

Upper Mount Bethel Economic Development Committee Monthly Meeting

March 25th, 2021 Minutes

Attendees: S. Cole, T. Hayward, W. Hall, M. Kulicke, G. Deen, A. Defranco, M. Brown, Ed Nelson,

.

Guest: Lou Pektor, Lisa Pektor, Ken Foltz, April Fisher

- 1 Approval of Feb Minutes. S. Cole asked for motion to approve, T. Hayward made a motion to approve Feb minutes as submitted, second motion by M. Kulicke.
- 2 Lisa Pektor from RPL gave an overview for the NID proposal. With focus on facts and clarity regarding what the NID is and how it will work if approved. Lisa has provided the Township with preliminary plans as per Act 130. Next steps are to hold a public hearing for the formation of the district. Proposal to include the Township Park land for funding of improvements and services. Estimated 42 acres will be dedicated to trails and recreation. The NID is designed for business within the River Point Commerce Park to provide capital and operating funds for training and emergency responds for those types of uses, which can be used by the community. Details will be outlined in the services agreement between the NID and the Township. Addressed the fears about expansion of the NID with formal process needed.
 - A) S. Cole asked several questions to summarize the NID and surrounding parcels. S. Cole referenced section 9 of the proposed NID proposal.
 - B) T. Hayward asked question regarding the 42 ackers in relationship of the Township park. L. Pektor gave specific details of the location. A. Defranco reminded everyone that the preliminary plans are on the Township website and anyone wanting to review this can visit the township, along with the proposed map.
 - C) M. Kulicke asked question regarding the first responder's locations regarding services contract within the NID. A. Defranco replied with the Township designates the responders once a year and currently Mount Bethel and Banger are the two under agreement for mutual aid. The proposed NID allows for a service agreement to be developed to services by whom the choose. Ken Foltz, their council, answered more details around the service agreement of the NID.
 - D) S. Cole summarized that the NID Proposal is posted and encouraged everyone to read it.
- 3 S. Cole introduced Lou Pektor for updates on River Road. -L. Pektor reported they continue to develop the site. The Geotech reports are back to solidify the master plan of the site and received the environmental certifications to move forward. Master grading plan is now completed. Gave an overview of market conditions and commented they are behind on being able to deliver as compared to market demand. Gave comparative to other sites being

developed. Several concerns develop over the labor market as this site develops in comparative to other sites. L. Pektor agreed to stay on the call for answers if needed.

- A) A. Defranco asked a question regarding the progress on Demi Rd. L. Pektor answered they have reports back to value engineer the site to make it more efficient regarding elevation.
 - B) M. Kulicke asked question regarding the height of the building due to the report. L. Pektor believed the height of average of 45'. Described how they can use the existing rock as walls down 8' to balance the site.
- 4 Status of the business directory. M. Kulicke defined that the list is complete and posted on the web. S. Cole agreed we all will push to get all business verified with in the next few weeks. Everyone agreed to web search and verify if the business is still active. Agreed to use the Google drive for all updates to eliminate duplicate call to verify if the business is active.
- 5 Air Liquide- S. Cole referenced local job openings and offered to post on our Township website. Asked the group for suggestions for filling the open 20 spots. Looking to fill 70-80 positions. M. Brown suggested ESU career center for candidates. M. Kulicke offered a recruiter friend contact to help fill open positions. A. Defranco suggested the National Guard in North Hampton Co. Also suggested reaching out to the VFW post.
- 6 Public comment was received.
- A) Mark Mezger-Made a comment regarding the NID in details as he perceived the details. Asked questions about the future out come of the NID. L. Pektor responded to address many of his concerns. She referenced the proposal submitted to the Township. L. Pektor defined the investment he is investing on the infrastructure for the site. Ken Foltz also responded to His concerns with more details to accuracy of the NID.
 - B) Richard Wilford-Hunt- Concerns over use groups of the site as proposed as compared to actual developed, along with the traffic concerns forthcoming due to the use groups changes.
 - C) Frances Visicaro-Question regarding the NID and future growth. She fear taxes will force increases. K. Foltz responded with details as to how the NID would develop with property owners close to the NID area. L. Pektor expanded on the NID with legal conformation as to how the NID expands in the future. K. Foltz suggested clarifying the details around the ordnance of the Future NID expansion to eliminate home owners not to be include in the NIB.

Motion received to adjourn.

Emailed public comment:

From: Mark Mezger <mmezger58@outlook.com>

Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2021 11:11 AM

To: Scott Cole <scott.cole@bayer.com>

Cc: townshipsecretary@umbt.org; townshipmanager@umbt.org; supervisorpinter@umbt.org; supervisorteel@umbt.org; supervisordefranco@umbt.org; supervisorblue@umbt.org; supervisorbermingham@umbt.org

Subject: Questions and Comments Concerning the Proposed Neighborhood Improvement District (NID) for UMBT

Scott, at the 22 March 2021 Board of Supervisor's (BOS) Meeting Supervisor Pinter instructed us to hold our questions and comments regarding the NID being considered by the town be held and presented to the Economic Development Committee (EDC) meeting on Thursday 25 March 2021. I would like to have the following comments and questions read, and made part of the official record of the 25 March 2021 EDC Meeting and incorporated into the meeting minutes.

Bottom line up front: We need to slow down and think this entire thing through prior to making any decisions. Before this can happen, the entire picture needs to be presented FIRST.

1. My initial concern is that given the magnitude of the project at hand with the Industrial Park, the township does not have the expertise nor the resources required to properly vet and validate all of the factors that are critical to its success. If this endeavor is rushed into like the "Text Amendment" was, the outcome will most likely be the same. I am hoping that the BOS will not rush into this decision and consider all aspects prior to holding a public hearing on the matter.
2. PA Act 130 affords the management activity (NIDMA) for the NID great latitude and power over the NID. The NIDMA is the governing organization for the NID and structuring it properly is crucial to everyone. Given that

there are currently 27 properties under consideration how many property owners will this decision impact now? If Air Liquide and Lamtech properties are NOT a part of the NID then it appears that there are only two property owners involved in this activity presently. That is UMBT and RPL. If the Lamtech and Air Liquide properties are a part of the proposed NID what is their disposition to it?

3. After the NID and NIDMA are established, there is a potential that in the future the NID could expand and impact other properties nearby. The NIDMA needs to have substantial representation on its board from the Mt. Bethel residents at the beginning and a major voice in the NID's plans. What do the property owners believe is a fair representation of the UMBT citizens?
4. Act 130 also stipulates that the NIDMA has management authority over the NID's activities, plans, and budgets. As such, the NIDMA should be established first and then put a plan together for review by the town at a public meeting prior to the decision to adopt a NID proposal. In other words the NIDMA prior to a decision by the BOS to implement a NID should answer the following questions:
 - a. What problems are going to be solved by this entity? What problems for RPL and what problems for the town does the implementation of a NID provide.
 - b. What are the benefits of this solution and what other options or plans were considered in solving these problems?
 - c. What will be required from the town in terms of
 - i. Investment commitments
 - ii. Service commitments
 - iii. Through the life cycle of the NID
 - d. The NIDMA should present an organization charter that speaks to what the Vision and Mission of the NID is and present
 - i. An activities Management plan (to include management team structure)
 - ii. Financial plan to include level or resources needed and the sources for those resources
 - iii. Business plan to include economic impacts and ramifications, property investments, etc.

- iv. A schedule of Milestones
 - v. A communications and marketing plan
 - vi. A sunset date that clearly indicates when they intend to complete the mission
 - vii. What happens afterward who owns what and who is responsible for what
5. Hopefully, this will provoke some thought in regards to both the town government and the residents as they enter into the decision phase of this effort.