

**MEETING MINUTES**

**DATE:** April 19, 2010

**SUBJECT:** East Cocalico Township Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee

**LOCATION:** East Cocalico Township Municipal Building, 100 Hill Road, Denver, PA 17517

**ATTENDEES:**

NAME	COMPANY	PHONE	E-MAIL
Louis Hurst	TIF Advisory Committee		
Mark Janke	TIF Advisory Committee		
Paul Keller	TIF Advisory Committee		
Sean Killen	TIF Advisory Committee		
David Lutz	TIF Advisory Committee		
Marcia Martin	TIF Advisory Committee		
Doug Nedimyer	TIF Advisory Committee		
May Roth	TIF Advisory Committee		
Shad Sahn	TIF Advisory Committee		
Jamie Sweigart	TIF Advisory Committee		
Lynn Weaver	TIF Advisory Committee		
Brian Wise	TIF Advisory Committee		
Mark Hiester	East Cocalico Township		
Brent Lied	Becker Engineering		
Dan Santoro	Delta Development Group, Inc.		
Matt Radinovic	Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc.		
Christopher May	Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc.		

The purpose of the meeting was to select officers, review the Transportation Service Areas and Excluded Areas Map, and review residential and non-residential projections. The following is a summary of significant comments made at this meeting:

1. Jamie Sweigart was selected for AC Chair by unanimous vote with motion by Shad Sahn and second by Brian Wise.

2. Shad Sahm was selected for AC Vice-Chair by unanimous vote with motion by Shad Sahm and second by Jamie Sweigart.
3. Chris and Brent presented the excluded areas map. This map shows areas that are excluded from the TIF program where future development is not anticipated. These areas were selected using criteria such as to exclude existing residential where lot size combined with current zoning does not allow for future subdivision, Township owned lands, including parks and Authority parcels, preserved farms, approved but not yet constructed land development plans, road right-of-ways, and commercial areas where limited expansion is anticipated. In regards to commercial areas, the assumption was that even by excluding the commercial parcel does not remove the parcel from the TIF program, and that changes in use/expansion could have impact fees collected even if the parcel was excluded. However the most recent legal interpretation is such that if an area is excluded, impact fees can not be collected from that parcel even if there is a change in use or expansion. As such it was recommended and agreed to by the AC that the map be revised to only exclude commercial area where no future expansion or change in uses is anticipated. The AC also decided to keep the parcels for land development plans that have been submitted but not approved in the included area and carefully evaluate projects that are approved but not constructed.
4. The excluded areas map also included two (2) preliminary Transportation Service Areas (TSAs). These areas are made up of a maximum of seven (7) square miles of included parcel areas and are the boundaries of which impact fees are collected and utilized. Improvements are calculated for each TSA based on a projected number of origin/start and destination/end trips in that TSA from which an impact fee per proposed PM Peak Hour trip is calculated. There is not a limit on the number of TSAs that a municipality is broken down into, however the fewer the better due to the way in which fees are collected. For example, if three TSAs were used in East Cocalico Township, and a trip originates/starts in TSA 1, travels through TSA 2 and is destined/ends in TSA 3, then impact fees could only be collected for impacts to TSA 1 and 3. TSA 2 could not collect impact fees for this trip as the trip only passes through the area. Municipalities are also best broken into TSAs using roadways as boundaries which are anticipated to require the most number of future improvements as roadways that share multiple (typically two) TSA boundaries can apply impact fees collected from both TSAs to improvements. Currently the preliminary TSAs presented use N. Reading Road (SR 0272) as the boundary. However due to revisions to the excluded areas map discussed in #3 above, three (3) TSAs will likely be required in East Cocalico Township. As such if three (3) TSAs are required the boundaries would most likely use N. Reading Road (SR 0272) and Swartzville Road (SR 0897). The AC concurred with the use of three (3) TSAs using these roadways as boundaries as it is unlikely to have a significant number of pass through trips in any one TSA. The use of three (3) TSAs will also allow a more conservative approach relative to including additional properties (minimizing excluded properties) where future redevelopment, development potential or changes in use are difficult to predict.
5. Dan reviewed a revised set of residential projections based on feedback from the previous AC meeting. This set of projections included four (4) different projection trends as follows:
  - A. Assume steady increasing growth for next five years (2010-2015) and from 2015 and beyond assume a 1% growth rate in residential units per year. This resulted in a total of 794 projected residential dwellings over the next 20 years.
  - B. Assume a steady increasing growth rate ending in a 2% per year growth rate on 2030. This resulted in a total of 1096 projected residential dwellings over the next 20 years.
  - C. Assume steady increasing growth for next five years (2010-2015) and from 2015 and beyond assume a residential growth at 28 dwelling units/ year based on average

- Township historical data (2000-2009). This resulted in a total of 708 projected residential dwellings over the next 20 years.
- D. Assume steady increasing growth for next five years (2010-2015) and from 2015 and beyond assume a residential growth at 52 dwelling units/ year based on highest year Township historical data (2000-2009). This resulted in a total of 910 projected residential dwellings over the next 20 years.
6. Currently there exist approximately 800 planned residential units in subdivisions/land development plans submitted to the Township that have either received preliminary approval or were submitted for preliminary review prior to the TIF resolution. The question was raised: that is it feasible to assume that only 100-200 more residential units will be proposed within the next 20 years? The AC concurred that it was not feasible to think that only 1-2 new residential subdivision/land development plans would be proposed within the next 20 years. Therefore an assumption will need to be made as to how many of these backlogged units will actually be built according to the current land development plans under review.
7. Dan reviewed the non-residential information that is currently prepared. This information pertained to location quotient, or how the Township compares based on industry subsets against Lancaster County and PA. Location Quotient is used to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Township business mix. Shift Share information was also reviewed which shows a historical trend (2003-2008) of how the Township has either gained or lost jobs in each industry subset as compared against the statewide averages. More detailed non-residential projections will be available at the next AC meeting.
8. Items that will be discussed at next months meeting are as follows:
- A. Additional Township historical data will be obtained for residential and non-residential trends (1990-1999).
  - B. Non-residential projections will be presented.
  - C. Existing intersection analysis will be completed to discuss how the study intersections are currently operating.
  - D. The table of land development plans that are currently under review will be revised to sort by residential versus non-residential and review status.
  - E. The excluded areas map will be refined based on the recent legal interpretation received and will be presented for discussion/finalization.

We believe these minutes accurately reflect the items discussed at the subject meeting. If there are any revisions or corrections to these minutes, please contact the undersigned within ten (10) days of receipt of these minutes. If no revisions or corrections are requested, the minutes will stand approved as submitted.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc.



Christopher W. May, P.E., PTOE