



Study Committee Meeting Minutes
Spring Meadows Community Park Update
Project No. 13.1141.001
Date: 07.24.2014

Study Committee Meeting No. 3 was held at the Township Municipal Building on 07.24.2014 for the above referenced project. The following people were in attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>Email</u>
Andrew Mears	JMT	717.741.6269	amears@jmt.com
Ann Toole	Toole Recreation Planning	267.261.7989	anntoole@comcast.net
Sarah Colondrillo	Director of Recreation		
Kurt Uhler	Director of Parks & Facilities		
Brady Pyers	Parks & Recreation		
Duff Manweiler	Board of Supervisors		
Tom Houf	Boiling Springs		
Pat Dieter	BSSD/Mount Holly Springs		
Matt Steiman	Dickenson College Farm		
Brady Ayers	SMT		
Tom Hayes	SMT		
Jarrett Sweeney	SMT		
Donna Ludwig	SMT		
Cory Adams	SMT		
Angela Stever	Resident		
Quest Stever	Resident		

The purpose of the meeting was to review conceptual design alternatives for redevelopment of the park. The goal of the meeting was to agree on facilities and relationships of facilities in the park design based upon the site's physical characteristics.

- Will get transportation planner to look at school connections.
- Park is unique with the water resources and managing the park from that perspective is important.

The following items were discussed:

1. A. Mears reviewed the meeting agenda which included:

- Park Vision Statement
- School Connection (at pre-final)
- Alternative Designs
- Stormwater Management
- Prelim Cost/Budget
- Comments/Questions
- Next Steps

A. Mears noted that the school connection was not completed at this time and that a transportation planner would be reviewing the initial concepts suggested by the Committee.

2. A. Mears reviewed the shortened revised vision statement based on the comments provided at the previous study committee meeting and as modified by *Andrea Ciccocioppo, member of the Park Plan Advisory Committee.*

Park Vision Statement

Spring Meadows Park conserves our community's unique, prized natural resource - the springs - while providing opportunities for citizens of all ages to experience enjoyment, fun, learning, relaxation, and wellness in a natural setting.

3. A. Mears presented a brief recap of the existing site constraints and developable area restrictions that were the driving force for the park program and development of the conceptual alternative designs. As a result, a theme for "all things water" emerged. Each concept was developed with water resource protection and education as a common theme. The park could become a demonstration site for protection measures, strategies, and management solutions within karst areas by showcasing stormwater management practices that respect the geology of the region. Example of these practices include:

- Reducing Paved Areas & Turf
- Trees Planted Near Pavement
- Rain Gardens
- Filter Strips
- Created Wetlands
- Vegetative Swales
- Underground Projects (Subsurface Infiltration)
- Downspout Planters
- Sidewalk Stormwater Planters
- Tree Trenches
- Rainwater Harvest & Reuse
- Porous Pavement
- Green Roofs

4. A conceptual diagram was presented depicting areas for development for the proposed facilities.
 - The diagram delineates active and passive areas. Proposed fields have been sited where appropriate based on the existing topography and drainage patterns. There are three primary areas for fields that respect the existing conditions. Placing fields in other locations will be a lot more costly and require additional mitigation measures for stormwater management. SMT would need to decide how important it is to add fields outside of the recommended areas.
 - The community hub area ties everything together – existing and future park area.
 - Access to cell tower is maintained.
 - As part of the conceptual diagram a grading comparison was presented to illustrate the costs implications associated with siting of the proposed athletic fields. Field A was located and graded in one of the recommended locations and a preliminary cost estimated at approximately \$85,000. Field B was located in a steeper area of the park and estimated at approximately \$140,000. The difference in the cost can be attributed to the additional amount of earthmoving required in the steeper location. It was also

noted that the comparison only accounted for bulk excavation and seeding, fine grading and compaction, and seeding of the athletic fields. Additional costs such as potential retaining walls, ramps, fencing, and ADA access may be needed based on the surrounding area of the field and was not included in the costs comparison.

5. A. Mears presented the two alternative designs. Each alternative is attached to the meeting minutes for review by the study committee members not in attendance. The following highlights the discussions and conclusions regarding each alternative design.

Alternative 1:

- Includes two full-size multi-purpose fields and a practice field, pavilion, amphitheater with small multi-use stage, floating boardwalk along wetland, splash pad and playground in main hub, additional parking, and a memorial grove developed surrounding the cell tower area.
- Grouped fields are desired but site restrictions limit grouping of fields in one particular area.
- The existing cell tower could be disguised as a flagpole and incorporated into a memorial design.
- An additional restroom/storage building is proposed in the area of the existing youth baseball fields.
- Community building anchors hub and also includes maintenance facility.
- Amphitheater - The Ned Smith Center's amphitheater was suggested as a model but is too large in scale and sited in a different kind of topographical setting. This park setting does not accommodate that configuration and orientation.
- Picnic Loop located in the far corner of the site with a one-way loop drive to provide access to each of the proposed picnic units.
- Water Harvesting should be considered in all aspects of the park redevelopment including adding rain barrels to existing and proposed structures and also considering reuse of existing grey water. Both would provide great environmental, interpretation and education opportunities. Water harvesting is becoming more and more prevalent especially in dryer areas of the country.
- Conversion of existing lawn areas to meadows of warm season grasses is proposed. It was noted that SMT is already practicing this.
- Bio-Retention/Rain Gardens will be utilized to direct and treat stormwater runoff, however, infiltration will not be promoted. Filter strips will also be recommended for use in the park as a pretreatment solution.
- Standalone amphitheater/stage and backdrop only – adding a building to the amphitheater will drive up the costs. SMT will need to analyze programming alternatives in order to determine the ultimate needs.

Alternative 2:

- Grouped rectangular multi-purpose sports fields.
- Amphitheater and community building are all-in-one. Accommodates 800 to 1800 people.
- Memorial Grove is located at the park entry.
- Formal lawn area with picnic units and a meadow backdrop.
- Core area has splash pad and tot lot.

- Potential for both a destination playground and a natural play area.
- Maintenance building is separate.
- Include turnaround and other parking improvements discussed.
- Incorporate maintenance area into the community building/Amphitheater.

Pre-Final Design:

In general Alternative 2 was the preferred option with slight modifications and additions from Alternative 1.

- Memorial located in conjunction with cell tower.
- Include picnic loop as shown in Alternative 1.
- Develop an overlay to keep the field in upper area and include smaller picnic loop.
- Keep parking close to community building but add grander lawn/entry in front of building.
- Add tot lot and pavilion in ballfield area as shown in Alternative 1.
- Look at the meadows and connections for the overall park.
- Alternate 2 would require more grading but not so much grading that would require walls or a fence.
- Does Alternate 2 have more pavilions? No, it includes one large pavilion while Alternate 1 has multiple smaller pavilions.
- The Memorial in front as shown in Alternate 1 may provide better access for those with disabilities such as the Wounded Warriors. A. Mears noted that any memorial design would have to be ADA compliant.
- A discussion was held on the number of fields depicted. More rectangular fields are the primary needs of the Township and this does not provide as many fields as they had hoped for. Providing athletic fields is one of the reasons the Township acquired the site.
- Are both the front pieces depressions? Yes, they are both closed depressions.
- What are the phasing implications? Fields are the highest need while the amphitheater is lower in priority. This park must be affordable.
- Number one item expressed by the public is the playground. Playground is in the core area in both Alternatives.
- Restrooms and changing area is recommended and needed for the splash pad area. Could tie into existing utilities by having the splash pad in the core.
- How many phases would this plan require? Construction phases will be developed in a logical sequence and developed in modules to maximize areas of work.
- More parking is needed because more facilities are being added.
- Using the natural drainage patterns is the best way to handle stormwater onsite. We want the water to flow naturally. Stormwater design for this park would deal with water quality issues. The water here does not leave the site. That is why it is difficult to maximize development of the site.
- Will the splash pad cause a problem with water as it runs off? It will be a re-circulating system.
- As we put more things on this site, will we be changing nature? Yes. So we need to be careful about not putting too much on this. S. Collondrillo pointed out that both of these concepts do that. Everything is dictated by the stormwater.
- The amphitheater is in the middle but we want that on the back burner. A. Mears cautioned not to worry about that as JMT will work on phasing after we decide the relationships and get them to be what we want them to be.

- S. Collondrillo confirmed that an additional restroom and tot lot place in the area of the existing ballfields is needed due to the number of events held in the park. Additionally it is great place for younger siblings of those using the ballfields. She cautioned against the size of the tot lot and recommended it be small enough to just serve the field area. There will still be another larger playground in the main hub area of the park.
- An amphitheater was always envisioned to be developed in the later phases of the project. There is a concern for a “hole” being in the park for years if the phasing has the amphitheater later. There will be a walkway to the splash pad, ADA access and parking. If we do not build the amphitheater for a while it will just be an open grass area for informal play and that will be okay.
- How will splash pad affect more serious programming of the amphitheater? The relationships should provide some buffer between these activity areas. While programming of the splash pad can be controlled, use of the playground cannot.
- Educationally the floating boardwalk is an excellent idea. How expensive is the walkway to get kids there? Would it be cost prohibitive? It will depend on the ultimate design and detailing of the boardwalk. The concept would be to develop something functional that could meet the needs at a reasonable cost.
- Sara is looking at the alternatives and is programming it. S. Collondrillo prefers the relationships of the facilities in Alternate 2 with amphitheater and community building connected. The open lawn area is good programmable space that people renting pavilions will want to utilize. She would like to see that space on the same side as the building. She suggested switching the parking area and the open lawn area to create a better relationship between the community building and the open lawn area and enhancing the overall space and entry to the building. This would also allow the open lawn area to be more convenient and not require park users to cross the parking lot and access drive. This would also enhance the hub area and could be coordinated with the tot lot and youth playground.
- What about maintenance? The maintenance facility will be needed right away. Could it be incorporated into the existing building? Not easily as that is a prefabricated structure and the entire character of the structure as well as the proposed hub area would be affected.
- K. Uhler noted that the proposed build out of the park would require four guys per week to maintain park. Additional maintenance equipment will also be needed just for this park. Maintenance area could be developed in the proposed community building but should also include storage areas for not only maintenance equipment but also sports and league equipment.
- The hill in the southeast corner of the site should be considered as a sledding hill. A. Mears noted that the grade change is not very conducive to sledding. The easternmost part of this area should try and accommodate sledding within the picnic loop. There was some debate over number of pavilions within the picnic loop. It was concluded to show all three pavilions in the design. SMT could decide to build or not.
- The group was in favor of the improved turnaround recommended for the existing parking lot.
- Meadows would be developed with warm season grasses with certain areas such as the park entry and along the access drives developed as wildflower meadows.

- D. Manweiler wanted to be sure that the depressed areas could not be used for anything else? Yes, without substantial investments to address stormwater management and increased potential for sinkholes.
 - D. Manweiler noted that SMT initially acquired the park because it was not very attractive for development. Almost unbuildable, it was a good value for purchase by the Township.
 - Fields are shown at 225 by 360 ft. which allows for optimal use for most sports.
 - Can we adjust the loop to gain a field or practice area which we need more of? The loss of one field is an acceptable tradeoff for what we will ultimately gain in the picnic area. The pre-final will include an overlay for the additional field and/or practice area and corresponding costs for consideration.
 - How can we connect to the High School? A connection concept will be shown as part of pre-final design.
 - Are cost estimates being developed using prevailing wages? Yes.
6. A. Mears concluded the meeting by outlining the next steps in the planning process:
- Develop Pre-Final Design
 - Review Design with Township Engineer
 - School Connection Concept
 - Develop budget estimate
 - Operations and Management Plan
7. The comments provided will be incorporated into the pre-final design which will be presented at the next public meeting. After some discussion regarding the most suitable time for the public meeting it was agreed that the meeting will be held on September 4th at the Township Building at 6:30 PM.

The above represents a true and accurate account of the discussion during this meeting to the best of my knowledge. If there are any conflicts, misrepresentations, or omissions with the above statements, please contact the undersigned within ten (10) days of this date.



Andrew A. Mears

08.08.2014

Date:

Copy:
Study Committee Members
Project File



LEGEND

1. Multi- Purpose field
2. Practice field
3. Meadow
4. Pavillion
5. Community building with storage and maintenance area
6. Splash pad/playground/ tot lot
7. Amphitheater (1500-2000 capacity)
8. Boardwalk/stage
9. Memorial grove
10. Picnic loop
11. Paved parking
12. Floating boardwalk
13. Restroom/Storage
14. Tot Lot

Alternative 1



LEGEND

- 1. Multi-Purpose field
- 2. Multi-Purpose field - conversion
- 3. Meadow
- 4. Maintained lawn
- 5. Picnic unit
- 6. Amphitheater/ Community building
- 7. Paved parking
- 8. Splash pad/playground/ tot lot
- 9. Improved parking area
- 10. Memorial grove
- 11. Maintenance building
- 12. Natural playground

Alternative 2