

---

## MEETING NOTES

---

Project:	<b>Detweiler Park Master Site Plan</b>	Project No.:	<b>19060.10</b>
Location:	<b>100 Fort Hunter Road Harrisburg PA 17110</b> <b>Virtual Meeting</b>	Meeting Date/Time:	<b>09/21/2020</b> <b>7:00PM – 8:30 PM</b>
Re:	<b>Public Meeting #3: Draft Plan</b>		

---

### ATTENDEES:

See Attached Record:

### NOTES:

Simone Collins on behalf of Dauphin County Parks and Recreation held a Microsoft Teams Live Event to present the Detweiler Park draft master plan to the public. A recording of the presentation can be watched by following the link below.

[Click Here to Watch Meeting](#)

If you need any additional help on watching the meeting, please refer to link below for instructions:

[How to watch a Microsoft Teams Live Event](#)

Prior to the meeting, SC and Dauphin County Parks and Recreation held an open house from 4 – 6 PM at the open-air Stone Stable in Fort Hunter Park. Following State Covid-19 guidelines, visitors were welcomed to view the draft master plan and speak with the SC team to address any questions.

The following is the record of questions and comments submitted by the public during the virtual live event. Order of questions have been revised to group similar comments together. Simone Collins has edited submitted questions for grammar and spelling errors. Moderator (Simone Collins) responses have been revised for clarity. Names have been associated with comments when they were provided.

1. Anonymous – Please identify what was stated as Federal/State support for Deer management. What and how?
  - Moderator – the plan does not specify any specific programs, but deer management is an important part of any restoration of habitat on site. This can be done through a number of ways such as the deer enclosure proposed in the forest restoration area or through deer culling. Deer culling or controlled hunting can be administered by the County. This has been done successfully by other municipalities and parks. The County can consult with the PA Game Commission and other knowledgeable agencies to set up programs for wildlife management.

- Anonymous – Will the deer exclusion fence have gates for access and how do you keep careless people from leaving them open?
  - Moderator – there will be gates and these gates will have self-closing mechanisms
2. Tim - I understand and agree with the need to establish a transition from meadow to forest, but it is imperative that the panoramic views of the mountains and gap to the south be kept accessible from the high points of the meadow trails.
    - Moderator - Agreed the reforestation area would be used to frame and reinforce the current views.
  3. Tim - Regarding the stream channel erosion, there may be a link to the lack of understory vegetation in the forest, & increased runoff from the area. Please address the opportunity to reduce forest land runoff & erosion with improved vegetative growth.
    - Mike McGraw – Agreed, this comment drives to the point of the overpopulation of deer where deer browse has removed any successional growth on the forest floor. By establishing a vegetated riparian zone with native plants and seeds, this would greatly improve stormwater conveyance on the site.
  4. Tim - Ecological purity aside, open water is a magnet for people. There is a value in maintaining some open water as a visually appealing resource. I wonder what other members of the public think about the proposal to eliminate the pond.
    - Moderator – this has been a topic of discussion throughout the master planning process and we welcome continued feedback. The idea is to have more habitat and reduce maintenance. We considered this area for fishing but there was not much interest because the Clarks Creek area meets this need.
    - Mike McGraw – removing the dam and pond is based on sound ecological values. However, removing the dam does not mean removing all ponding water since this is important not only to stormwater management, but to some of the species that depend on some open water area. The final configuration of open water areas would be developed during design and engineering and would be based on soils and habitat types.
  5. Tim - With 400 acres in the park, why would we want primitive campsites so close to Peters Mtn Rd? Or do we want campsites at all?
    - Denise - How are those campsites monitored? I can see use of them by local youth if not well monitored.
    - Moderator – Agreed, if camping was developed in the future, they would have to be monitored.
    - Sarah Leeper – the idea for the campsites is to provide for that use for someone who may be hiking regional trails. This might also provide AT hikers. Campsites should be considered once suggested regional trail connections had been completed.
    - Peter Simone – the County does have camping at another County Park, so policies for management are in place. One recommendation of the plan is to add a full time Park Manager and that person could provide monitoring of the camp sites. The potential exists for the Peters Mountain Farmhouse to serve as housing for a park manager which is in close proximity to where the camp sites might be located.
  6. Tim - Great photos! Will they be in the draft plan?
    - Moderator – thank you and yes

7. Anonymous - Could you elaborate on the crosswalks on Clarks Valley and Peter Mt Roads? I have serious doubts that a flashing light will slow cars on either of those roads.
  - Tim - Would the lighted crosswalk be similar to the new crossing on the Hbg Greenbelt?
  - Anonymous –Rapid flasher at Front & Vaughn (*above comment location*)
  - Moderator – PennDOT owns both these roads and would need to approve improvements at either location. Safety is a big concern and any improvements will have to consider both vehicular access and pedestrians for safety concerns. Also, there is no pedestrian crossing recommended on Peters Mountain Road.
8. Richard - Given the southern exposure and global warming, skiing on site is doubtful, but I thought I heard skiing mentioned in connection with stone dust trails. That is not a good mix. What about wood chip trails?
  - Moderator – cross-country skiing was mentioned. If it does snow, this could be a possible winter recreation opportunity especially in the flat areas. We wouldn't recommend using woodchips on most trails since it is not ADA compliant and these trails would need to serve primarily as walking surfaces throughout the year.
9. Jerry - is there any estimates on the annual operating costs for the park?
  - Moderator – These numbers are still being completed and will be included in the full master plan report.
10. Rich - everyone who uses the park on a regular almost daily basis is opposed to any changes to this paradise
  - Moderator – thank you for your comment. We understand that this is a special place to those who have been using it regularly for the past couple of years, but the goal of the plan is to open the space to more diverse group of users while still protecting the natural resources that are on site. This includes making the park accessible to folks who have mobility challenges.
  - Mike McGraw – we understand that there are people who are enjoying the park as is, but from an ecological standpoint, the existing ecology is facing too many stress factors such as spreading invasive species and deer browsing. Without human intervention, the aging forests and degraded riparian area will only get worse.
11. Jim - Just a big thank you for an informative presentation.

This report represents the Professional's summation of the proceedings and is not a transcript. Unless written notice of any correction or clarification is received by the Professional within ten days of issue, the report shall be considered factually correct and shall become part of the official project record.

Sincerely,  
SIMONE COLLINS, INC.  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE



Sarah Leeper, RLA  
Project Manager