

**HALFMOON TOWNSHIP OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION BOARD  
REORGANIZATION MEETING-MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 12, 2014**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Ron Hoover called the meeting to order at 7:02pm. Other members present were Joe Tylka, Christine Bracken-Piper, Lorin Nauman and Patti Hartle. Staff present was Amy Smith, OSPB Administrator and Rebekah Seymour, Recording Secretary. No audience was present.

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**3. ORGANIZATION OF THE OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION BOARD**

**a. Appointment of Chairman**

- ***MOTION: Mr. Tylka moved to appoint Mr. Hoover as the Chair; Ms. Bracken-Piper seconded; Mr. Hoover accepted; Mr. Tylka moved to close the nominations; Ms. Bracken-Piper seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion carried.***

**b. Appointment of Vice-Chair**

- ***MOTION: Mr. Hoover moved to appoint Mr. Tylka as the Vice-Chair; Ms. Bracken-Piper seconded; Mr. Tylka seconded; Mr. Hoover moved to close the nominations; Mr. Nauman seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion carried.***

**4. RECORDING SECRETARY**

- ***MOTION: Mr. Tylka moved to appoint Ms. Seymour as Recording Secretary; Mr. Nauman seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion carried.***

**5. MEETING SCHEDULE**

Mr. Hoover discussed with the board of having scheduled meetings for OSPB on the first Wednesday of each month only or keeping original format of scheduling meetings on the first and third Wednesday of each month. Ms. Bracken-Piper questioned that if they needed the second meeting how far in advance would they have to give notice in order to schedule a meeting if they approved one meeting a month now. Ms. Smith stated that they would only need 24 hours' notice. There was brief discussion about points in the year when it was beneficial to have two meetings a month to which the board concluded that around times of inspections, applications and advance payment requests it would be prudent to have two meetings scheduled. Mr. Hoover suggested that during the months of September and November the board should hold two meetings to accommodate

inspections, applications and advance payment requests to which the board agreed.

- ***MOTION: Mr. Nauman moved to approve the following meeting dates for the OSPB for 2014: February 5<sup>th</sup>, March 5<sup>th</sup>, April 2<sup>nd</sup>, May 7<sup>th</sup>, June 4<sup>th</sup>, July 2<sup>nd</sup>, August 6<sup>th</sup>, September 3<sup>rd</sup> & 17<sup>th</sup>, October 1<sup>st</sup>, November 5<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup>, December 3<sup>rd</sup>; Mr. Tylka seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion carried.***

## **6. MINUTES**

- ***MOTION: Mr. Tylka moved to approve the meeting minutes of November 30, 2013 as submitted; Ms. Hartle seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion carried.***

## **7. CONTINUED DISCUSSION ON ACQUISITION LANGUAGE**

Mr. Tylka began discussion by giving an overview of what the OSPB has been working on for the past years to give the two new board members background information on what would be discussed at the meeting. Ms. Smith expanded on Mr. Tylka's comments in regards to the packet that contained suggested language and answers to their questions from previous meetings. Ms. Smith pointed out that the first question, raised by former board member Mr. Eberhart, as to why both conservation and permanent easement both needed to be in the ordinance was outlined at the top of the first page. Mr. Tylka stated that he agreed with Ms. Yurchak's (not present) explanation for why both were needed in the ordinance to which the board agreed. There was brief discussion about how best to proceed with discussions about suggested language and answers to questions in the packet to which it was decided they would go page by page and look over the notes given to them by Ms. Yurchak.

Mr. Tylka requested Ms. Smith inquire whether A (1) & A (2) regarding privately owned acquisitions were redundant and if so could A (2) be removed from the ordinance. Ms. Smith stated she would forward the question to Ms. Yurchak. Mr. Hoover stated that on page 2 of the packet next to B the comment states "same as above" and questioned what this statement referred to. Ms. Smith stated that the comment referred to Ms. Yurchak's recommendation from a previous question (memo dated 10/29/2013) posted next to A on the previous page referring to eligible and ineligible acquisitions.

Mr. Tylka voiced concern and requested that the financial forecasting model be added to the Ordinance as a required part of the evaluation process when applications are being considered by the BOS and OSPB to help prevent drawing funds down to the point where they cannot support lease payments of current or future land. Mr. Tylka suggested adding under Application Review (b) (iii) language that would make the running of a financial forecasting model a

requirement of the OSPB evaluation and the results would be included in their recommendation to the BOS for approval/denial of the application.

- ***MOTION: Mr. Tylka moved to propose that under Application Review (b)(iii) become (b)(iiii) and proposed new language of (b)(iii) as follows: “The Open Space Preservation Board will complete a financial evaluation by using the OSPB forecasting model to determine the proposed program’s ability to appropriately fund the proposed purchase and maintain payments and leases in perpetuity”; Mr. Nauman seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion carried.***

Ms. Bracken-Piper stated she agreed with the idea of the model but questioned if the word appropriately was clearly defined in terms of the program. Mr. Tylka stated he had used that word on purpose because as of now there was no priority policy in place of what land parcels they would approve. Ms. Smith stated there would be upcoming discussions regarding the land rating chart and program policies. Mr. Hoover and Mr. Tylka agreed that when language is sent to Ms. Yurchak to review she can recommend the proper language.

Ms. Smith reviewed the recommended revision under Application Review (d) (ii) to replace the current language regarding availability of funds provided by Ms. Yurchak, to which the board agreed.

Ms. Smith pointed out the language that had been placed in the packet from DCNR and the County in regards to their requirements for appraisals. Mr. Tylka stated they were highly detailed because of appraisers taking liberties which is why he had suggested the multiple appraisals approach to help with that. Mr. Tylka further stated that though there was nothing wrong with the descriptions he would like to see that the OSPB can always reserve the right to send it back and say it wasn't what they were looking for and provide guidelines to outline what they were looking for. Ms. Bracken-Piper stated she wanted some detail to be placed in so future board members would have it to reference. Mr. Tylka stated he agreed with that and suggested that the OSPB should either look at the county language presented or to keep ordinance simple and referenced to following a defined appraisal policy similar to the prioritization policy. There was a discussion about how firm a policy would be versus having it written down into law in regards to the regulations being followed. Ms. Smith suggested the question be forwarded to Ms. Yurchak about whether appraisal requirements should be put into the law or kept in a separate policy that would be defined in the law. Mr. Tylka stated that if they all agreed with applying this in a policy and if a third appraisal was needed it would have to meet the appraisal policy requirements and language would need to clearly state that in the ordinance. Mr. Hoover stated that discussion on language should be placed on hold until appraisal policy was discussed to which the board members agreed. Ms. Smith stated that Mr. Eberhart had suggested the appraisals include fee simple and not

just easements and she would remind Ms. Yurchak to add that into the appraisal policy and Ordinance.

Mr. Hoover questioned why there were two different sections in regards to installment sales that are 5 years or less and over 5 years since the language given was almost identical except for one portion. Mr. Tylka suggested the question be forward to Ms. Yurchak for her opinion on the purpose of distinguishing the two.

## **8. OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Tylka requested an update from Ms. Smith about the new owners of the Barr property and if they had been informed about the OSPP and that the previous owner had received advance payments. Ms. Smith stated that to her knowledge the new owner was aware that the property was in the program but was not certain if they had been informed about the advance payments. Ms. Smith stated she would ask Ms. Yurchak for a memo that would give Mr. Tylka an update about what was disclosed to the new owners of the property.

Mr. Hoover briefly spoke about Mr. Eberhart and the honor of the Unsung Hero Award that was to be given to him. Mr. Hoover inquired if the township was going to be contributing anything in his honor as well. Ms. Smith stated that they were working on putting a bench in the Wildlife Corridor dedicated to him. Ms. Bracken-Piper suggested that perhaps planting a tree in his honor in Autumn Meadow Park would be a good option due to his involvement and efforts to preserve open space in the Township. Mr. Hoover stated they should ask the Board of Trustees to open up a donation to be taken from various boards Mr. Eberhart served on toward planting a tree for Mr. Eberhart in the park to which the board members agreed.

## **9. CITIZEN'S COMMENTS**

There were no citizen's comments.

## **10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:36pm.

- ***MOTION: Mr. Nauman moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:36pm; Mr. Tylka seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion carried.***