

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Mark Stevenson called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. Other Supervisors present were Andy Merritt, Barb Spencer, Ben Pisoni and Todd Kirsten. Staff present were Susan Steele, Township Manager; D.J. Liggett, CRPA and Eric Vorwald, CRPA. Residents & others in attendance: Bob Eberhart.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**

None.

4. **TREASURER'S REPORT**

- ***MOTION: Ms. Spencer moved to approve the Treasurer's Report for the period ending 6/30/12; Mr. Pisoni seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried.***

5. **BILLS LIST**

- ***MOTION: Ms. Spencer moved to approve the Bills List for bills paid in 8/12; Mr. Pisoni seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried***

6. **MINUTES**

- ***MOTION: Mr. Pisoni moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of July 26, 2012; Mr. Merritt seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried***

7. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF REVISED FY 2013 BUDGET CALENDAR**

Ms. Steele stated that since the last meeting there had been discussion as to possible dates through email as well as CNET televising all the budget workshops this year. In addition, the supervisors felt there was no need to schedule as many workshops as last year. If an issue or more time is needed, it could be covered during the regular meetings scheduled between September and December 6. From those discussions Ms. Steele revised the FY 2013 Budget Calendar and asked the Supervisors if the latest revision in their packets was accurate. Mr. Stevenson felt it was but asked Ms. Steele to put the days of the week on each date as well as asked each supervisor to bring to the review of the manager, set for September 13, 2012, at 6:30 p.m., in an Executive Session, prior to the regular meeting, the manager's assessment. Mr. Stevenson asked Ms. Steele to forward to all supervisors the self-assessment he asked her to do and which she forwarded to him to all the supervisors as well as another blank assessment form with Halfmoon Township and the dates of the review. Ms. Steele said she would do so. Mr. Stevenson added that the manager review would be done in front of all the supervisors this time, rather than just with him, to facilitate all supervisors to make an input. The revised calendar is as follows: 9/11/12 at 6:30 p.m. (Tuesday) Supervisors' retreat, televised by CNET; 9/13/12 at 6:30 p.m. (Thursday) Executive Session for Manager Performance Review prior to regular meeting; 9/17/12 at 6:30 p.m. (Monday) Budget Workshop, televised by CNET; 10/8/12 at 6:30 p.m. (Monday), televised by CNET, 12/6/12 at 7:00 p.m. (Thursday), budget adoption at regular meeting.

***MOTION: Mr. Merritt moved to approve the Revised FY 2013 Budget Calendar with the above mentioned changes of adding the day of the week to each date; seconded by Mr. Pisoni; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried***

8. **PRESENTATION OF DEVELOPMENTS REGARDING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN CENTER COUNTY AND FUTURE LAND USE IN HALFMOON TOWNSHIP POLICIES**

Ms. Steele indicated that as part of its outreach efforts, the CCBIC had formed a municipal managers subcommittee comprised of the different municipal and county managers within the County. This subcommittee had its first meeting and Vern Squires, the Executive Director of the CCBIC asked the managers questions as to elected official thoughts on economic development. Ms. Steele stated that many of the managers had not discussed economic development with their elected officials at any length, and as a result of same, Ms. Steele felt it was an opportune time to bring this matter to the Board for discussion and input. In addition, Mr. Squires is interested in having a "summit" of elected officials within the county and wanted input as if a summit would be

something the elected officials would be interested in or participating in if a subcommittee was formed for elected officials.

Therefore, Ms. Steele wanted to present the powerpoint to the Board that CCBIC put together for the managers to bring the elected officials up to date prior to making any decisions as well as a segway into the future land use topic Ms. Liggett would be presenting.

Ms. Steele stated that within the last two years the CCBIC had hired two different consultants to assess Centre County Economic Development efforts to date and ways to improve business retention, expansion and growth. Ms. Steele stated the CCBIC embarked on this effort, prior to the Penn State sanctions and institutional issues, in an effort to diversify the economy and to encourage future job growth in the area. The consultants observed the following deficits in the County as it pertained to economic development: Not part of regional marketing; legal liability ranking; state business climate ranking, selected taxes, population diversity, power costs and incentives.

Ideas for improvements the CCBIC is already working on with other business leaders in the community are: name change highlighting State College, move forward to create an economic development triangle, \$750,000 budget for the CCBIC, two shell buildings for office and industrial, Benner Land sales, PSU continue fortifying the tech transfer and business collaboration with alumni entrepreneurs and CEOs to base some of their business activities or satellites to Centre County, Post secondary trade education, KOZ for Benner, local deal closing fund, fast track permitting construction, industry/entrepreneur appreciation.

Ms. Steele stated the managers will be working with the CCBIC on the fast track permitting and construction aspect as using a model of a company who wished to relocate to the Centre Region/County that would be bringing 100 new jobs. What would they need to go through insofar as permitting and codes? Would it be duplicative? Cumbersome and could it be streamlined?

Ms. Steele also stated that at this time it is important for each municipality to determine their role in this economic development. For instance, Patton Township may be the retail center, State College student housing, etc. What would be Halfmoon's role? Obviously without public sewer/water commercial and industrial is probably not practical for Halfmoon. But what about single family and higher density housing?

The Supervisors stated they would be interested in a summit with the CCBIC and suggested it as a future topic for the General Forum, inviting not only COG municipalities but also all the municipalities in the County. The Summit could be facilitated by the CCBIC. Mr. Stevenson and Ms. Spencer would be interested in assisting if a subcommittee was formed, but it would need to be at night due to their work hours.

Ms. Liggett then began the future land use discussion. Ms. Liggett gave the supervisors a listing of the general future land use categories, a map as to what the existing land use is under the present zoning, and then another map which showed the future land use under the present zoning. Ms. Liggett noted that under the present zoning all the AG could be developed as residential in the future except those that have been preserved under the open space program or is forest. Is this what the supervisors wanted?

Ms. Liggett stated that future land use is to be a guide to future growth and development and should not be confused with zoning. Zoning is what implements the future land use so the Supervisors must first decide what the future land use is and then zoning or other methods outside of zoning could be used to implement the future land use. Ms. Liggett stated that Corey Miller had said many times that zoning is much more effective than the SSA to dictate future land use in a municipality. However, zoning should not allow a more intensive or less intensive land use than is shown on the future land use map included in the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Liggett went on to explain the existing land use map. This was the map which was included in the 2000 comprehensive plan. As noted a majority of the land area is shown and is used for agriculture. It indicated limited residential areas in established neighborhoods. However, the zoning was not true agriculture as it allows one dwelling per acre in ag zones. In addition, the rural preservation district's intent was to protect the ag land but is in fact being used as a means to increase density and surrounding it with open space. But the open space many times cannot be farmed because there is sewer and water or other utilities located underneath. Ms. Liggett also stated that one dwelling per acre is possibly not an efficient use of land because even though it is open, it cannot be used for ag and it either lacks infrastructure or is not dense enough for developers to financially succeed.

Ms. Liggett then drew the supervisors attention to the future land use map she included in their packets. It should provide guidance on location and intensity of future development. Forecasted growth is around 467 dwellings in the next 30 years in the Township. Should these be located within specific areas or scattered throughout the township as it is presently? The future land use should be consistent with the Township's vision for its future character. Also this would be the ideal opportunity to make the land use map and zoning consistent which at this time it is not.

Ms. Liggett asked the supervisors to consider the following:

- Agricultural land use does not reflect underlying zoning regulations
- Zoning allows 1 dwelling per 1 acre-rural preservation allows smaller lots than 1 acre
- You get what it on the zoning map-not what is on the future land use map (works both ways—mixed use tells developers zoning will change to allow other uses; ag tells residents the adjacent property will be a farm field for foreseeable future.
- Should consider consistency between zoning and land use
- Current development patter is not most efficient use of land and infrastructure
- Cost to extend infrastructure (roads, sewer, water, transit, cable, natural gas, internet)
- Will there be sufficient financial resources to support the land use pattern and demands for the future service? (fire, police)
- Is the current zoning consistent with the character of the community?
- Does it support the future land use?

Ms. Liggett concluded her presentation by stating this was just a preliminary discussion only and no positions or decisions needed to be made immediately.

The Supervisors discussed the rural preservation district, the future land use, the RVD zoning, and other topics at length with Ms. Liggett. Mr. Stevenson asked if the future land use maps could also include a pie chart which showed if fully built out at present zoning what percentage would be open to ag, residential, industrial, etc. Also value added ag businesses were discussed such as horse farming, hops production, etc. Mr. Stevenson also asked Ms. Liggett and Mr. Vorwald when they needed these maps completed by the Township. Mr. Vorwald and Mr. Liggett responded by the end of December, 2012.

Ms. Liggett said she would have pie charts drawn up. She also said that there are some other techniques to preserve ag land or future land use implementation outside of zoning as the supervisors were concerned about down zoning. She discussed with the supervisors the ideas of a yield plan, transfer of development rights, ridge overlay, rural preservation district as a few. The Supervisors asked Ms. Liggett and Ms. Steele to continue to place this item on their agenda and to take all this to the Planning Commission between supervisor meetings to get their input for the Supervisors. Ms. Liggett and Ms. Steele said they would do as directed.

**9. DISCUSSION REGARDING BOARD AND COMMISSION MEMBER TERMS EXPIRING 12/31/12**

Ms. Steele reminded the supervisors that as part of the budgeting process last year, the Board wanted to open up membership to the different boards and commissions as terms expired. They would ask the present members whose terms were expiring if they wanted to be reappointed and also ask different members of the community if they had any interest. Ms. Steele said that the following individuals' terms were expiring at the end of the year: Open Space Board-Jerry Brown (already resigned) and Brooks Way, Planning Commission-Larry Fennessey and Joe Tykla, Parks and Recreation-Todd Kirsten, Zoning Hearing Board-Ed Miranda. Ms. Steele said she would put these positions of interest on the website and update as well as have something available during election day to see if anyone was interested. Ms. Steele also asked if the supervisors still wanted supervisors on the boards since some supervisors had indicated they were not sure last year. The Board of Supervisors felt supervisors on boards, such as Mr. Kirsten, were acceptable since they were allowed on the Open Space Board.

Also, the Board of Supervisors wanted Ms. Steele to make sure the present members understood they thought they were doing an excellent job and wanted to retain them but also wanted to give the other citizens in the community who may be interested a chance to engage in the process. Ms. Steele said she would do so.

The Board felt that anyone interested in participating should be allowed a chance. There was no prerequisite except they be a resident of the Township. They suggested that during election day, Ms. Steele and staff have a

---

Secretary

description of each board and different boxes if individuals were interested in checking off more than one. In that way, maybe they would not be on a board this year but would be contacted in the future. Ms. Steele said she would do so.

**10. DISCUSS REGARDING INTENT OF OPEN SPACE POLICIES**

Ms. Steele stated that in an effort to make the next year meaningful and accomplishing the objectives of the present moratorium from disallowing any new open space lease applications and advance payment requests, Ms. Steele had asked the supervisors to email her what they wanted the future objectives of the program to be. She had heard many different ideas being tossed around, but wanted to make sure she had a clear directive before taking everything to the open space board to work on. Ms. Steele stated that some supervisors had thought transition the program into more of a development rights purchase program and some had thought keep it a lease program but to tighten it up. Ms. Steele just wanted some sort of feel to take back to the open space board.

Ms. Spencer and Mr. Merritt wanted the Open Space Board to look at different methods towards purchasing easement rights similar to the way the County does it. Mr. Kirsten also agreed but added possibly a lease purchase program also could be reviewed. The supervisors recognized there had been concern in the past that the Township could not have possibly preserved as many properties that they had with the present 99 year lease program, but possibly reserving money for acquisitions would be more in line with the future preservation visions of the Township in the future. Mr. Pisoni said he would like to consider rating lands so if a property was sometimes at the top of the list and it became available, that the Township either had the option to purchase the development rights outright or if it did not have the funds the lease option would be available. Mr. Stevenson stated he would like to keep it a lease program but wants the Open Space Board to look at some things such as: fixing the acquisition language so that the Supervisors were not restrained by the 25% of what was in the year end open space fund as to the maximum that could be used, quality rating system, the language Robert Eberhart is concerned about wherein it appears no mortgages can be placed on the property after the Township's lien. Mr. Stevenson understood Kathleen had language to clean this up, and to place on the application to include a statement as to if there are any present mortgages on the property and if the applicant would be willing to work with their mortgage company to have these mortgage subordinated, all mortgages will need to be subordinated to our lien, review lease to make sure it is consistent with Township ordinances. Mr. Stevenson also asked if there was any way to secure the present advance monies retroactively as the Township solicitor previously said there was not. Ms. Steele stated she had checked with an expert in Philadelphia as part of due diligence on this matter. The expert had checked with bankers and there was no way to retroactively secure these monies. Ms. Steele stated that she believes the Township should always keep available around \$40,000 for attorney fees in the event there is a foreclosure on a property that has received an advance and the Township must have their attorneys recoup these tax dollars. Kirsten pointed out that some of the issues might be taken care of or different issues might arise dependent upon the intent of the policy. Mr. Merritt suggested televising some of the open space board meetings. Ms. Steele stated she would look into this.

Ms. Steele stated she would take these comments back to the open space, ask for their input, and bring them back to the supervisors for further discussion or direction.

**11. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING PENSION PLAN UPDATE-TABLED**

**12. MANAGER REPORT**

Ms. Steele provided a written report. The Board asked Ms. Steele to pursue having the SR 550 improvements done when the Public Works personnel was back from the Grange Fair. They wish to have the crosswalks painted and then PennDOT monitor the speed before putting out the pedestrian sandwich signs. Ms. Steele took note and said she would have the Public Works begin the project when they return. Mr. Kirsten stated he had told Scott he would help and flag. Ms. Steele stated that flaggers had to be trained. Ms. Liggett said that Scott usually uses another individual that is trained from an adjoining municipalities' public works department. Ms. Steele said she would check with Scott when he returns.

Ms. Steele and Ms. Spencer also discussed in more detail the CCMPO meeting they attended. They advised the supervisors that the CCMPO budget will be prepared using the current formula but did not know if Ferguson would be paying anymore than \$23,000 and if not, where the additional \$11,000 would come from. Mr. Stevenson suggested that the CCMPO could possibly cut their budget by this amount if the contributions were not enough due to Ferguson's payment.

---

Secretary

Mr. Stevenson also stated he and Ms. Steele were having a conference call with the pension plan administrators and actuaries on Friday, 8/24/12 and would report back to the supervisors.

**13. SUPERVISORS' REPORTS**

NONE

**14. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

- ***MOTION: Mr. Merritt moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m.; Mr. Kirsten seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion Carried.***