

CENTRE REGION PARKS & RECREATION AUTHORITY
APPROVED BOARD MEETING SUMMARY
December 4, 2014

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Mascolo called the meeting of the CRPR Authority Board to order at 12:15 PM at the Ferguson Township Meeting Room with the following individuals in attendance:

Board: (6 of 6): Diane Ishler, Sue Mascolo, Kathy Matason, Shannon Messick; Jim Dunn, Chris Hurley.

Staff: Ronald J. Woodhead, CRPR Director; Todd Roth, Aquatics Supervisor; Jim Steff, COG Executive Director; Molly Hetrick, Nature Center Supervisor

Others: Jim Pawelczyk, SCASD; Ed Poprik, SCASD; Robert O'Donnell, SCASD; Amber Concepcion, SCASD; Matt Harlow, ELA Group; Michael Garrett, State College.com.

II. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A motion was made by Ms. Ishler and seconded by Ms. Matason to accept the meeting summary of the November CRPRA Board meeting as presented. The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

IV. VOUCHER REPORT

A motion was made by Ms. Ishler and seconded by Ms. Matason to accept the Authority vouchers from November. The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

V. BOARD MEMBER ITEMS & UPDATES

Patton Township – Mr. Hurley noted that their Resident Park Survey will be mailed to 1,750 random households and the information will be used to guide recreation planning in the Township. Construction on the 9-hole expansion of the Disc Golf Course at Bernel Road Park will begin in 2015. A citizen committee will be formed to look into more open space for the Township.

VI. STAFF REPORTS

A. Director's Report – Mr. Woodhead noted that the Staff Activity Report for November will be issued and distributed in mid-December. The 2015 Winter/Spring CRPR Active Guide will be published in the Centre Daily Times and online at www.crpr.org on Sunday, 14 Dec 2014. The 2014 Program Report and the 2015 Work Plan will be presented at the January Board meeting. He also shared that Ann Harpster will be donating funds for a My Veteran/My Hero tree for Roy Harpster. Mr. Woodhead also asked that the Board authorize a special meeting on Monday, 22 Dec 2014 at 12:15 PM in the COG Forum Room as requested by Solicitor Williams regarding Oak Hall Regional Park. It will be a joint meeting with the Parks Capital Committee. Mr. Hurley made a motion that they hold a special meeting on December 22 at 12:15 in the COG Building, seconded by Dr. Dunn. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

B. Staff Highlights – will resume in January.

VII. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Wm. Welch Community Swimming Pool – Shared Parking

1. ADA Parking Complaint:

Mr. Roth reported that he gave a presentation to the COG General Forum relating to ADA parking complaint and that there was interest in professional exploration of alternative options for ADA parking there. He requested permission to seek a proposal from Alan Popovich to,

on a time and materials basis, explore options available and determine the costs to provide some ADA parking spaces closer to the pool gate. Mr. Woodhead said that the Board would then have the proposal from Mr. Popovich available to consider at the January meeting. Ms. Mascolo asked about the cost of the proposal, and Mr. Woodhead stated that there would be no cost to obtain the proposal then it could be considered in January. Mr. Hurley made a motion to authorize staff to obtain a proposal from Mr. Popovich and once the proposal is received and the Board sees the costs involved, the Board will then have the option of proceeding or not. Dr. Dunn seconded the motion which passed unanimously. Ms. Ishler asked the location of the potential supplemental ADA parking spaces, and Mr. Roth stated that the spaces would be on the leased pool parcel.

2. High School Project / Welch Pool Shared Parking Plans:

Mr. Woodhead recapped a chronology of the 3 resolution versions before the Board. He noted that Attachment #3C shows the revisions made by the District on 3 Dec 2014 and includes the most-recent High School layout sketch plan. Given the decision deadline provided by the District, he feels there are two choices that the Board can make:

1. proceed with the SCASD-prepared plan that is provided by the 2009 Agreement - which has drawbacks acknowledged by the school and the Authority, or
2. approve the revised SCASD-prepared plan which provides for pool parking on both sides of the Parkway and also raises several concerns with respect to pedestrian safety.

He then asked how the Board wanted to proceed to come to a resolution on the issue.

Ms. Mascolo then stated that she first wanted to address Mr. Pawelczyk. She said that she was offended by the discussion at that SCASD Board meeting on 1 Dec 2014. She said she felt he could have handled it much better – or the president could have. She said the Authority has always tried to work with them and that they were treated very poorly – and then she reiterated how offended she was. She pointed out that the CRPRA Board did not cause the problem – SCASD didn't address it soon enough to include the 106 spaces. She said that now the problem is being portrayed as the fault of the CRPRA Board. She said she will be telling everyone she knows how upset she is. She said that the Board and staff have been, and still are, trying very hard to work with SCASD. She said it was shameful to have this inaccurate portrayal of the Authority Board.

Regarding the design of the parking layout for the high school project, Mr. Pawelczyk stated that he had heard it characterized several times by the CRPRA Board as “an afterthought.” He said that was incorrect and a mischaracterization. He said he can document in figures he has going back more than a year ago that this was a consideration in their early concept plans and has been a consideration every step of the way. He said that the School Board has recognized that the plan (with all pool parking on the south side of the parkway) is not optimal for the Authority or the District. What they have presented are options, but in order to implement those options, he said there needs to be an amendment to the Shared Parking Agreement that strikes nine words and that he has consistently explained that. He said that is exactly what he explained to the School Board during Board Reports at their last meeting.

Mr. Pawelczyk explained that their Board has strong feelings about this, dating back several years. He said that their Board didn't know what they were doing with respect to the High School Project in 2009, but in the spirit of cooperation, they accepted the fact that the CRPRA

Board was making a partial withdrawal from shared parking by eliminating all parking on the old Welch Pool site. He said they have always been willing to share what they have and that is what they continue to do. He said some of those concerns and frustration are still heard from five years ago. He said the School Board members are still upset about that and whether the CRPRA Board thinks that is appropriate or not, he said that the School Board members are entitled to their individual opinions. He said he felt that Ms. Concepcion, during her first seating as Board president, did a very good job handling a difficult discussion. There were a lot of strong feelings but what they did was communicate exactly where things stand in the process between the two Boards. He said they presented the 1st version of the CRPRA-developed resolution just several hours before the meeting on Monday. He said the situation was rapidly evolving, and it was appropriate for them to have that discussion and hear from their Board. He said that was all that happened.

Dr. Dunn said in his opinion there is a fundamental disagreement about what the job is of the CRPRA Board compared to the School Board. As members of the CRPRA Board their responsibility is to look out for the interests of the pool. His interest has always been the safety of the people coming to the pool. He said it is not that he is trying to throw the school under the bus, if you will, but the Authority's responsibility is related to the pool. He said the fact that the School Board thought the CRPRA Board was foolhardy in ignoring the School Board's problem, which he said the Board is not ignoring, but he said it would be inconsistent with the CRPRA's responsibility to ignore the issue of safe access to the pool. He said he did not feel the issue of parking across the parkway was a problem anymore but he continues to worry about construction traffic moving between the parking lot and the pool, and he hopes no one is killed by a bulldozer or something like that coming through there.

Ms. Concepcion said the safety of pedestrians crossing at that intersection is just as important, if not more important to the School Board, because the school district will have students on their campus walking across there. She said the safety of that intersection is one of their top priorities and that is why they are going through the process with PennDOT to try to get a signal there. That is one of the reasons they hired a construction management firm to work during the phasing of the construction to ensure safety of students and the community around the whole campus during construction.

Mr. Pawelczyk said that construction managers are specifically trying to avoid that intersection as they access construction vehicles around the facility. He said the construction managers understand that it is not the preference of the school district that trucks be moving through that area during construction.

Ms. Matason said that at the last meeting she felt the Board was all satisfied with the suggested changes; they understood that there had to be an agreement and that they were all moving in the same direction and will probably reach a resolution. She said she would like to clarify for her own benefit what Ms. Mascolo was trying to say: It has nothing to do with the parking agreement and has everything to do with how the Authority Board was presented to the School Board and the amount and degree of anger that was shown and comments that were made that were inappropriate and incorrect. She said she does not believe there is a degree of tension and resistance. She said she believes there is a degree of concern and that the Authority Board

is very concerned about upholding what their mission is to COG and Centre Region Parks and Recreation, and she was very concerned that the School Board members seemed to be appalled that the Authority Board was questioning the parking agreement and then accusing the Authority Board of holding up the project. She said those were quotes from the video and she believes the Authority Board members were misrepresented. She said that she was personally offended by that and she said to Mr. Pawelczyk that she felt he was disingenuous. She made clear that she was speaking for herself and not the Authority Board. She then said that she felt they were all very willing to cooperate and agree on a parking agreement but she was very upset about being misrepresented. She said she knew that Mr. Pawelczyk believed that the end justifies the means but she does not agree with that; she said she believes the two boards can be civilized about it.

Ms. Matason said she understands the frustration, but she reminded everyone that back in 2009, when the parking agreement was created and everything was in flux, there was great concern that the school would be moved and the property would be sold. At that time the Authority Board was looking at making a commitment of taxpayer dollars in excess of five million dollars to update the pool and they felt it was important that they ensure that patrons could park and access the pool. However, she said they understood that the school was now going to stay there and she pointed out that the school has benefited from that pool project such as changing rooms available to the school. She said the School Board has portrayed the Authority Board as being standoffish and not wanting to be accommodating and above all, not contributing, and she wanted that to be clarified.

Mr. Pawelczyk thanked Ms. Matason for her candor and said that if she feels that he had misrepresented the concerns of the Authority Board at the School Board meeting he would be happy to discuss those with her offline. He said he was certain that he never used the words that the Authority Board was holding up the process; quite the contrary to that, he said he never stated that.

Ms. Matason said comments were made at the School Board meeting that the Authority Board was holding up the process and that no one was going to get the school because the Board was going to hold this up. She said she didn't hear Mr. Pawelczyk, or anyone else who had been familiar with the process, say, "Excuse me, but that's not the case." She said that Mr. Pawelczyk could have said that the Board was cooperating.

Mr. Pawelczyk then thanked Ms. Matason for stating what he could have said. He said what he felt he was very clear in stating was that the two boards would continue to cooperate, that they will need to continue to cooperate on shared parking because that is very important. He said what he thought Ms. Matason was sensing was a degree of frustration from the School Board and really in reaction to the first version of the resolution. He said the first version has a number of issues in it where it states that there would be a degree of response or "subject to joint approval." He said he wanted to make it very clear of the position that the School Board has on this and that is that the parking that is being constructed around the \$120 million project, is owned and operated solely by the State College Area School District. It does not have an approval path through the Parks and Rec. Board. He said the School Board is not seeking to have third parties create an approval path other than all of the municipal authorities

that they already work with. He said that is what the School Board members were reading in the first version of the resolution and that is why they immediately expressed their concerns back to CRPR staff. However, the second version continued to include those same ideas of joint approval. He said that to be honest, if joint approval is where the Authority Board wants to be, and then he said he couldn't speak for the entire School Board and he was just giving them his sense of the board, he didn't think that the School Board would approve that because it is parking being constructed by the State College Area School District that, in the spirit of municipal cooperation, they are willing to share with the Authority. He said that has always been their case.

He continued saying the third version of the resolution attempts to reconcile those issues - states what it is the district is seeking which is the ability to extend the 400 foot radius on the north side of the street and provides a clear expression of all the concerns that the Authority Board had, which are concerns that the School Board shares. The issues of safety and safe crossing are something that they want to provide but the School Board cannot promise that every single one of those features will end up being enacted once the plan goes through the various discussions with municipal authorities involved. As a result of that, if this requires joint approval, he doesn't believe the School Board will support that.

Ms. Concepcion said that the concern that one School Board member expressed about holding up the process was in reference to agreeing to the terms of the resolution because the School Board would not know until PennDOT approved that traffic light what the outcome of that was. So they were concerned about that process holding up the land development approval on the site there. The School Board felt that if it agreed to this, since they couldn't control PennDOT, then the process could be held up.

Mr. Pawelczyk said that if the Authority Board could not provide support until they see PennDOT approval, then the District will continue with an alternative approach (to maintain the pool parking on the south side of the parkway). They will not hold up the project.

Mr. Hurley said that he had watched the video and found it frustrating. He felt there was some spirited conversation and some comments were made that probably needn't have been - such as the \$1 per year lease and parking - but both sides were concerned about safety. On the original proposal with all of the parking on the south side, he said it didn't appear to be practical or safe, with cars backing out onto the school driveway - and he didn't think it was good proposal for the school district either, with putting the seasonal parking plaza in front of the school. On the latest plan proposed, he felt that he could live with that but he was concerned about how people were going to traverse the parkway. He said he also realizes that the Authority Board was asking SCASD to do things that they were not in control of - the school district cannot go out and put up a signal. He thinks the Authority Board should join in with the groups trying to get the light and safety items for that intersection.

Regarding the video, he said that he wasn't happy with what he saw; it was disappointing; and he wishes that someone had made it clear, as people started to go on, that that was really not the tone of attitude of the Authority Board towards the parking issue - that the Authority Board really does care about safety and they also had a good agreement with SCASD. He said

he felt there was good reason for the Authority Board to question an agreement that they had with SCASD; he doesn't necessarily see that as holding up things. Mr. Hurley said that as he listened to Mr. Pawelczyk talk and saw what was proposed, it seemed reasonable to but he felt the groups should get together to figure out how they were going to make this intersection as safe as possible.

Mr. Hurley said he had not seen school-prepared "Version C" of the resolution until recently. He said he didn't think it served anybody any good – the School Board or the Authority Board or the community that they serve – to keep going back and forth over this. He said he felt the bottom line was the SCASD has a very beautifully designed building – he's familiar with the folks who designed it and with Mr. Harlow. Mr. Hurley said he is troubled because he felt if those people had known they had to have 106 spaces and appropriate ADA parking, in the initial design process, he felt those people would have come up with a better plan, and the SCASD would not have come and presented a proposal that appeared unsafe and not practical. However, Mr. Hurley said that since Mr. Pawelczyk said he had documentation that the parking issue was part of the design process from the beginning, Mr. Hurley has no reason not to believe him.

Mr. Hurley made a motion – and he encouraged other discussion – that he said he hoped would get them off dead center and starts moving them forward so the School Board can get on with what they need to do. He said he wants to make sure that there is good, convenient parking for the pool and that the Authority Board works with the SCASD and other entities involved to get that traffic light and other safety devices installed to slow the traffic down. If the Centre Region Parks and Recreation Authority and the SCASD School Board can smoke the peace pipe and get this thing going for all the residents, then he said he is all for it.

Mr. Hurley made a motion that *"the Authority Board accept Resolution#02-2014-C (Attachment #3C) as presented, but go one step further and strongly urge that an agreement be drafted that the Authority Board and the SCASD press PennDOT, the Borough or whomever, to do something with that intersection."* He said he couldn't imagine that they would not do that for the safety of the pool patrons and also for the safety of the new school.

Ms. Ishler said that she agreed with Mr. Hurley. She also said that the Harris Twp. P&R Committee does not want parking across the parkway from the pool. She said she personally understands it was not practical to put all the parking on the south side at this point. She said she did not see the video of the School Board meeting but she read about it in the paper, and she felt like she was boxed in to make a certain decision, and if she didn't agree, then the Authority Board was going to be portrayed as the group who caused the School District to pay more money. At least that is how she read the paper, she said and that she was upset at that. She said that she, too, is just interested in the safety of the intersection and agrees that they should all work together to try to make that happen.

Ms. Concepcion reiterated that the School District is still continuing to pursue a signal at that intersection as they have shown all along, and they are continuing down that path. Mr. Pawelczyk then explained the sequence required to make application for the traffic light. He said everything is proceeding on an appropriate, brisk course. He said they need to sit down

and have a discussion about how best to deal with the interim parking time during construction. He said they are staying off the north side of the street so the parking will be available for interim parking. What can they do for crossing the street? He said they might want to think about temporary lighting there for dawn and dusk hours because of the active times during the summer. He said they might want to think about extending the warning lights, under control of the Borough, and they might want to think about rumble strips, again with the Borough. He said SCASD is very willing to do that because they think it is very important, and he said for all of them, safety should be job one.

Ms. Messick said she appreciates Mr. Hurley's take on things. She said from a district standpoint she read through all the different resolutions and the changes and sees where the district is coming from with the #3C resolution. She said to take off her Parks and Rec. hat and her District hat, she is a community Mom, so safety for her is key. They have used the pool as a family. Moving beyond the construction phase of things she doesn't see a problem with the majority of the parking being on the north side. There are a lot of things outside of their control like the traffic signal and pedestrian movement across the parkway but she said she agrees with Mr. Hurley that it is time to come to a decision and be able to move the process forward, and it's not for anyone holding anyone up but for the greater good to be able to move on.

Ms. Matason said she believed they had made a lot of progress since they started this and she thinks that the discussions have resulted in rethinking some of the parking issues - rearranging the lot, moving the access to the parking lots - she thinks that may or may not have happened without the prior discussions. She said she felt they started out at a point where they felt the parking agreement was not taken into consideration very seriously, but she thinks they've gotten to a point now where everyone understands the Authority Board's feelings and the Authority Board understands the feelings of the SCASD. She said she thinks it has been the Authority Board's intention to get to a point where they can talk about the parking issue and share each other's concerns and what the issue is about and move forward. She commented that you don't stop a parade to pick up a dime and the process needs to keep moving. She said she felt the Authority's concerns had been addressed and she felt satisfied that a compromise had been reached.

Ms. Mascolo asked the Board if they had decided which compromise they were interested in. Mr. Hurley pointed out that he had a motion on the floor to accept the version of the resolution in "Attachment 3C," as revised by the School Board, which closely resembles the first version of that resolution, but it points out their interest in working with the Authority Board to get a traffic signal installed at that intersection. He also said he wanted to recognize that the School Board put a lot of work into having parking as close to the parkway on the north side as they possibly could, by not having the traffic go right off of the parkway into the parking lot on the south side so it's going to be a safer situation. He said they are talking about the location of the ADA spaces. He said he thinks there has been a lot of good work that has been done and he is satisfied. He reiterated that he had made a motion and was looking for a second. Ms. Messick seconded the motion, which then passed unanimously.

Mr. Woodhead said he would place "Version 3C" of the resolution in final form and prepare it for signatures by the Board Chair and Secretary.

Mr. Pawelczyk said that on the sketch the SCASD provided along with Resolution#02-2014-C, there is a provision shown for two ADA spots as close to the pool as they could possibly make them. He said Mr. Harlow has assured them that that could be expanded to four spots. So as the Board continues their discussion on the issue of ADA parking, SCASD will need input on the number of spaces the Board wants to see in that area of the south parking lot. Mr. Pawelczyk said that five were specified in the agreement, but if additional ADA spots end up being placed in the leased tract, it may affect the number of ADA spaces requested in the SCASD lot. Mr. Woodhead pointed out that if the Board decides to engage Mr. Popovich in January, he would be involved in helping the Authority Board make that determination. Mr. Roth suggested that the SCASD stay with five until they hear differently from the board. Mr. Pawelczyk said he recognizes the need for discussion about interim parking during construction and he knows that the SCASD, CRPR staff, CRPRA Board representatives, the Construction Manager, and probably representatives from the Borough, should be involved.

Mr. Hurley asked Mr. Woodhead if it would be appropriate for a letter from the CRPR staff to whatever entity is responsible for granting the traffic signal strongly supporting the efforts of the School Board and stating the Authority Board's concerns, in some official way. He said he felt the Authority should jump on the bandwagon and encourage whoever they can to provide a traffic light and the other kinds of things that have been suggested to be able to make that intersection safe.

Mr. Woodhead said he would be happy to prepare that, pending the established process to measure and obtain that permit from PennDOT. He stated that they had a discussion the day before with the Borough Public Works Director and the Borough Planning Director about that process and the warrants (of traffic counts) that would be required. They were not aware of subsequent developments in the school plan. Mr. Harlow noted to Mr. Hurley that it is a process and once it is approved by the Borough they will start the process for a signal application, and at that time, Mr. Harlow said a letter of support could be sent. Mr. Harlow said the warrant that they have met is a weak one, so any community support would help with PennDOT. He said it is likely that the application will go to the central office in Harrisburg, and he said the more support they have from all of the involved bodies, the more beneficial it will be. Mr. Pawelczyk stated that a letter from the COG might be the best way to go. Mr. Hurley suggested a letter, also, from a state representative, and Ms. Mascolo said she was sure she could attain one.

Mr. Woodhead said this resolution authorizes the Authority to revise the agreement, and he said that the following day he would be meeting with the special solicitor for the Authority to prepare a revised agreement. Both parties have to revise the agreement, he said, and at this point the Authority has resolved to change the agreement. Mr. Pawelczyk then thanked the Authority Board for its time.

(Dr. Pawelczyk, Ms. Concepcion, Mr. Poprik, Mr. Harlow, Dr. O'Donnell and Mr. Garrett left the meeting at this time).

B. Millbrook Marsh Nature Center

1. Advisory Committee – Appointment of Volunteer Members

Ms. Hetrick announced that the following seven volunteer members have agreed to be reappointed to the Advisory Committee for a 2-year term ending on 31 Dec 2016, if so authorized by the Board:

- Kathy Matason, College Twp. Parks and Rec. Committee/CRPR Authority
- Steve Maruszewski, Penn State University
- Jennifer Shuey, ClearWater Conservancy
- Nancy Tamminga, State College Area School District
- Mary Sorensen, Centre Co. Historical Society
- Dr. Rick Marboe, At-large Appointee
- Jennifer Arndt, At-large Appointee

Ms. Gretchen Pritts has resigned effective at the end of her current term (31 Dec 2014). Ms. Pritts served as an at-large member so her replacement is not needed as immediately as if she were representing one of the agencies. Mr. Hurley made a motion that the Board approve the list of volunteer members to the Advisory Committee. Ms. Matason seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously. A thank you letter will be sent to Ms. Pritts for her volunteer service.

2. Wedding Event Policy

Ms. Hetrick gave a brief background of wedding events that have been held at the nature center, and explained that the Advisory Committee has been working on a wedding policy to streamline the wedding rental process. The Authority Board was presented with the draft policy by Ms. Hetrick who noted that there is also a detail-filled policy/marketing-style packet to help the brides understand the policies while learning what the nature center can offer. She said that there are two base packages with add-on options that brides can choose – all affordable for brides, and what the nature center staff can handle. Ms. Hetrick noted that the fees cover all of the costs involved for Marsh facilities and staffing. Ms. Mascolo asked if the lack of alcohol had been a problem, and Ms. Hetrick said she estimated that about half of their calls decline because alcohol is not allowed - but that the no alcohol rule was still the best way to proceed. Ms. Hetrick also suggested an amendment to the proposal to permit wedding reservations to be made up to 18 months in advance and subject to the rental fees that are in place at the time of the event. Ms. Mascolo asked if this was only concerning the barn and Ms. Hetrick said this also involves the Spring Creek Education Building. Ms. Ishler asked about capacity numbers for the barn, and Ms. Hetrick said that Code has revised the number and it is now 120 for each floor. She said the limit on the SCEB building is very high, around 200.

Mr. Hurley asked about caterers providing food to receptions at the Marsh. A discussion ensued about certification requirements for caterers to protect the parks. Mr. Hurley said any food vendor should have at least \$1 million of liability insurance. He said he would provide a copy of the form the university uses. Ms. Mascolo asked about concessionaires at the pools and the parks. Mr. Woodhead said CRPR already requires that insurance. Mr. Roth said any private group that rents the pools has to provide a certificate of liability insurance. Mr.

Hurley said he feels whoever is preparing and providing the food should provide the ServSafe certifications, the Hold Harmless agreement form, and at least \$1 million in liability insurance. Ms. Mascolo asked about potlucks. Mr. Hurley is going to check into the packet that Penn State uses.

Mr. Hurley made a motion that they amend the 2015 Fee Policy with the wedding policy to incorporate the revisions that were discussed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Matason and passed unanimously.

Mr. Woodhead announced there would be no Joint Parks Meeting on 11 Dec (but instead that meeting will be held on Monday, 22 Dec).

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the December meeting of the CRRA Board was adjourned at 1:15 PM. The Board will meet next on 22 Dec 2014 and then on 15 Jan 2015 at the COG Building Forum Room at 12:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Ginny Altenderfer, Recording Secretary

This summary was approved for distribution by Board action on 15 Jan 2015.