  
Lindsay Schoch, AICP, Principal Planner  
Sharon Meyers, Sr. Support Specialist – Engineering/Planning |
|--------|----------------------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUESTS:</th>
<th>Chad Stafford, Penn Terra Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## CALL TO ORDER:

Ms. Kerner called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

## REORGANIZATION:

Ms. Kerner asked for nominations for the chair.

- *Ms. Sittler moved to nominate Mr. Moore to chair. Ms. Smith seconded.*
- *With no other nominations, Ms. Sittler moved to elect Mr. Moore to the position of Chair of the College Township Parks and Recreation Committee. Ms. Smith seconded. Motion carried unanimously.*

Ms. Kerner asked for nominations for the vice chair.

- *Mr. Moore moved to nominate Mr. Schulte to vice chair. Ms. Sittler seconded.*
- *With no other nominations, Mr. Moore moved to elect Mr. Schulte to the position of Vice Chair of the College Township Parks and Recreation Committee. Ms. Sittler seconded. Motion carried unanimously.*

With no further reorganization needed the regular meeting of the College Township Parks and Recreation Committee resumed as scheduled with Mr. Schulte chairing as Mr. Moore was present via zoom and it was determined it would be challenging to chair the meeting remotely.

## ROLL CALL:

Mr. Schulte proceeded with roll call and verified that Ms. Simpson was excused from the January 9, 2023 meeting.
OPEN DISCUSSION:

Mr. Spoonamore stated he serves on the state guidance committee and they have accepted standards for E-Bikes on bikeways and parks for the entire state which he emailed to everyone the prior week for the committee to review. Mr. Spoonamore suggested the College Township Parks and Recreation Committee adopt the same standards for College Township’s bikeways and parks so that there is uniformity between the Township and the state. Mr. Spoonamore explained the reasoning behind the policy adoption. Mr. Spoonamore stated he’s unsure of the process for adopting a policy at the Township. Mr. Schulte asked if there was anything specific Mr. Spoonamore was looking to implement, or if he wanted to look at the guidelines and standards. Mr. Spoonamore explained they are a specific set of guidelines and standards and continued to list them. Mr. Spoonamore suggested again that the committee adopt the E-Bike state standards for bikeways and parks. Ms. Matason stated that since this item is not on the agenda the committee is able to talk about it, however, voting cannot happen until it is on the agenda. Mr. Schulte asked if there were any other comments. Ms. Meyers stated that Mr. Bloom will return to the Parks and Recreation Committee to discuss this topic. Mr. Schulte questioned who would be back. Ms. Meyers clarified, Mike Bloom the Assistant Township Manager. Mr. Schulte questioned if Mr. Bloom’s presentation would be relative to the Spin E-Bikes program and not E-Bikes in general. Mr. Spoonamore began to explain, Mr. Schulte stated he was asking Ms. Meyers. Ms. Meyers stated that the Spin E-Bikes program will be discussed, but she assumed E-Bikes would overlap the topic and be discussed as well. Ms. Kerner stated when Mr. Bloom comes to discuss the Spin E-Bikes program, that would be a good time to have this on the agenda and discuss everything at one time. Mr. Schulte thanked Mr. Spoonamore for gathering and circulating the information he provided. Mr. Moore suggested E-Scooters be added to the agenda as well, since they seem to be coming to the Penn State campus very shortly. Mr. Spoonamore stated that E-Scooters are also addressed in the state guidelines. Mr. Schulte made a note to add state guidelines and E-Scooters to the agenda for the next meeting.

MINUTES:

Ms. Smith questioned on the third page, what (*) meant. It was explained that the symbol in the formula stands for multiplication. Ms. Matason moved to approve the minutes of the November 14th meeting. Ms. Smith seconded the motion. Mr. Schulte stated he had a comment on page four, he had suggested the E-Bikes be limited to ten miles per hour via the process Spin E-Bikes has for limiting the E-Bikes. He continued that there is no speed limit on the Township bike paths. Mr. Moore stated there is a speed limit in the parks. Ms. Matason moved to approve the minutes for the November 14th meeting as amended. Ms. Smith seconded. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

OB-1 Rhodes Lane Revised Plan

Mr. Stafford introduced himself and stated that he had been present with this plan at the November Parks and Recreation meeting. He stated that the original plan had four single-family units and one duplex and after calculating the fee-in-lieu there was a discussion to re-evaluate the property to determine if there would be space to define as a small parklet. Mr. Stafford explained that the original plan presented to this committee was also presented to the Planning Commission with their recommendations. The Planning Commission had made a motion of recommendations to Council at that meeting and after a discussion with the client Mr. Stafford asked that the plan be pulled from the Council agenda while changes are made. Mr. Stafford stated that some changes have been made hence this presentation to the Parks and Recreation Committee.

Mr. Stafford explained that the original duplex unit had been removed from the plan and a single-family unit had been added, making the total of single-family units five. Mr. Stafford continued by directing the committee to sheet eleven of the plan, which is an enlargement of the park area being proposed. He stated that more land is being offered than is required by the ordinance and
a small community center is being proposed. Mr. Stafford stated after some correspondence with Ms. Schoch, Ms. Meyers has provided a supplemental package which shows a few changes to the parkland area. Mr. Stafford stated the volleyball court is not intended for athletic competition, but for recreational use by residents and the community. He stated that this area is proposed to be an active as well as passive recreational area. The active area would include something like the proposed volleyball court and passive areas would include the picnic tables and proposed fire pits. Mr. Stafford acknowledged that the size of the proposed sand volleyball court is atypical, however it is intended for recreational use by the community. Mr. Stafford explained the proposed changes to the size of the volleyball court and the new dimensions meet the standards for a Regulation Beach Volleyball Court, per NCAA, USA Volleyball, and FIVB. Mr. Stafford pointed out that the standard dimensions for a 2v2 Volleyball Court measure 26’3” by 52’6”. Mr. Stafford further stated there is no particular standard for this type of volleyball court and repeated that the intent of this park area is not to provide an athletic competition area but to provide recreational area to residents and the community.

Mr. Stafford continued to describe the changes made to the community center. He stated that after some discussion with the developer it was decided to make the building smaller to leave more open space for recreation. Mr. Stafford stated the community center would possibly include a restroom for visitors to the park to use, a small office area possibly for use by the HOA and community, and some area for storage. Mr. Stafford stated his request to the committee is to develop the smaller community center with a restroom and office facility, expand the passive park area with a few more passive amenities, and install a 2v2 volleyball court. Mr. Stafford added that this request would include some additional grading in order to fit the proposed 2v2 volleyball court; however, the slope will remain a 3:1 slope which is considered a mowable slope. Mr. Stafford stated this proposal meets the intent of the ordinance and added that the ordinance states if parkland is offered it should be accessible through a public right-of-way. With that being said the developer would offer the driveway to be an easement in order to connect the park to the public road, First Avenue. This would then satisfy the ordinance requirements of Chapter 180 Section 26: Parkland and Open Space.

Mr. Schulte stated that he has many comments but wanted to open the floor for discussion amongst the other committee members. Ms. Sittler stated that she likes the idea of Mr. Stafford having the intent to develop the proposed open space for recreational uses for the residents and surrounding community. She added the community center deviates from the committees intentions of getting people outside not inside, and the Township will not want to maintain a public restroom like the one proposed. Mr. Stafford explained the ordinance and that parkland is available for the community but it is not large enough to be offered to be taken over by the Township. As the ordinance reads in order for the parkland to be taken over and maintained by the Township the area must be a minimum of four acres in size. The intent is for the HOA to have full responsibility of the community building. Mr. Schulte stated he would like to correct the record and added there is no hard stated minimum size for a Township park. Mr. Stafford agreed and stated there is a clause in the ordinance that has a suggested minimum area. Ms. Sittler stated she has a list of comments on the proposed plan. Mr. Stafford stated if the committee does not want the community center building his client will be happy not to build it as it will save a lot of money. Mr. Schulte stated that he is not sure that removing the building all together is the direction the committee is intending. Mr. Schulte added that there may be a need to recalculate the size of the park area, if the building is not considered recreational then the developer wouldn’t be dedicating the same amount of property to the Township. Ms. Sittler agreed and stated that if the building is to be used for a meeting place for the HOA then that would not be a College Township matter and therefore not a Parks and Recreation matter.

Ms. Sittler questioned if the volleyball court would be sand. Mr. Stafford confirmed that the court would be sand. Ms. Sittler stated that cats would love that, and it would need to be cleaned somehow. Mr. Stafford stated the HOA would be responsible for maintenance and that the agreement with the developer would need to be explicit with these details.

Ms. Smith stated that there had been another offer in the past for a developer to incorporate
fire pits into a plan. She continued that the committee had rejected this idea as the fire pits were not intended for heating and would create air pollution and a hazard. Grills were suggested to replace the proposed fire pits. Ms. Smith stated that Mr. Stafford had mentioned the units were single-family residence, however, they are actually condominiums. Mr. Stafford clarified that the units are separate single-family homes that would be part of a condominium association. Ms. Smith questioned the position of this property to Limerock Court. Mr. Stafford confirmed that Limerock Court is not far in distance; however, there is an issue of difference in elevation. Ms. Smith suggested, if this is an isolated community that a pickleball court may be a consideration. Mr. Stafford confirmed the suggestion and stated that there are a lot of complaints about pickleball. There was a discussion about the demand for pickleball in the area and the noise associated with the game.

Mr. Moore questioned how much area is required for parkland for this particular development. Mr. Schulte stated 0.24 acres is required. Mr. Stafford explained the area required is actually 0.20 acres, because one unit had been eliminated from the plan. Mr. Moore stated that the area being offered in 0.32 acres, therefore whether the building is included or not the proposed park area meets the requirement. Mr. Moore questioned if this property would be deeded to the Township or would remain owned by the developer. Ms. Schoch stated that according to the Township Manager the Township does own a few parks that are smaller than four acres, so this would not necessarily remain property of the developer. She continued that it is typical that the Township would take over the parkland and not the HOA, which is a topic that would continue to be discussed. Mr. Schulte added to put this matter into historical context, there have been several parks that were HOA parks and the HOA no longer had the financing to maintain the park. At which time the residents asked the Township to take over and maintain the park. He continued, in several cases the Township accepted the parks and in a couple cases the Township did not. The committee discussed the circumstance of Limerock Terrace and why the Township took ownership of that particular park. Mr. Stafford pointed out that Limerock Terrace has access to a public road, hence the special circumstance of ownership by the Township. Mr. Stafford added his client is willing to work with the Township and whatever they request including ownership if requested. Mr. Moore questioned if the proposed parkland is to be subdivided. Mr. Stafford stated he does not believe the land needs to be subdivided to be offered to the Township. He continued that an easement can be offered and since the ordinance requires access from a public roadway the developer would offer the parkland with the access easement as a whole. Mr. Schulte questioned if this would meet the letter of the law. Mr. Stafford confirmed it would.

Mr. Schulte asked if Ms. Sulzer had any questions or comments. Ms. Sulzer questioned if the Township accepted the proposed building and restroom, would the restroom be accessible to the general public or would there be keys given only to members of the HOA. Mr. Stafford stated that the matter would have to be worked out with Township direction. Mr. Stafford continued that if the Township would require the building be unlocked and open to the public certain times of the day, that would need to be written into the agreement. He stated that those details would be up to the Township and the developer is willing to work with the Township on these matters. He added whatever the Township directs, they will do. Ms. Sulzer stated that she is unaware of any community centers in the area that are open other than using key access by the HOA. Mr. Stafford stated that they are willing to do whatever the Township directs them to do. Mr. Schulte added that we have nothing in the Township that is like that.

Mr. Moore asked what other committee members thoughts were on a pavilion instead of a building. The majority of the committee voiced their opinion that a pavilion would be a better idea. Mr. Kalp agreed and stated he was going to suggest a paved pavilion in the area near the paved rescue area, that way the pavilion could serve two purposes. He continued by adding that sand volleyball courts can easily become unkempt and cats can be an issue with the sand as well. Mr. Kalp suggested a level lawn area adjacent to the pavilion as a play/event space. Mr. Stafford agreed that a lawn area would be nice and keep the area open for various activities, but nets could
be kept for optional use. Mr. Kalp suggested shifting the pavilion area away from the refuse area, and maybe center it in the proposed park area. Mr. Stafford thanked Mr. Kalp for his input.

Ms. Smith requested some trees be planted in the park area as she did not notice any being proposed. She added that holes can be added in the flat grass area, which can be mowed over, as an option for different activities. Mr. Stafford agreed the installation of holes would give a greater opportunity for various activities. He added trees can be added; however the slope creates a hardship with installing the trees and adding trees to the mowable slope would render the area unusable for recreational activities.

Mr. Spoonamore questioned how often the current sand volleyball courts within the Township are used and added that he has never seen anyone in any of them. Mr. Kalp stated that there is one in Spring Creek Park which is occasionally used. Mr. Schulte confirmed that there are two sand volleyball courts within the Township, one in Spring Creek Park and one in Dalevue Park. Mr. Kalp added in those parks there is more flexibility of space and in this instance there is very limited space that would be taken up by an area for a very specific recreation. Mr. Stafford agreed and added that the thought behind the sand volleyball court was to add a relatively low cost recreational facility. Mr. Stafford added that a flat area where the residents and community can do what they want is a good idea.

Mr. Spoonamore stated he would like to finish his thought, he has seen very little use of volleyball and suggested a pickleball court as pickleball is in high demand and this property seems to be a perfect spot for it. Mr. Stafford stated that he doesn’t know anything about pickleball but he’ll look into it. Mr. Spoonamore expressed his appreciation and added that he agrees with his colleagues and strongly suggests the wiser choice is a pavilion as opposed to a community building.

Mr. Stafford stated the HOA does need an area to store equipment for snow removal and mowing, among other things. He continued with the possibility that one end of the pavilion could possibly be closed off for storage of such equipment.

Ms. Sittler questioned the College Township park area being used by the HOA. Mr. Schulte stated that he understands Ms. Sittler’s confusion and added that the area to be used by the HOA cannot be considered into the calculation for parkland. These two entities need to be kept separate so that the HOA is responsible to maintain the building to be used by them and that maintenance is not interpreted as the Township’s responsibility.

Ms. Kerner stated the plan was reviewed from the point of view of staff and the Township does not maintain any buildings like the one being proposed. The Township does maintain pavilions, picnic tables, and those types of entities. Ms. Kerner questioned the comingling of the Township and HOA, and suggested if an easement is accepted by the Township then that is acceptable. She added that she has not been through this process with this unique situation. Mr. Schulte explained that the easement is to grant public access to the park. Ms. Kerner confirmed that she understands the easement; however, if the Township is to own the park… Mr. Schulte interjected and stated the Township is not to own the park and it would be owned by the HOA. Mr. Schulte asked Mr. Stafford if that is correct. Mr. Stafford stated that he cannot be the one to make that decision. He added that the offer would be made as part of the land development plan, but the decision is ultimately up to the Township. Ms. Kerner verified that Council will make the final decision and added that she suggests this committee make a recommendation to Council on whether an easement or a dedicated parkland should be offered to the Township.

Ms. Kerner stated she has some additional comments. She continued that the slope in the proposed park area lends itself to a natural slide which does not require infrastructure.

Mr. Schulte asked if there were any further comments. Ms. Kerner pointed out that Ms. Sulzer had her hand up. Mr. Schulte acknowledged and asked for her comment. Ms. Sulzer stated that she believes there is an existing sand volleyball court, or two, at the Villas at Penn State. Mr. Schulte stated that that area is not in the Township. Ms. Sulzer stated that the Villas at Penn State are within the Township and added that the location is off of Driebelbis. Mr. Schulte stated he stands corrected. Ms. Sulzer added that given the option of a building or a pavilion she would be more
inclined to consider a pavilion or gazebo.

Mr. Schulte asked what the target group was for the development. Mr. Stafford stated that there is no age restriction and added that the homes being proposed are smaller homes. They are not necessarily to be considered affordable housing but the target value it to be $175,000 - $225,000. Mr. Schulte asked how many bedrooms the homes will have. Mr. Stafford stated each home is to have two bedrooms, a garage, and no basement. Mr. Schulte stated that is very helpful information.

Mr. Schulte stated if the volleyball court is still on the table, he maintains that the dumpster area is problematic and it hinders the safety area which would surround the volleyball court. Mr. Schulte suggested the dumpster be relocated. Mr. Stafford explained the dumpster must remain in that location. Mr. Schulte stated that that brings him to his next point, 180-26 utilities, which basically states no above ground utilities shall be placed on parkland or open space. Mr. Schulte opined that he would consider a dumpster to be an above ground utility, in this situation. Mr. Schulte added that he cannot tell Mr. Stafford what to do but he suggests the dumpsters not be placed as proposed. Mr. Stafford stated that the dumpster has to be located there, so he would modify the boundaries of the parkland and as he previously stated there is no other location on the property where the dumpsters could relocate. Mr. Schulte stated this conversation has circled back to the measurements of the park and will this the plan still meet the required acreage.

Mr. Schulte continued, as a general rule the Township does not light public parks and added that will save the developer on the electricity bill. Mr. Stafford asked Mr. Schulte to repeat himself. Mr. Schulte restated that he understood during the initial presentation there was a statement about lighting made. He added that as a general rule this committee and the Township do not light public parks as parks are closed at night.

Mr. Schulte stated that he is not as opposed to fire pits as some of his colleagues and added that he is not saying they are a great idea, he’s just not opposed to the idea. He continued that Slab Cabin is a perfect example of fire pits that work.

Mr. Schulte opined that on the plan there is an inaccuracy that remains. The railroad is marked as abandoned and as Ms. Smith pointed out in November the railroad is not abandoned. Mr. Stafford stated based upon the research from a professional surveyor the plan reflects the recorded data. Mr. Spoonamore stated that area in questioned is recorded at the state as an abandoned railway. He added that he has been researching the opportunity to convert the area as a rail trail and the state has it listed as abandoned. Mr. Schulte stated in the interested of getting this plan through this committee, he would suggest that the word abandoned be removed from the plan. Mr. Stafford stated he cannot legally do that. Ms. Kerner intervened and shared a GIS image showing that the railway in one section shows to be owned by the Bellefonte Historical Railroad and when clicking on another area of the railway there is no data. Ms. Kerner then highlighted the property in question to show it's proximity. Mr. Schulte admitted this map has caused a fair amount of confusion on his part. Ms. Kerner stated a surveyor knows the rules which need to be followed for developing plans like these.

Mr. Schulte acknowledged the committees intention of suggesting pickleball in the location; however, Mr. Schulte was unsure it would be a good fit due to the location of the homes. He continued that the idea of a pickleball court is a nice idea but he believes more research should be conducted prior to making a recommendation for a pickleball court.

Mr. Stafford asked if it would please the committee to have an open flat space that can be used for whatever the community wishes. He added that this would meet the requirements of the ordinance and that the ordinance does not say that the developer needs to provide any recreations. Mr. Stafford added, again the client would be happy because that is money he wouldn’t have to spend. Mr. Schulte stated that he thinks the committee cannot answer that question yet because the exact acreage has not been calculated. Mr. Stafford clarified that Mr. Schulte is saying there is no consensus with what the active recreational area should be so there will be no motion. Mr. Stafford added that he just has to meet the ordinance requirements and as long as he provides an access easement and meets the two and a half to one standard he can offer a big piece of green property and that will meet the intent of the ordinance. Mr. Stafford stated he is here tonight with the intent to
offer something back to the Township. Since a consensus has not been reached for the active recreational area he plans to report to his client what has happened at the meeting and he believes the client will ask what can be done to meet the requirements of the ordinance. Mr. Stafford continued stating if a decision can’t be made, he will recommend a blank piece of green grass to be called parkland.

Mr. Moore stated that all the developer has to do is reserve the land for park and recreation purposes, it doesn’t need to be given to the Township and the area doesn’t even need to be made public. Mr. Moore used the Aspen Heights project as an example of how land had been privately reserved for recreational purposes and not dedicated to the Township. Ms. Schoch stated the developers dedicated some land, which was off site, to the Township, then added an area within the property that is not open to the public. Mr. Moore stated the minimum requirements per the ordinance and opined that a pavilion would be nice for residents.

Mr. Kalp presented a sketch of what he believes to be a combination of what is being proposed and what the committee is requesting. Mr. Stafford stated that the engineering of the property has not changed from his prior presentation. The only thing that was changed is the duplex was removed and a single-family home was place on the opposite side of the driveway, but the engineering has remained the same. Mr. Stafford stated that this parkland area is a modification to the plan and as it is still under review by staff he is happy to come back to the Parks and Recreation Committee with a modification to the parkland area. Mr. Kalp asked what the protocol is for sharing a sketch. Ms. Kerner stated she can scan it and email it to Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Schulte agreed with Mr. Kalp’s sketch in that it flipped the play area and the building area which alleviates the dumpster issue discussed earlier. Mr. Schulte added that he wouldn’t go planting trees at this point and one should walk the land prior to planting so as to not block desirable views.

While Ms. Kerner was scanning the sketch, Ms. Smith asked if Mr. Stafford could tell the committee who the owner of the property is. Mr. Stafford stated the owners are JJ Bowman and Mr. Swanger, the current owner and family trust executor. Mr. Schulte stated that he hopes Mr. Stafford walks away from this discussion with a lot of input which he is free to use or not use. He added if nothing else the area needs to be mowable. Mr. Stafford stated that the slope being used is a 3:1 slope which is considered to be mowable. Mr. Schulte stated he just wanted to make sure that that was understood.

Ms. Smith added that she is pleased to see houses being built that are not mansions. Mr. Stafford spoke about the developer and the types of homes he usually deals with. Ms. Kerner returned from scanning the sketch and shared the image on the screen. She also offered to send the image to Mr. Stafford. Mr. Stafford thanked Ms. Kerner. Mr. Schulte suggested the storage structure be pushed up against the dumpster as neither structure has anything to do with the park or parks and recreation.

Mr. Schulte asked if there were any other comments regarding the Rhodes Lane revised plan. Ms. Kerner stated at some point there will need to be a motion from the committee as to whether this should be accepted as an easement or dedicated parkland to the Township. She questioned if a dedication was the preference, would a subdivision be necessary. Mr. Stafford stated that a subdivision would not be required as a portion of the condominium can be deeded without a subdivision. Ms. Kerner stated that when this plan is presented to Council they will want to know if the Parks and Recreation Committee has any recommendations. Mr. Stafford offered to bring the plan back to the committee this way he would at least have Park and Recreations action prior to the plan being presented to the Planning Commission. After some discussion amongst the committee members Mr. Stafford stated that he will be asking for a recommendation at the next meeting. With no further comments the committee thanked Mr. Stafford for his presentation.

**OB-2 Park Signage Standardization**

Ms. Kerner introduced the topic of standardized signage. In the fall there was a directive to
devise some standardized signage which would be standard in colors and language. The packets provided to the committee reflected the signs in a 11”x17” size, which is close to the size of the signs that would be ordered. Ms. Kerner stated that mock-ups were not ordered as they can be expensive and she would prefer some kind of direction on colors to be used and language such as sunset to sunrise or dusk to dawn. Mr. Kerner added what she is asking from the committee this evening is whether green or brown is preferred, which are standard colors used to parks in general. Mr. Schulte stated white on brown is standard. Ms. Kerner stated that green is also acceptable according to the MUTCD. She added that the committee has been given the opportunity to create a new desirable standard.

Ms. Sittler asked if there are any signs posted currently. Mr. Schulte stated about three quarters of the parks have signs that state park closes at sunset. He added that he had taken pictures of a bunch of signs and he sent them to the committee months ago. Mr. Schulte continued that there is a facto standard which is white lettering on brown signs that are already posted at many, many parks in the Township. Ms. Kerner stated, again the point being the signs will be standardized. Mr. Schulte stated they are already standardized. Ms. Kerner continued, once a decision is made the signs will be replaced throughout the Township parks.

Mr. Schulte stated he would open the floor to comments, starting with the people participating remotely.

Ms. Sulzer stated she likes the white with brown and favors the dusk to dawn rather than sunset to sunrise. She then explained dusk is more easily verifiable since the light continues after sunset. Ms. Kerner shared the images Mr. Schulte had sent to the committee. Ms. Sittler stated she will keep a tally of desired colors and language.

Ms. Smith stated the language may be confusing and believes the sign should read parking lot. Ms. Sittler disagreed and added that the signs should be simple with the least amount of words while remaining enforceable.

Ms. Matason agreed with Ms. Sulzer. That language is short, to the point, and definable. Mr. Spoonamore also agreed. Ms. Sittler asked if the committee preferred brown or green. The majority stated brown to be the choice color.

Mr. Schulte stated that he lives right next to a park and he absolutely prefers the current standard which is sunset to sunrise. He explained that having people wondering around outside of your house when it is pretty much dark is problematic. Mr. Schulte stated that no one is going to enforce this and no one is going to call the cops because it’s sunset and there are still people in the park. Mr. Schulte opined that the signs should read sunset in the hopes that people will start to clear out of the park at sunset and by dusk they are all gone. He summarized his thoughts and stated that he prefers sunset, as a person that has to put up with this on a daily basis. He also stated brown on white, white on brown, whatever. Lastly Mr. Schulte assumed if a park has not parking area this sign is irrelevant. Ms. Kerner confirmed that this sign is for the parks that have parking areas. She added that the next step, which would cost more money, would be to put signs at the remaining parks which would be the standard design but would read, park closed dusk to dawn.

Ms. Smith pointed out that the image of the sign with a green background and white letting was difficult to read. Ms. Kerner stated once a consensus is reached on color, she would be able to have two mock-ups made, one brown with white lettering and one white with brown lettering. Ms. Sittler stated she thought the sign looked good with the white background. Ms. Kerner stated that the sign is a little more vibrant with the white background.

Mr. Kalp asked if there was a consensus. Ms. Sittler confirmed that Mr. Schulte was the only member who preferred the sunset to sunrise language. Mr. Schulte stated he is just sticking with the existing verbage. He opined that dusk to dawn is pointless because it adds words to the sign (Noted Change: He opined that ‘park and parking closed dusk to dawn’ adds wordiness to the sign.). Mr. Schulte further explained that the people in the park in the early morning are people walking their dogs and they are not noisy. Ms. Sittler stated that she likes that new language gives a more definitive time, dusk to dawn.
Mr. Schulte asked Ms. Kerner if she had gathered enough information from the discussion to move forward. Ms. Kerner stated that there is no motion or second but rather a consensus to go with the brown on white and dusk to dawn. The committee confirmed. Ms. Kerner stated she will order the signs and once received the topic will be added to the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS:
None presented.

PARKS REPORTS:
(Written reports received are emailed to all members the Wednesday prior to the meeting date) Mr. Schulte stated that he submitted a last minute set of park reports which he does not see in the packet today. Ms. Meyers stated since the packet was posted the Thursday prior to the meeting and the reports were received the day of the meeting, Mr. Schulte’s report will be included in the agenda packet for the February 13th meeting.

Ms. Smith stated for the record her appreciation for the crew, the picnic tables in Glenn Park, and the mulch at Mountainside. Mr. Spoonamore questioned the very large mountain of mulch in the Stoney Batter area. Ms. Kerner stated that pile is the Christmas trees that have been collected.

Mr. Spoonamore questioned if the Township would open the pile to the public to get mulch since the pile is so large. Ms. Kerner stated there is an unwritten rule that the public can call and we will allow them to come and get some mulch; however, the Township does use some of the mulch around the Township.

Mr. Schulte stated that Ms. Simpson is not present to comment on the bike path, yet, he had a question that could be answered by Ms. Kerner. Mr. Schulte thanked Ms. Kerner for having the branches along the bike path trimmed. He continued that after the trimming there is a huge pipe now visible underneath some of the trees along the bike path and believes it should be removed. Ms. Kerner stated she will let the crew know.

Mr. Schulte added that there is a house in the same area that may be a little aggressive with their use of that area. Ms. Kerner stated that she refers those reports to the zoning officer to determine if a property owner has encroached or not.

STAFF INFORMATIVES:
Ms. Kerner stated at the next meeting she will provide the committee with the next five year plan/CIP in hopes of reviewing the document in February and having it approved in March. Ms. Kerner added this is earlier than prior years so she wanted to let the committee know as early as possible.

OTHER MATTERS:
OM-1 Annual Report Draft
Mr. Schulte stated the staff informative conversation transitions nicely into the next topic. He continued that he dug out Ms. Kerner’s email from last year and held it up for everyone to see.

Mr. Schulte stated that the document in his hand should be the addendum of the five year plan in the annual report and not whatever was added in that section (Noted Change: Mr. Schulte stated that the spreadsheet attached to Ms. Kerner’s email dated Feb 25, 2022, 2:22pm should be the five-year plan addendum to this year’s annual report, not whatever was in the meeting packet.). Mr. Schulte further explained that the document the committee approved in 2022 is the document which should be included into the annual report. The committee agreed with Mr. Schulte’s statement.

Mr. Schulte asked for other comments regarding the Annual Report Draft that has been presented. Ms. Smith stated that she had an issue with the fund expenditures presented for 2023 for Mountainside Park. Ms. Kerner stated she believes that is to be in 2024. Ms. Smith added she believes it should be in 2023 and the amount of $30,000 not $35,000.

Mr. Schulte stated that the document Ms. Smith is referencing is incorrect and held up the document which should be included in the report. Ms. Kerner reminded the committee of the bond issue which the committee had been
asked to prioritize projects, and that may be the reason that project got moved up. Mr. Schulte stated that will be discussed during deliberation in the upcoming meetings when the five year plan is discussed. Mr. Schulte continued to explain the historic record. Mr. Schulte asked if there were any comments from the participants on zoom. He then asked if everyone had a chance to review the document. Mr. Spoonamore stated that he had reviewed the document. Mr. Schulte verified that Mr. Spoonamore is new to this process and document as he has been a member of the committee for less than a year. Mr. Spoonamore stated he noticed in the email exchanges regards the annual report that Mr. Schulte is correct and the document in the report is incorrect and should be changed.

Mr. Schulte asked again if anyone online had any comments. Ms. Sulzer stated she had nothing to add and had already made her suggestions for changes a month and a half ago. Mr. Moore had not comments.

Ms. Sittler asked who will make the presentation to Council. Mr. Schulte stated since Mr. Moore is the new chair, it should fall on him. Mr. Schulte stated when he has been present for the presentation to Council, he sent his prepared report to Council and was present for any questions. Mr. Spoonamore asked when the presentation is scheduled. Mr. Schulte stated it has not been scheduled yet. Ms. Kerner stated the presentation is typically scheduled for the first Council meeting in March.

Ms. Sittler asked if there are any other highlights to add to the report, as there are only two currently in the report. Mr. Schulte explained what he has done in the past when presenting to Council. Mr. Moore stated he will represent the Parks and Recreation Committee equitably.

Mr. Schulte asked if there were any capital improvements done in 2022. Ms. Kerner stated there were a few smaller improvements and the Penn Hills project which was scheduled for 2022 was deferred due to the mini masterplan. Ms. Kerner stated the crew did fix asphalt on the bike path, so that may be a project to add to the highlights. Mr. Schulte asked how that project should be titled. Ms. Kerner suggested, asphalt restoration of the College Township bike path. Ms. Kerner added the flood lights at Slab Cabin were replaced. Mr. Spoonamore suggested adding that parking has been improved and is being highly utilized at Stoney Batter. Mr. Schulte verified the three improvements that are to be added to the highlights section of the annual report. Ms. Smith requested the construction and installation of picnic tables at Glenn Park and installation of mulch at various parks be added to this section as well.

Mr. Schulte stated he will call out one or two more things from the annual report that should be addressed. First is the inventory of facilities, Mr. Schulte stated he is pretty sure the bicycle path is not four square miles and that measurement should be changed. He continued that Fogleman Fields and Fogleman Overlook should be divided onto two separate lines as they are two separate entities, one being owned by the school district and the other is owned and maintained by the Township. Mr. Schulte stated the last issue on this page has to do with Slab Cabin Overlook. He continued by stating if one looks that park up on GIS, it will not be found. Ms. Kerner stated that the Township GIS Specialist worked on that and has made it work a little better by designating that area differently. Mr. Schulte stated that he is pretty sure it is not three and a half acres. He added that Slab Cabin Overlook is behind one of the committee member’s house and it is approximately three feet wide and half of it is in the creek. Mr. Schulte has this parkland, according to his notes, measuring 0.7 acres and could not find it on the GIS program. Mr. Schulte stated that as far as the sizes of other parks on the list, he will leave to the representatives of those facilities to assess the accuracy of the numbers for the other parks.

Ms. Smith added that Nittany Orchard has a pickleball court. Mr. Schulte stated that he did not know that and this should be added to the chart. He continued that the soccer field can be deleted from Dalevue until the multi-purpose field is restored. Mr. Schulte asked if anyone else had any comments. No one had any further comments on the annual report.

Mr. Schulte stated that, as discussed last year, the annual approved budget should be removed as it is not a product of this committee’s work, therefore it should not be part of this report. He continued that it is a working document needed in order to prepare the committees five year plan,
but should not be a part of the annual report. Mr. Schulte suggested the budget not be part of the report, as it is not the committee’s work product and doubles the size of the report. Mr. Schulte added that he has more comments but he will let it slide for another year.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**
Mr. Schulte announced the next Parks and Recreation Committee meeting will be held at the College Township Municipal Building on Monday, February 13, 2023 at 7:00 pm.

**ADJOURNMENT:**
With no other matters to discuss, Ms. Matason moved to adjourn the January 9, 2023, Parks & Recreation Committee Meeting. Ms. Sittler seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 8:53 PM.

Respectfully Submitted By,

    [Signature]

Sharon E. Meyers
Recording Secretary