

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
AD HOC PROPERTY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 15, 2022

The regular meeting of the Ad Hoc Property Committee of the Township of Lower Makefield was held remotely on September 15, 2022. Mr. Steadman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

Ad Hoc Property Committee: Dennis Steadman, Chair  
Bette Sovinee, Secretary  
Joe Camaratta, Member  
Sarah Daubert, Member (joined meeting in progress)  
John Mohan, Member  
Jim Scott, Member

Others: Fredric K Weiss, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Fred Childs, Ad Hoc Property Committee Vice Chair  
James McCartney, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Ms. Sovinee

Mr. Steadman moved, Mr. Mohan seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of March 24, 2022 as written.

It was noted that while there was a meeting held on June 16, 2022, there was not a quorum present so they are considered Informational Meeting Minutes only and do not need to be voted on.

WELCOME JOE CAMARATTA: Mr. Steadman

Mr. Steadman stated Mr. Camaratta is the newest member of the Committee, and is the representative from the Lower Makefield Historical Commission replacing James Nycz who did an excellent job but is no longer able to serve.

Mr. Camaratta stated he has been on the Historical Commission for three years, and is the current Chair. He stated he is passionate about historical preservation. He stated the Historical Commission was able to provide some historical information for the Ad Hoc Property Committee's initial report; and while that effort was led by Dr. Helen Heinz, he was able to go out and look at other farmsteads in Bucks County and learn what was important to get them on the National Register. He stated he hopes to make a solid contribution to the Ad Hoc Property Committee.

Mr. Steadman stated the way the Board of Supervisors constructed the Committee was wise and there is required expertise, one of which is the seat that Mr. Camaratta is holding, someone from the Historical Commission. Another seat that is required is a Commercial Real Estate professional, and we have Jim Scott on the Committee who fits that role. He stated we also need a finance/project management professional on the Committee and John Mohan fits that role. Mr. Steadman stated he himself is an agriculturist so there is a good amount of expertise and talent that we can draw upon.

'LEVEL-SET' FROM JUNE MEETING: Mr. Steadman/All

Mr. Steadman stated with regard to the recommendations, there were three fundamental principles which were used to guide the potential use options that the Committee considered with the top priorities – agriculture at the Patterson Farm, which is preserved farmland (agriculture to remain there in a critical role), preservation of the buildings for use by the Township and the community, and in order to keep those buildings alive each must have a purpose/a use. Mr. Steadman stated we wanted to have balanced decision making to include preservation of history and agriculture, community use and support, and fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Steadman stated this led to a summary of recommendations, and the first two which is where we are today. the first recommendation was to establish a Patterson Farm Oversight Board to help guide the planning and the management. The second was to develop a Patterson Farm Master Plan. Mr. Steadman stated the Board of Supervisors accepted the recommendation of developing a Master Plan, and they earmarked up to \$300,000 for the development of the Master Plan; however it is his goal to not come close to that expenditure level. He would like to do a quality job for less than that. Mr. Steadman stated this included an RFP for remediation of soils around the Satterthwaite House.

Mr. Steadman stated that the Board of Supervisors decided that rather than create an Oversight Board at this point, that the Ad Hoc Property Committee should oversee the Master Plan. Mr. Steadman stated he feels the Committee is in a good position to move forward as requested.

Mr. Steadman stated at this point, we should begin the Master Plan development; and while we looked to begin that in June, there was not a quorum present at the June meeting. He stated Mr. Childs, Ms. Sovinee, and Mr. Scott were present at that meeting, and they had a productive discussion with Dr. Weiss. The summary of the June meeting is in the public domain for viewing.

Mr. Steadman stated the Committee's first step is to develop an RFP, and we would request professional input including detailed engineering studies and cost estimates as part of the RFP process which Mr. Scott will discuss as he has expertise in this area. Mr. Steadman stated Mr. Scott envisioned that it would require input from multiple vendors. Mr. Steadman stated Dr. Weiss made it clear that the Supervisors did not want to limit or constrain the Master Plan. Mr. Steadman stated it was also made clear that the Township staff is available to the Committee, and Dr. Weiss had indicated that the Committee is to develop a Master Plan which will have to be approved by the Township; and implementation will be up to the Oversight Board when and if that Oversight Board is formed. Mr. Steadman stated a quality Master Plan will need to be of a detailed nature so that it can be implemented.

Mr. Steadman stated we need to remember the Vision for Patterson Farm that was included in the Report of Recommendations in March as we discuss development of a Master Plan. He stated the Vision for Patterson Farm was "Among highways and suburban neighborhoods, the Patterson Farm is a 220-acre oasis of farmland, trees, ponds, wildlife, and home to two historical Pennsylvania Quaker Farmsteads that are utilized by the community for producing food, art, and inspirational and educational opportunities while at the same time the rich soil remains continuously productive as it has been for more than 300 years."

Mr. Camaratta asked if there is an RFP for the Master Plan and a separate RFP for the remediation issue. Mr. Steadman stated right now we are focused on the RFP for the Master Plan. He stated part of what the Committee will discuss is the level of detail that the Master Plan will go down to in terms of individual buildings, cost estimates for remediation, use, etc. He stated the Master Plan

have a broad vision, but also include engineering studies and specific cost estimates for specific buildings for specific uses so it is envisioned to be a very comprehensive plan.

DISCUSSION OF MASTER PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND RFP PROCESS: Mr. Scott

Mr. Scott stated the Master Plan will make the vision more concrete and add details taking it from conceptual to more of a three-dimensional document that is available for review showing the long-term plan for the overall site and the individual buildings.

Ms. Daubert joined the meeting at this time.

Mr. Scott stated an RFP is a "Request For Proposals." He stated he sees this as a collection of proposals. He stated they will get costs for the remediation to have as a placeholder. He stated this can be bid out to get pricing. He stated the larger picture is to bring in engineering expertise for overall site work, getting a better sense of where utilities exist and where they may be needed given future uses of the buildings, looking at the impact of the roads and circulation, making sure there is appropriate ingress and egress at the site, and appropriate parking for different buildings. He stated he believes that this will ultimately require a number of different vendors on the engineering side and the construction side where there have been recommendations on the various concepts for preservation. He stated the ultimate goal is to understand what those costs are. He stated the goal is not to move ahead or decide on a final scope of work, but to get a base line on what some of the different components would cost. Mr. Scott stated we want to have some details so that when it goes to the Board of Supervisors they have concrete information that is actionable for them to make decisions on.

Mr. Camaratta stated the costs for utilities, parking, etc. will depend a lot on the use of the building. He stated especially with regard to the Satterthwaite Farm, he recalls that the Committee did not make any recommendations for the use of the buildings. Mr. Steadman stated there was a recommendation that the Satterthwaite barn be used by the farming tenant for storage of equipment and straw, etc.; and that would require some improvements to that barn so that it has weight-bearing capacities. He stated with regard to the Satterthwaite House, the use is still to be determined.

Mr. Camaratta asked when the potential uses fall into the work we are going to do since the use will drive a lot of the other requirements. Mr. Scott stated while he agrees, he does not feel that the concept is to pick one use or the other but to get a better understanding what the spectrum is. He stated they discussed if the Satterthwaite House could be office space for the Township, and they were looking to obtain a ballpark cost for that; and this is the chance to get those estimates. Mr. Scott stated it is difficult to determine the end use without any concept of costs; and one end of the spectrum could be stabilization structurally and the other could be to take it to a finished office space or some other use which would involve utilities, restrooms, etc. so we would have an understanding of the costs.

Mr. Steadman stated the Master Plan in trying to determine best uses, and some of those may be nearer-term and some of them may be longer-term. He stated some things will evolve more quickly depending upon other variables within the Plan.

Mr. Scott stated going forward it will be a task for the Committee to go into some of the various recommendations and determine what the scope of work is that we are going to ask the vendors to quote so that there is a clear scope to be able to compare the quotes from the different vendors.

He stated they need to consider what would be needed for today's use as well as the future so that the Township does not have to re-do anything that they have already spent money on. Mr. Scott stated this is also a time to consider the phasing as not everything will be happening at the same time.

Mr. Steadman stated we discussed and are looking to get professional management support in developing the RFP in addition to tapping into Township staff. He stated the Committee needs help to define the correct details of an RFP in a quality way. Mr. Steadman stated we are fortunate to have in the community high-level expertise, and he would propose hiring the professional services of Jennifer Stark, Vice President of Avison-Young, as the Project Manager for the RFP development. He stated the better the RFP, the better the product will be. Mr. Steadman stated many in the Township know Ms. Stark who is an experienced architect with a Masters in historical preservation and a lot of experience and passion in that regard. He stated she is an LMT resident, and she currently serves on the Historical Architectural Review Board. He stated she is already familiar with Patterson Farm and the issues surrounding it.

He stated based on recent conversations, she is willing and available to prepare a proposal to help guide the RFP development. He stated Mr. Scott also works for Avison-Young in Philadelphia which is a very large commercial firm in Philadelphia. Mr. Scott works in a different Department from Ms. Stark. Mr. Steadman stated we do not yet have a proposal from Ms. Stark to consider, but he would like the Committee to discuss if this is a direction we want to go in the development of the RFP.

Mr. Scott stated where he sees Ms. Stark providing value is as a great resource to ask the Committee the right questions and foster discussion to make sure that all the right components will be included in the various RFPs in the finished product. He stated Ms. Stark also understands the appropriate vendors as she has a wealth of relationships in the construction and professional industries, and she can connect us with the appropriate vendors for each task.

Mr. Steadman agreed adding that in discussing the RFP in a broad sense, Ms. Stark indicated that she knows the top handful of companies that should receive the RFP.

Mr. Mohan stated he is in favor of bringing in someone with the expertise that we need and who has the historic preservation experience as well which will make the process move more quickly.

Mr. Camaratta stated he appreciates Ms. Stark's historic preservation experience. He stated when he read in the initial report some of the work that the other firms had done, he did not feel that enough attention was being paid to the historical significance of the buildings; and he is sure with Ms. Stark leading the process, we will have firms that know how to work on historic buildings.

Ms. Sovinee asked if there is an estimate as to how long this will take; and while Mr. Steadman stated he did not know, he expects that would be in Ms. Stark's initial proposal which she has agreed to prepare. Mr. Scott estimated that it would be a few months as it will be a collection of work product from different vendors. He stated even if we were to make those requests today, not everything would come back immediately, and it could be several weeks to get certain vendors out to the site and another few weeks for them to produce a report. He stated this would be for the end goal and not to receive something from Ms. Stark. Ms. Daubert asked how long it would take to develop the RFP

and how long we would be giving the vendors to respond. Mr. Scott stated he feels different tasks will have different timelines. He stated Ms. Stark will help us with the RFP. Ms. Daubert asked when they hope to send the RFP out. Mr. Scott stated he feels at the next meeting, we could define the scope of what we are asking. Ms. Daubert stated she feels it could take two months to put the RFP together, and Mr. Scott agreed. Ms. Daubert stated depending on the scope of the RFP, that will outline how long vendors will have to respond; and Mr. Scott agreed. Mr. Steadman stated the RFP will have multiple components. He stated Ms. Stark can put those different pieces together and there would be different timing for the various components. Ms. Daubert stated every vendor would not be bidding on every section, and Mr. Steadman agreed.

Mr. Mohan asked if the Township needs to review the RFP before it is issued, and Mr. Steadman stated they would work with Township management as we will want their input before the RFP goes out. Mr. Steadman stated Mr. Majewski has experience in this area. Mr. Mohan stated that needs to be factored in with regard to the timeline.

Mr. Steadman stated he is hearing a favorable reaction to receiving a proposal from Ms. Stark, and once it is received he will circulate it to the Committee for review and discussion.

Mr. Mohan asked if this includes the Slack House, and Mr. Steadman stated this is just for Patterson Farm, and we are not including the Slack House. He added that there has been no formal reaction from the Board of Supervisors to the recommendation on the Slack House.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one from the public wishing to speak at this time.

#### ACTION ITEMS AND ASSIGNMENTS: Ms. Sovinee

1. Mr. Steadman - Get a proposal from Ms. Stark

FUTURE SCHEDULE: All

Mr. Steadman stated we will still meet once a month, and the October meeting is on the Township calendar for October 13 at 7:30 p.m. He stated future meetings are targeted to be held on the second Thursday of each month although nothing further has been scheduled past October 13. While some members indicated they may be on vacation, they agreed to try to join in on Zoom. The Committee members were interested in continuing with Zoom as that provides the members more flexibility to be able to dial in if they are out of town.

COMMENTS FROM DR. WEISS

Dr. Weiss stated he feels the Committee is off to a great start, and the Board of Supervisors is looking forward to getting the RFP developed so we can get something concrete. He stated this is a Township project, and we do not plan to “sell or lease the unfinished product and send it out to a third party to develop.” He stated this will be community-directed, Township directed, and the community will determine what the best use will be and how we will spend our money to get the best possible product since once we build it, we will need the best use to maintain it in perpetuity.

Mr. Steadman stated it is Township property and it will be Township resources and money that go into it.

Dr. Weiss stated there are a lot of people, both professionals and volunteers, who are willing to help; and the Committee should tap into all of those resources. He stated hopefully the RFP will go out by December or January, and Mr. Steadman stated he feels that is a reasonable expectation. He stated he feels that with professional help we will be able to put out a good product in a timely way; but it will require a lot of work by the Committee, and it will be up to the Committee to formulate answers to the questions being asked by the professional.



September 15, 2022

Ad Hoc Property Committee

There being no further business, Ms. Sovinee moved, Mr. Camaratta seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bette Sovinee, Secretary

