

Municipality	Municipal Board Comment	COG Staff Response																																								
College	Do you utilize amortization schedules for the Pool and/or Parks loan? If so, could we get a copy?	See attached – 2011 Renegotiate in 2020 is the Parks Loan, use the first column. We managed to extend the fixed rate for an additional 6 months but did not get a revised amortization schedule due to the short term nature of the borrowing (looking to change the loan).																																								
College	If no amortization, could we get original principle, current balance, current interest rate, compounding period, remaining term/maturity date and current payment (have annual, looking for per period) for each? Any of this not on the amortization schedule would be appreciated in addition.	N/A – see above																																								
College	For the Parks loan, confirming the current already drawn being held amount as \$1,285,047.	Still working on this, believe it to be correct but not 100% tied down – Loan Draws Spreadsheet. Will be confirmed prior to General Forum.																																								
College	For the Parks loan, amount remaining to be drawn?	See Loan Draws spreadsheet.																																								
College	For the Parks loan, original principle already paid back?	Not completed at this time however staff will note that all amounts drawn currently match the loan balance - meaning the entire loan could be repaid with funds on hand.																																								
College	For the Parks loan, confirming that the current debt service level is only on the already drawn amount and will obviously increase if fully drawn.	Correct. Amount drawn to date has been for Oak Hall plus amounts in escrow only. Oak Hall portion of the debt has been fully repaid.																																								
College	<i>In addition, please refer to responses in the Comment Guide</i>																																									
Patton	<i>What is the Centre Region Population Exepected Forecast</i>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1045 829 2018 1062"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1045 829 1241 873">Municipality</th> <th data-bbox="1241 829 1430 873">2010 Census</th> <th data-bbox="1430 829 1625 873">2019 Population Estimates</th> <th data-bbox="1625 829 1820 873">2030 Forecast</th> <th data-bbox="1820 829 2018 873">2040 Forecast</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1045 873 1241 906">College</td> <td data-bbox="1241 873 1430 906">9,521</td> <td data-bbox="1430 873 1625 906">10,055</td> <td data-bbox="1625 873 1820 906">11,823</td> <td data-bbox="1820 873 2018 906">12,893</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1045 906 1241 938">Ferguson</td> <td data-bbox="1241 906 1430 938">17,690</td> <td data-bbox="1430 906 1625 938">19,462</td> <td data-bbox="1625 906 1820 938">22,203</td> <td data-bbox="1820 906 2018 938">24,704</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1045 938 1241 971">Halfmoon</td> <td data-bbox="1241 938 1430 971">2,667</td> <td data-bbox="1430 938 1625 971">2,833</td> <td data-bbox="1625 938 1820 971">3,543</td> <td data-bbox="1820 938 2018 971">4,031</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1045 971 1241 1003">Harris</td> <td data-bbox="1241 971 1430 1003">4,873</td> <td data-bbox="1430 971 1625 1003">6,040</td> <td data-bbox="1625 971 1820 1003">6,703</td> <td data-bbox="1820 971 2018 1003">7,281</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1045 1003 1241 1036">Patton</td> <td data-bbox="1241 1003 1430 1036">15,311</td> <td data-bbox="1430 1003 1625 1036">15,805</td> <td data-bbox="1625 1003 1820 1036">18,925</td> <td data-bbox="1820 1003 2018 1036">20,648</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1045 1036 1241 1068">SCB</td> <td data-bbox="1241 1036 1430 1068">42,034</td> <td data-bbox="1430 1036 1625 1068">42,160</td> <td data-bbox="1625 1036 1820 1068">43,506</td> <td data-bbox="1820 1036 2018 1068">44,553</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1045 1068 1241 1094">Centre Region</td> <td data-bbox="1241 1068 1430 1094">92,096</td> <td data-bbox="1430 1068 1625 1094">96,355</td> <td data-bbox="1625 1068 1820 1094">106,704</td> <td data-bbox="1820 1068 2018 1094">114,110</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1045 1062 1486 1094">Source: Centre Regional Planning Agency, 2010</p>	Municipality	2010 Census	2019 Population Estimates	2030 Forecast	2040 Forecast	College	9,521	10,055	11,823	12,893	Ferguson	17,690	19,462	22,203	24,704	Halfmoon	2,667	2,833	3,543	4,031	Harris	4,873	6,040	6,703	7,281	Patton	15,311	15,805	18,925	20,648	SCB	42,034	42,160	43,506	44,553	Centre Region	92,096	96,355	106,704	114,110
Municipality	2010 Census	2019 Population Estimates	2030 Forecast	2040 Forecast																																						
College	9,521	10,055	11,823	12,893																																						
Ferguson	17,690	19,462	22,203	24,704																																						
Halfmoon	2,667	2,833	3,543	4,031																																						
Harris	4,873	6,040	6,703	7,281																																						
Patton	15,311	15,805	18,925	20,648																																						
SCB	42,034	42,160	43,506	44,553																																						
Centre Region	92,096	96,355	106,704	114,110																																						
Patton	<i>Please refer to responses Comment Guide</i>																																									
Harris	<i>Please refer to responses Comment Guide</i>																																									

<p>Ferguson</p>	<p>What are the precise penalties and costs to municipalities if the loan is repaid and the project abandoned? What remaining loan payments for the regional park would still need to be met? What would the costs amount to by municipality?</p>	<p>If the project is abandoned from a loan perspective the amounts held in escrow would match the amount outstanding on the loan, therefore the loan could be repaid in full with nothing remaining in debt service for the municipalities. The 2008 acquisition grant for the 75-acre parcel was \$159,000 and the 2011 acquisition grant for the 25-acre parcel was \$183,566. The 2011 Master Site Plan grant was \$19,100. The municipalities would be required to pay the grants back in full (\$361,666) plus penalty interest. The penalty is 10% annual interest compounded 4x annually (2.5%/quarter) from original grant date. That would be 12 years for the first grant, 9 years each for the second grant and the master site plan grant. The estimated penalty payments are \$702,784, for a total repayment of \$1,064,450. The costs to each municipality would most likely be based on the COG Modified Formula that was in place at the time these three grants were secured. The playground grant started in 2019 and the lighting grant started in 2020. While the COG/Authority is in possession of some of these funds, none have been spent yet; we are on the precipice of purchasing the playground equipment and lighting equipment via PA Costars as we have locked-in pricing at this time. The playground is being funded through \$300,000 from the loan and the rest of the cost through donations and grants. The lighting project is being funded solely through grants and donations. Requirement for projects funded under the Project 70 "Land Acquisition and Borrowing Act," Act 8 of 1964: i. Approved uses: Project 70 provided that, "Lands to be acquired by any political subdivision shall be such that they may be utilized for recreation, conservation and historical purposes, and contribute to meet the recreation or conservation needs of the community." ii. Restrictions on use: Project 70 provides that, "No lands acquired with funds made available under this act shall be disposed of or used for purposes other than those prescribed in this act without the express approval of the General Assembly: Provided, That the Commonwealth or a political subdivision, as the owner of such lands, may issue permits, licenses or leases for the exploration, development, storage and removal of oil, gas or other minerals, or for the installation and use of water, gas, electric, telephone, telegraph, oil or oil product lines, under the reasonable regulations prescribed by the owner consistent with the primary use of such lands for "recreation, conservation and historical purposes." If this project did not move forward and the land was sold or converted, not only are grant repayments required, with penalty, but the PA General Assembly must provide approval. Additionally, the acquisition of equivalent replacement land is required.</p>
<p>Ferguson</p>	<p>If the loan is refinanced and the additional funding turned back into the park's development, what would it enable to be purchased with the Phase I scope that is currently unfunded?</p>	<p>If the \$300,000 estimated in the matrix scenarios is what is being referred to, those funds could be allotted to site development which is the most expensive piece of the park's development. The \$300,000 only reduces the overall shortfall from \$2.011m to to \$1.71m approximately. The \$300,000 could also be used as 1-to-1 matching dollars for DCNR/DCED grants to increase the funding available for the underfunded project.</p>

<p>Ferguson</p>	<p>What <i>priority use agreements</i> are in place with other local organizations for the fields? Will this impact the ability of the park to be used by local organizations? If so, how? Also, will the lack of funding to provide restrooms at the park impact any priority use agreements? If so, does CRPR anticipate any lost funding as a result?</p>	<p>The priority use agreement with the Happy Valley Adventure Bureau includes tournament use on the larger fields; funds were provided to assist with the purchase of the LED Sports Field Lighting. The priority use agreement with Centre Soccer includes league and tournament use. Neither of these agreements preclude any use by CRPR's leagues and programs nor by other third-party user groups. Restrooms would be an ideal addition for this project; based on the volume of use at Oak Hall Regional Park, the volume of use at this park could be higher. Regional use has been in place at Hess Softball Complex for years without flushing restrooms. Porta-johns are provided and while users do not prefer them, they are available and are utilized. They would be utilized at this park as well, and a higher amount of accessible handicap porta-johns would be needed to accommodate users of the all-ability playground.</p>
<p>Ferguson</p>	<p>What is the guarantee that the connection to the Musser Gap Greenway will be made and what is the cost associated with it? What agreements exist between Penn State University and Clearwater Conservancy that may guarantee this connection? Generally, the Board would like to see this documentation to make a more informed decision on whether or not to recommend removal of the trail.</p>	<p>In late 2019, PSU President Barron was quoted in the CDT: "Barron said the project is a "large undertaking" and may take several years to fully implement. "As we move forward, other elements proposed by the community may be further developed and new ideas may also emerge," he said. "That being said, we're as excited to move forward as the community is, so we may pursue a phased approach in order to maintain the momentum we've built up over the past 12 months." Recognizing that the COVID-19 pandemic has had many significant impacts on projects and resources at PSU, Staff reached out to Penn State staff for a current status. The response indicates continued support, but improvements are not currently planned: "The Musser Gap Greenway Project is the result of a 2014 collaboration between Clearwater Conservancy and Penn State. This recreational connection between Rothrock State Forest and the Whitehall Road/future Regional Park links the Centre Region bike path system to Rothrock State Forest. While there are no current plans to update the un-improved tractor lane portion of the Greenway on Penn State property, it continues to be available for use as-is for traversing the area between the future Whitehall Road Regional Park and the newer Musser Greenway segment and onward to Rothrock State Forest."</p>

Ferguson	What is able to be built with the available funding? What can be built with the additional \$2 million that is currently not funded?	There are no individual costs for the park development other than for the playground and for the LED Sports Field Lighting projects (see budget pages from Zoom & Learn or GF Presentation Slides), and that is because these are grant funded projects. The budget includes site development work, stormwater management, water system, sanitary system, etc. There is no single cost per field or per the trail's linear foot. The project is set to include two medium natural grass fields, two large tournament natural grass fields, a 12,000 LF walking trail, a 15,000+ SF all-ability playground, LED Sports Field Lighting for the tournament fields, all stormwater management, water system, sanitary sewer system, a maintenance storage building, a restroom building (Phase 1 of the larger restroom/concession/year-round pavilion building), all parking lots, all landscaping, and all the "dressings" to include benches, goals, trash cans, etc. The project is \$2.01m short; these additional funds allow the completion of the reduced Phase I as designed and approved per the Land Development Plan, approved by the Ferguson Township Planning Commission and the Ferguson Township Board of Supervisors in December 2019.
Ferguson	Would the municipalities support eliminating the fields from the park and include the remainder of the proposed amenities? Is there any regional interest in converting this to a passive-use park and include the all-abilities playground? This would maintain the loan but reduce the cost of the park's development. What are the cost savings associated with not installing the fields and only performing the site work for the amenities that remain?	Please see responses from other municipalities on the Comment Guide. This park is part of the Regional Parks project and has always been intended to be a mix of active and passive recreation. The acquisition grants from 2008 and 2011 included language that this park was to be an active park facility with sports fields; the intent was clear from the moment the Authority applied for the funds. The Master Site Plan funds were to develop the master plan to include sports fields for the entire 100-acre facility, with a small mix of passive use areas such as the trails. The sports fields located at this park will reduce the shortfall of playing fields that this community faces now; additional sports fields are earmarked for Phases 2, 3, and 4 for this park, per the original acquisition grant applications and master site plan work.
Ferguson	What grant funding that has been secured or is pending is contingent on the development of the full first phase of the park? Is the grant for the all-abilities playground tied to other development of the park, as well? Specifically, the Board is interested in knowing whether significantly changing the park's development scope would impact grant funding that is tied to the amenities that remain.	The DCNR Playground Grant is only for the playground designated for Whitehall Road Regional Park. The DCNR Lighting Grant is only for the lights designated for the Whitehall Road Regional Park. If either item is eliminated, the grant funding would need to be returned.

St College	Considering the current budget climate and the pandemic, I am questioning the assumptions about economic drivers of the plan. Are the projections appropriate given the different environment from when the assumptions were made? For instance, please demonstrate that there aren't enough soccer fields in the Centre region.	In 2002, the Centre Region was short 12 rectangular fields; the area gained four rectangular fields in 2005/2006 when fields were created at Fogleman Field Complex and Circleville Park. That left the area with a shortage of eight rectangular fields. Whitehall Road Regional Park's reduced Phase I will include four rectangular fields, leaving the area still short four rectangular fields. Right now, as noted in the Zoom and Learn and GF Presentation, the rectangular fields used now, across municipal parks with rectangular fields, are overused. They are not allowed appropriate rest and renovation time. The Agency is not able to take any fields out of rotation due to demand; when a field is damaged beyond a quick repair, taking it out of rotation causes much undo burden on other fields and typically the reservation schedule is impacted greatly for the youth sports organizations. Projections of use at Whitehall Road Regional Park are still valid, despite the pandemic. Softball/baseball tournaments were still held throughout the 2020 summer months, and soccer, football, flag football, lacrosse, and field hockey activities all restarted this fall with COVID-19 safety plans in place.
St College	If the debt is refinanced for a savings of approximately \$300,000 and that amount is added to the \$4.8 million that has been borrowed, what will the Park look like? What will the Borough be paying in debt service assuming all of the \$4.8 million is used for construction?	For the first question, see the answer to a similar question from Ferguson Township above. For the second question, the debt service should mirror the attachment as requested above by College Township.
St College	The COG should ask the Water Authority to assume the costs of providing potable water throughout the site in exchange for the preservation of the 100 acres as a permanent recharge area. This cost of providing water in Phase I is estimated at \$419,000.	The Regional Parks plan designated Oak Hall Regional Park, Hess Softball Complex, and Whitehall Road Regional Park to be active recreation sites with a mix of passive recreation opportunities as well. At this time, Hess Softball Complex does not have any passive use areas, but the facility can be used for passive or low-use events. These larger, active parks are to help with the burden of use currently in place at the municipal parks.
St College	The COG should ask the UAJA to contribute the \$175,000 costs of providing sanitary sewer within the site.	The UAJA will assume/has assumed the maintenance and operation of the pump station that was built on-site at the regional park. The pump station serves the regional park as well as the student housing complex built along Whitehall Road. Every developer is responsible for installing their own sewer sanitary system and paying the fees to connect the service to the local sanitary system.
St College	If the park is abandoned, how much will be lost in grants and interest?	See answer included in Ferguson Township section. That number is not able to be calculated at this time, but the original grant amount plus 10 years of 10% interest compounded 4x annually will be due to DCNR for the two acquisition grants and the master site plan grant.

St College	If the existing debt is refinanced and the 2.0 million is added to the new financial package, assuming a rate of 1.4 percent over 20 years, what would the borough's 24% share of the annual debt service amount to?	This question, answered directly based on staff estimates is approximately \$400,000 per year in debt service over the life of a 20 year loan, with the Borough's share being \$96,000 per year based on that amount. Staff cautions reading too much into this number at this point and recommends more research be done in terms of getting bids from contractors and more exact interest rates from bond counsel once a path forward is determined.
St College	<p>Re Phase 1 possible cost cuts:</p> <p>a. Should not include cuts to the walking trail as it is an important connector. It provides outdoor recreation for those who do not have small children or play active team sports.</p> <p>b. Please clarify that if the fields are removed, how many fields are we short? If I interpret this correctly, we are short 8 rectangular fields? Also, please explore cheaper irrigation options.</p> <p>c. Can we scale back the size of the all-ability playgroups?</p> <p>d. Can we explore creative building architecture re: restrooms/storage/maintenance.</p>	Duly noted. Will explore. For response to b., please see above.
St College	Re: financing. I propose moving forward with refinancing with savings to go to invest in Phase 1 (option 1) but Option 4 is also something to consider seriously. ClearWater Conservancy had a hydrologist on staff a few years ago and she argued the need to safeguard these lands. The site I believe still sits on a groundwater recharge area for our water supply.	Duly noted. Staff will talk with our investment advisor once the various options are pared down. Because this land is no longer being farmed, the land is being improved. We have shared our data for treatment levels for municipal/regional park turf fields with the SCBWA and they are acceptable; the applications to the farm land, when it was being leased for farming, were 4x higher than any applications our Agency applies to turf fields. The site plan includes stormwater basins planted with grasses and pollinators, and several rain gardens to help filter all run-off. The percentage of permeable is greater than the impermeable surfaces percentages within the Phase I design.

St College	<p>I believe that comment 2 where the current plan would be approved so long as a refinancing does not increase the debt service is the best way to go. It appeared from discussions by the authority with input from the consultants the Borough has used for a long time is possible. Using only the approved funding (\$4.8MM) would cut the project down to too large a portion necessary for infrastructure work necessary for future additions and would not provide a reasonable park. Cutting the original budget from the about 9MM 8+ years ago seemed reasonable at the time, but prices have increased considerably over the past 4 years. The General Forum should discuss with short statements from the Authority and the Finance Committee preceding the discussion. This is the way I believe was the best solution from the Authority discussions.</p>	<p>Duly noted. Staff will talk with our investment advisor once the various options are pared down and the municipalities have consensus options they would like to be investigated.</p>
St College	<p>The letter from Miller, Kistler and Campbell, raised some serious questions-what were the original State DCNR and DCED grants for specifically and should we modify the agreement? Have we already used the DCNR and DCED grant funds and what is the SC borough 's obligation if we should walk away from the project? Is there a low-cost low-impact option where we can keep the land in a holding pattern until our finances and future is more certain for example, a nature preserve with trails. I think this plan needs more discussion.</p>	<p>See answer included in Ferguson Township section.</p>
St College	<p>As this is a recharge area, the parking areas should be permeable. This can be done in a number of ways including permeable asphalt paving.</p>	<p>Permeable asphalt paving was explored; while the cost was similar to traditional asphalt, the required maintenance and machinery needed for this small square footable was not ideal. The parking lot is currently partially pavement and partially gravel; in the future, it could be fully paved and it would still meet our stormwater management requirements due to the acres of green space still in Phase I.</p>
St College	<p>I do not know what the formula is for sharing regional park costs, but I would point out that the nonstudent population of the Borough is approximately 13,000. The student population is provided active recreation facilities by the University.</p>	<p>Students will use this facility however, whether through organized non-university sports/leagues or because they live within proximity of the park. All municipal parks are open to students as well, and many are used for student activities and gatherings, both university-organized and non-university-affiliated. The formula for sharing the costs is based on the standard COG formula modified for Parks (to exclude Halfmoon) which considers three factors (Earned Income Wages, Assessed Value of Real Estate, and Population excluding students).</p>

St College	Phase I shows 609 parking spaces while the total number of spaces for the entire 100 acres is 720. This seems to be out of balance.	Based on the parking issues at Oak Hall Regional Park during tournaments and large events, parking available in Phase I was increased. The parking in the original Master Site Plan is not supportive of the type of activities that will be hosted at the facility on the high-peak weekends. The original Maser Site Plan parking may not even accommodate general use during the week at full build-out for the indoor/outdoor facilities. OHRP has major parking issues with an under-sized parking lot; we find that we are parking in overflow areas or there is illegal parking along the main driveway which creates other issues.
St College	The plan for the 100 acre development shows a walking trail or 1.7 miles. The plan for phase I indicates a walking trail of 2.27 miles. Which is correct?	The current Phase I walking trail is 12,000 LF and includes the outer perimeter as well as the internal connector trails between fields and through the wooded area and meadows. Additional grass trails will be available in the undeveloped land, but those distances are not available at this time. The original Master Site Plan includes the measurement for the perimeter trail only and is considerably shy of the total distance.
St College	<i>In addition, please refer to responses in the Comment Guide</i>	