

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PARK & RECREATION BOARD
MINUTES – NOVEMBER 14, 2023

The regular meeting of the Park & Recreation Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on November 14, 2023. Mr. Krauss called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. and called the Roll.

Those present:

Park & Recreation Board: Douglas Krauss, Chair
Michael Brody, Vice Chair
Kim Rock, Secretary
Michael Blundi, Member
Rob LaBar, Member
Dennis Wysocki, Member

Others: Monica Tierney, Park & Recreation Director

Absent: David Malinowski, Park & Recreation Board Member
Colin Coyle, Supervisor Liaison

DEFER APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 24, 2023 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. LaBar moved, Mr. Blundi seconded and it was unanimously carried to defer approval of the October 24, 2023 Meeting Minutes until the December meeting.

LIAISON REPORTS

Mr. Gordon Workman, Lower Makefield Football Association, stated two Tackle Teams are continuing onto the playoffs. He stated the Flag Season is officially over other than two Tournament Teams one of which won the NFL Flag Tournament in Boston and will be playing at the Pro Ball in Orlando. He thanked the Board for the use of Memorial Park for their practices, and he stated they look forward to continuing that. He stated there were 650 players in Flag this year, and they continue to rise about 5% a year. He stated they were up to five Tackle Teams this year, with about 110 playing Tackle.

Mr. George Schlieben, YMS President, stated there are four boys teams and three girls teams who will be playing in the National League Play-Offs in Tampa in December. He stated YMS participated in a number of community service projects including a clean-up at Lake Afton and the Run The Course event. Mr. Schlieben stated the season is done this weekend, and they will be clearing off the fields. He thanked volunteers Mr. David Marinoff who served as Treasurer on the Board for four and a half years, Mr. Reza Maghadem, the Rec Director who served on the Board for six years, and Mr. Mike Corso, the Vice President and Tournament Director who served for six years and who are all now moving on.

Ms. Laurie Grey stated she is a Lower Makefield Township resident, and there was an incident on October 13 at Macclesfield Park, and she is working on getting that resolved through Ms. Tierney and some other avenues. She stated there was a Community Night that evening at Macclesfield Park, and there was a lot of noise, etc. She stated Ms. Tierney was notified and is working on that, and Mr. Workman was also notified as well and got back to her. Ms. Tierney stated the football organization had a Pep Rally with a DJ, and the music was a little loud.

BUDGET/FEE DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF FEES

Mr. Krauss stated Ms. Tierney made a presentation to the Board of Supervisors as part of their Budget discussions for 2024. He stated they discussed some of the recommendations that the Park & Recreation Board had made as well as other fees, revenue streams, and expenses. He stated we need to work to make sure that we are providing Ms. Tierney solid recommendations to the Board of Supervisors in terms of what we believe Park & Rec should represent to the Township, what the costs should be to participants, and if there are ways to close the gap in terms of generating revenue to offset increased expenses that we are seeing through inflation, cost of goods, and labor. He stated we also want to make sure that we are mindful of the cost to the participants and not on passing so many costs that it becomes cost prohibitive for people to enjoy the programs and services that the Township offers.

Mr. Krauss stated the Budget meeting was televised, and there are differences of opinions as to how the Supervisors want to see the Budget. He stated in the past, typically the costs have been more of a break-even proposition in terms of the revenue stream offsetting the expected expenses. He stated as Ms. Tierney has advised, there are times when those expenses are either higher or sometimes the revenue is higher because the expenses came in

lower. He stated there are opinions on the Board of Supervisors that we should be making a higher revenue and they encouraged higher fees where there is opportunity to do that.

Mr. Krauss stated at the last Park & Recreation Board meeting, the Board looked at LMT Camp, pickleball, and the Dog Park; and while we will discuss those again tonight, we will also look at the other areas including the Pool, League User Fees, and Community Center Fees.

Mr. Krauss stated the Park & Recreation Board should consider what we stand for in terms of parks and recreation, what it delivers to the constituents of the community, and consider what the Fees can be so that we can send a solid recommendation back to the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Tierney stated the Board of Supervisors is going to have another Special Budget meeting, and the Budget needs to be advertised thirty-days in advance of the Board of Supervisors voting on it so we are running out of days. Mr. Krauss stated he feels the goal should be to get the recommendations to the Board of Supervisors before Thanksgiving if possible.

Mr. Wysocki stated he is confused as to the purpose of tonight's meeting, since he felt that we had already established the goals of Park and Recreation as to what is provided to the community and the costs. He stated it seems that there is conflicting direction that we are being given. He asked if we are being asked to make programs more affordable for residents or is it to fit everything into a Budget that they have already established in their minds. Ms. Tierney stated it seemed as though the direction from the Board of Supervisors was to increase Fees to not only offset or break-even, but also to consider some of our additional usage due to the programming to cover the Capital repair expenses. Mr. Wysocki stated it seems that it is more of a Budget concern than it is affordability for participants.

Mr. Krauss stated he feels the Park & Rec Board needs to look hard at the Budget and understand where there is room to be creative. He stated we need to consider how much of the expenses we are going to pass along to the participants, and not only just what it takes to run the program. He asked if we are expecting the participants to start paying additional Fees over and above what it costs to run the program to cover potential Capital improvements in the future. He stated at the Board of Supervisors meeting it was brought up that Macclesfield may need the parking lot re-paved and if the User Fees should pay additional Fees to cover potential re-paving of the parking lot in the future. He stated the Park & Recreation Recommendation

Board is an Advisory Board, and the Board of Supervisors can agree or disagree with their recommendations. Mr. Krauss stated he is trying to explain what he felt was the sense of what the Board of Supervisors at the Budget meeting and their feedback on the recommendations on some of the fees based on the expenses and whether or not we have the ability to raise the fees higher to capture potential future costs.

Ms. Tierney stated what was before the Board of Supervisors was the Draft Budget that had a .5 millage increase to the Park & Rec millage which is not part of the General Fund. She stated that would equate to about \$21 a household. She stated the sense she was getting from the Board of Supervisors was that they would prefer that instead of increasing millage, that we increase User Fees to cover our operational deficit.

Mr. Blundi stated what was discussed at that meeting was that the Township as a whole is spending more than what we are generating in revenue; and that is in large part what the Board of Supervisors is looking at.

Mr. Brody stated he watched the meeting, and he felt that the Board of Supervisors basically disagreed with the Park & Recreation Budget. He stated he believes we always had the theory that we should “run even,” but the Board of Supervisors made it very clear that needs to change; and tonight the Park & Recreation Board needs to consider where we can change, come up with a different plan, or argue why we think it should be a certain plan.

Mr. Brody stated he has some concerns about the methodology that the Board of Supervisors wants the Park & Recreation Board to do, and he would like to find more of a middle ground.

Mr. Krauss stated the Park & Recreation Budget Revenue is from fees, and then any other funds received are from the Park & Recreation millage; and there are no other funds that are transferred from the General Fund. Ms. Tierney stated when there is a shortage, funds are transferred from the General Fund.

Mr. Blundi stated at the last Park & Recreation Board meeting Ms. Tierney showed a slide that showed that the past two years, \$355,000 was what the deficit was. He stated he does not feel technically that was an overspend because there were Capital items in that number. Ms. Tierney stated the number Mr. Blundi is referring to has changed a little bit because as they went through the Budget, there were some corrections. She stated year-over-year the deficit has been accumulating. Mr. Blundi stated it is

a six-figure number so it is not a small amount, and Ms. Tierney agreed. Mr. Blundi stated the way we are currently operating, Park & Recreation is not covering the costs of the programming that we are putting out.

Mr. Wysocki asked what the Board of Supervisors was looking for, and Ms. Tierney stated they want to make more money from Fees than just break even. Mr. Wysocki asked if they want to make Park & Recreation a profit center, and Ms. Tierney stated the money would go back to Park & Recreation operations.

Mr. LaBar stated at the previous meeting there was discussion about millage, and at one point it was raised, and then it was decreased; and Ms. Tierney agreed. Mr. LaBar stated he understands that we are not capturing some of the maintenance and future expenses, and he feels that needs to be addressed. He stated that was discussed at the last meeting which was why we were recommending to the Board of Supervisors to increase the millage to address some of that. He stated there is maintenance that is not being done, and he felt our recommendation to increase the millage was so that we could encompass future maintenance and problems that might accrue at the various parks. Mr. Brody agreed.

Mr. Krauss stated it is a combination of things as we have added new parks and there are instances at the parks and the Pool where things need to be replaced and there was not funding to account for that. He stated when a Capital project needs to be done there is not a fund today that we can tap into. He stated we need to consider how much should the users pay for things that have not been done over time.

Ms. Rock asked if it is normal for Parks & Rec in other Townships to have a surplus. Ms. Tierney stated generally in Lower Makefield we go for break even in Parks and Recreation. She stated while she has not called all the other Townships, not every Township has dedicated Park & Rec millage; and they are part of the General Fund.

Mr. Krauss stated if a Park needs to be re-paved, is it expected that the Fees paid by the people using that Park would be paying for that, or is it something that the Township is budgeting for as a Capital expense. Ms. Tierney stated with regard to the other Townships, she believes that the tendency is not just to break even on Operations. She stated some Townships have other sources of income, and she noted Falls Township

has the landfill money that comes in that they can use if there are overages. She stated the Pool at Falls Township and the County Pool have Waste Management money that comes in and can cover an overage so that it never impacts the Township tax. She stated Lower Makefield does not have that source of income to help with that. She stated we need to make decisions that are the best for Lower Makefield.

Mr. LaBar stated he knows that the surface at the playground at Memorial Park needs to be replaced which will cost six figures. He asked how long that will last, and Ms. Tierney stated it should last approximately seven to ten years. Mr. LaBar stated that is not a User Fee type-facility with people coming there paying money to use the facility. He stated if the surface is replaced next year, budgetary-wise we know that in seven years, we will need to pay for replacement again; and he asked if there is a “rainy-day fund” that Park & Rec should have set aside with a certain amount of money each year for these types of expenditures. He asked if we are able to come up with a number of what needs to be put aside every year in order to be able to replace the playground surface in ten years. Ms. Tierney stated we have been looking at a Capital Improvement Plan to better identify needs, but unfortunately we have many amenities that are beyond their useful life. She stated we have allowed that to go on for some time, and we are trying to cover some of the deferred maintenance that we have not had funding to do.

Mr. LaBar asked how much would the increased millage bring in if that were approved, and Ms. Tierney stated it would bring in around \$250,000.

Mr. Krauss stated there are parks that are not generating any Fees, and anyone can use those facilities, and there are also facilities that are available when they are not scheduled for use by the Leagues. He stated we need to decide how much the users are going to pay versus those who are using the parks but not paying a fee for the parks which still require Capital improvements at some point.

Mr. Krauss stated it is important to invest in Park & Recreation because it is the heart of the community. He stated Park & Recreation provides programming and facilities to the constituents with significant value both tangible and intangible. He stated there is connectivity with the community as many people meet friends and neighbors through sports groups and social activities that the Township puts on such as Community Pride Day, soccer, football, baseball, etc.

Mr. Krauss stated it also provides physical and mental well-being. He stated it preserves natural resources which is important to the residents whether it is open park space, walking trails, etc.; and overall it adds value to Township properties. Mr. Krauss stated the Township adopted the Play For All Plan and we became CAPRA Certified, and we should try to invest in that and allow as many of our residents to participate where possible. Mr. Wysocki stated it seems that we need to refresh the Board of Supervisors' understanding of the value of Parks & Rec to the Township.

Ms. Tierney showed a slide which is a snapshot of what the proposed fees would be in 2024 to be able to break even. She stated this slide does not show the Pool, and it is just the Park & Rec side. Mr. LaBar stated break even does not factor in maintenance projects like the one at Memorial Park. Ms. Tierney stated it would include regular maintenance. Mr. LaBar stated it indicates that the Annual Operating Expenses for pickleball are \$35,000; and he understands that this will not include refurbishing the pickleball courts over the years. Ms. Tierney stated while it does not, this year they did incorporate into the Pickleball Fees the cost of the pickleball staff who will help run that group as well as some of the repairs that we need at the Memorial Park courts including soundproofing, extra nets, and other supplies that we just provided in the past. Mr. Krauss stated if something happens that is not expected, such as wind damage to a facility, we do not have money to cover those expenses in a "rainy-day fund." He noted this year there were \$70,000 in tree expenses, and we did not budget for that.

Mr. Wysocki stated we would need to know what the bigger Capital expenses could be at all of the facilities. He stated in order to consider something that could be done in the short-term we would need to look at what the imbalance has been year over year in total. Mr. Wysocki stated as noted earlier there are parks where User Fees are not paid and there are other Park that are largely User Fee based.

Mr. Blundi stated he feels it would be impossible to plan for every contingent and fund it, and he does not feel that is what the Board of Supervisors was looking for. He stated at this time the basketball courts at Memorial Park need to be replaced at a cost of \$220,000 and the cost for work that needs to be done at the inclusive playground is \$330,000. He stated he does not feel that the Board's idea was to charge User Fees that would cover that type of Capital improvement/maintenance. He stated he feels where we can increase Fees to the point that it will not negatively impact the amount of people who participate, it would make sense to increase fees. He stated we

would not want to raise Fees so much that there would not be people coming to participate. Mr. Blundi stated last year we did the tennis courts at Schuyler, and Ms. Tierney stated it cost \$500,000 to do that. Mr. Blundi stated he does not feel that the Board of Supervisors is asking that Park & Rec cover all of these things that come up, but they are looking at operating at a deficit Township-wide, and they are trying to be reasonable as to what is the right Budget to have.

Mr. Wysocki noted the amount under Special Events of \$70,000; and he asked if \$47,000 is coming from taxes and \$23,000 is from Fees, and Ms. Tierney agreed adding that is mostly Community Day which is our largest expense within Special Events. Mr. Wysocki asked if everything being shown in covered by taxes or by Fees, and Ms. Rock stated on this chart it seems to break even. Ms. Tierney stated this is just a snapshot, and it is not showing the entire Budget. She stated it is showing that our Programs that have User Fees are offsetting their costs, and primarily the expense to the taxpayers is operational.

Mr. Krauss stated there was discussion by the Board of Supervisors at the Budget meeting as to how we can help pay for some of these projects although he does not feel that they were indicating that we would be raising Fees so that it would cover a \$500,000 repaving of a tennis court. He stated the discussion was how much more could be obtained beyond break even, and we need to make sure that within each of our programs that the Fees are structured accordingly and that there be some margins to cover shortfalls where appropriate, and that we cannot operate in a deficit. Mr. Krauss stated while he understands that the Board of Supervisors does not want to increase millage, we may need to do so. Mr. Krauss stated other than the one year that the millage was increased and then went back down, he is not sure when was the last time the millage was raised. He stated costs have increased and not all of our Parks are Fee based so there are substantial amount of things that require revenue from taxes; and if the taxes do not increase, things that need to be replaced or fixed, do not get addressed.

Ms. Rock stated most of the things that are User Fee based are essentially paying for themselves through the User Fees. She asked if the User Fees were increased would the surplus go to future maintenance or would it go to offset operational costs that the tax money is currently going to.

Ms. Tierney stated what she is showing is with proposed increases. She stated there was a loss with the Leagues and the Dog Park last year. Mr. LaBar stated there was a \$2,500 loss at the Dog Park last year, but that does not encompass the fact that we may need to replace fencing in the future. Ms. Tierney stated we may also need to replace the scan system at some point. She stated we also need to replace a camera at this time. Mr. Krauss stated we should also consider paving the Dog Park parking lot.

Mr. LaBar stated he feels we should look at the Fees; and if we are not encompassing future expenses, the Fees should be raised not to make money but to be responsible. He stated there is still the issue that we have not done routine maintenance needed over the years, and the millage has not been increased. He stated he feels we need both components in order to get to where we need to be.

Mr. Wysocki asked if the Dog Park deficit was due to the fact that the Fees went up and we lost participants, and he asked if we were operating at break even before that. Ms. Tierney stated expenses have increased over time. Ms. Tierney stated League Fees have not been increased since she has been with the Township. Mr. Krauss stated four trees could fall at the Dog Park, and we would then have expenses associated with cleaning that up which was not anticipated. Mr. Krauss stated it could also be that membership did not increase as Budgeted, but we still need to cut the grass the same amount of time, replace the dog waste bags, etc. Mr. Krauss stated at the Pool we know we have potentially \$500,000 to \$700,000 in Capital expenditures, and he does not believe there is a way to assess those costs on the Pool members because it would be so expensive that no one would join. He stated this is putting the cost on to current Pool members to pay for past work that was never budgeted.

Mr. Wysocki stated with regard to the Dog Park, we do not know if the deficit was because we hit the tipping point with the Fee and the balance of maximizing the Township use of it against the Fee. He stated he does not know how we do that without trial and error. He stated the millage has not accounted for inflation over the years, and we just went through one of the biggest inflationary periods in the Country's history, and he cannot imagine that inflation did not effect salaries, etc.; and we have to deal with the inflationary forces as a Township.

Ms. Tierney stated the millage was 1.28 in 2016, increased to 2.08 in 2017, increased to 2.43 in 2018, increased to 2.67 in 2019, and then reduced in 2020 back to 2.43; and it has remained at 2.43 ever since.

Mr. Brody stated he thinks the idea of raising fees and having “extra bank” built into the other expenses of Park & Rec is important to do. He stated just because it has never been done in the past does not mean we should not tackle that in order to accomplish goals. He stated he feels the Board should first decide that there should be a millage increase. He stated he feels that there needs to be a millage increase since it has been stated repeatedly that for years the assets have not been maintained. He stated pickleball and possibly to some extent the Community Center are the main things that are not “kid-driven.” He stated if only Fees are raised, it will impact the families. He stated Play For All was approved, and it was indicated that we were underfunded. He stated based upon what was stated at the Board of Supervisors Budget meeting it seems that the focus is not to be through increases to the full community, but just to the user groups that pay. He stated he feels we need to support the millage increase needed to fully fund the programs as well as re-visit the Fees. He stated he would not be in support of there being no millage increase and only adjusting the Fees, and he does not feel that was the model that was just put in place getting CAPRA and Play For All.

Ms. Rock stated she agrees that it needs to be a combination.

Ms. Tierney stated if we take the Pool out and just look at Parks & Rec, we recoup 31%. Ms. Tierney stated Middletown recoups 28%, and Bucks County including their Pool is recouping 41%. Ms. Tierney stated with the Pool we recoup 53%. Mr. LaBar stated we are not putting in the \$500,000 filter that is needed, and Ms. Tierney stated she is speaking of the operational expenses. Mr. LaBar stated if we had included in the planning that every ten years we are going to have to replace a certain amount at the Pool, the 53% would be a lot less, and Ms. Tierney agreed.

Pool Fees Discussion and Motion

Mr. Krauss stated that Ms. Tierney had previously discussed a Flex-Pass Membership which would give residents the opportunity to bring in guests at any time. He stated we should also discuss the Discount Fees. He stated in 2023, we did not earn about \$92,000 due to the Discount, and in 2022 it was about \$78,000. He stated Ms. Tierney had suggested offering a straight 10% discount rather than a \$15 or \$20 discount. He stated he had previously discussed whether we should even offer a discount. He stated he feels the Pool is a good value and a good social place to go; and we need to think

about whether members will go somewhere else. He stated we could consider other ways to encourage people to sign up early, and he suggested that we offer a one-day pass. He stated the \$100,000 that we have been giving away because of those paying during the Discount period would then be coming back into the Budget and would continue for years moving forward. He stated he would also like the Board to consider some other ways to generate revenue. He stated. Ms. Tierney had discussed a membership discount for military, Veterans, Police, etc. Mr. Kraus stated an idea to generate money up front was to offer a \$100 ten-pass option that would be a 50% discount since the current guest fee is \$20. He stated that could be offered as an incentive up-front to sign up early. He stated Swim Lesson Fees could also be increased by 10%. He stated with regard to the Swim Team, last year they were being charged to cover the expected labor; and since it was noted that labor costs have gone up, he feels that increase should be reflected in the Swim Team charge. He asked that the Board consider some ways to close the gap in terms of the revenue.

Mr. Blundi stated he feels the Flex-Pass needs to be looked at more closely. He stated he does feel that we should offer a discount, but it could be that the 2023 price could be paid during the Discount Period as opposed to paying the increased fee for 2024. Mr. Blundi stated he is not in favor of ten passes for \$100 because he feels that might convert people who are paying for a membership into just buying the book of passes. He stated in 2022, we had 7,000 members, and 75,000 “people swiped,” so that is an average usage of ten times a year going to the Pool. He stated he feels a ten-pass deal might change a \$190 membership into a \$100 membership.

Ms. Rock stated she understood that you could only buy the ten passes if you were a member. Mr. Blundi stated if he and his wife were to join the Pool it would be \$190 for each of them; but if they are only going to go ten times, one of them could join the Pool and buy a book of ten passes and the other could go for \$100 as opposed to \$190.

Mr. Blundi stated he is also not in favor of removing the Caregiver Pass. He stated it does not cost that much, and he feels it is a value to people who have a caregiver; although he does not know what the numbers were in 2023 as to how many people bought a Caregiver Pass. Ms. Tierney stated she can provide that information. Mr. Blundi stated according to the “year in review” that was provided, it was a small number. Ms. Tierney agreed that it was a small number and many people opted to just get a membership as the caregivers were thinking that they were able to use the Pool outside of the time that they were watching the children, but the Caregiver Pass is limited to only

when you are with the children. Mr. Blundi asked if the issue was that the caregivers were trying to come in without the children; and Ms. Tierney agreed we had some trouble with that this past year, so people came in and upgraded their Caregiver Pass to a Membership Pass. Ms. Rock asked the cost of the Caregiver Pass, and Mr. Blundi stated it was \$145. Ms. Rock stated if they eliminated the Caregiver Pass and added the Flex-Pass, someone could buy the Flex-Pass, and the caregiver could use that. Ms. Tierney stated the caregiver could use that, but the children would not have memberships, and an Individual Pass could be purchased for the caregiver. Mr. Blundi stated an Individual Pass for a resident could be purchased for \$190 and it would be \$250 for a non-resident. Ms. Blundi stated for a \$50 increase, they could have unlimited access to the Pool. Mr. Blundi stated he would like to know how many Caregiver Passes we had. Ms. Tierney stated it was nominal, and a lot of them upgraded anyway.

Ms. Tierney showed a slide with a 12% increase which was felt to be a reasonable increase for the Pool. She stated we have many more amenities than other local pools including heated pools, slides, and high dives.

Mr. Brody stated the Board of Supervisors seemed interested in putting as much onto non-residents as possible. Ms. Tierney stated for DCNR funding for projects, the non-residents' charge cannot be more than double the resident fee. Mr. Krauss stated in this instances none of the non-resident fees would be double. He stated if we wanted to raise the fees 12% for residents and 18% to 20% for non-residents, we would have the ability to do that, and Ms. Tierney agreed.

Mr. Blundi stated with regard to the Pool he does not feel we would want to price the non-residents out of joining the Pool; but other areas such as the sports, our maintenance needs might not be as great if we had fewer non-residents participating. Mr. Brody stated for a huge League like YMS that would probably not have an impact; however, with the smaller sports that need more players, or even with the older age groups you get to a point where you need non-residents to join. Mr. Krauss stated unless the spread from resident to non-resident is going to be consistent across all categories, he would prefer that we just discuss the Pool fees at this time, and we will discuss User Fees later.

Mr. Wysocki asked if it is felt that the elimination of the Discount Period would make a difference in terms of membership numbers. Ms. Tierney stated eliminating the discount would make the fee increase much greater for those who previously took advantage of the discount. She stated possibly we could consider decreasing the 12%. Mr. Krauss stated he feels that the Pool has value, and people are not signing up because of the discount. He stated the money from eliminating the discount would come back into the Pool Budget. He stated we can look into other ways to incentivize people to sign up early . Ms. Rock stated she likes the idea of there not being a monetary discount because \$100,000 is a lot of money; and if there is an equal amount of money in giving a guest pass, that would be smart since people who do not normally bring a guest will bring a guest who may then decide they want to join the Pool.

Mr. Krauss stated one guest pass has a \$20 value. He stated the ten-pass option for \$100 could be only for the first 1,000 members, and that could be another motivator for people to sign up early.

Ms. Tierney stated she learned of a Pool where you get entered into a raffle to get an assigned parking spot in front of the Pool if you are an early registrant.

Mr. LaBar asked if the 12% increase in fees would get us to break even, and Ms. Tierney stated we would need a 30% increase in order to break even. Mr. LaBar asked if that is just for the operating expenses or would that include some of the maintenance that is going to be required such as the filter. Ms. Tierney stated painting of the Pool, which will be about \$140,000 was included, but other Capital improvements such as the filters were not incorporated into the Fee structure.

Mr. LaBar stated he feels there needs to be a combination of increased Fees and increased millage. He asked if we are able put in a certain percentage going forward that would encompass Capital projects that need to be done in order to catch up with maintenance needed. He stated there could be a certain amount of fee increases across the board, but we should advise the Supervisors that there also needs to be an increase to the millage so that we can get what we need done now and to be able to invest for the future. Mr. LaBar stated additional pickleball courts were built at Memorial Park in addition to the existing pickleball courts; and what we are doing now is charging User Fees to pay for balls and some other things, but it does not include that at some point in the future re-paving will be needed and we are not saving money for those future expenses. Ms. Tierney stated we are not saving any money for

future expenses; however, pickleball is also open to the public at times. Mr. LaBar stated that is why he is saying that there needs to be an increase in the User Fees as well as an increase to the millage as that relates to the facilities being open to the public. He stated at this point neither the amount of the User Fees or the millage being captured are sufficient in order to provide for the future, and that is why we are running at a deficit. He asked if there is an accounting principle that we could use that would indicate what would be needed going forward. Ms. Tierney stated she feels that there probably is an accounting principle for a standard operation, and she could look into that.

Mr. Krauss stated expenses and membership can vary year to year, and we have to prove the numbers year to year to the Board of Supervisors. He stated he feels the Township needs to make a determination as to how much of the cost of Capital projects will come from General Funds. He asked if there is a \$500,000 project at the Pool one year, are we going to tell the membership that the next year they are going to have a 15% assessment to cover that expense; adding he feels if that is done, the membership will decrease, and we will have no Pool. He stated the Pool is membership driven, and there is no public using it so every expenditure there is membership driven which is what we are trying to solve. He stated if there is \$140,000 needed for painting and \$500,000 is needed for a filter, that would be a very big assessment; and he feels we would be assessing the members to a point where they will not join because the Fees will become a barrier to participation. Mr. LaBar stated he feels that there should be a norm across the board such as 5% that would be like a savings account. He stated at this point we are not capturing anything, and in the future there could be a huge expenditure and we will have to increase Fees in 15%. Mr. Krauss stated he understands that Mr. LaBar is looking for an additional tax over and above the operating expenses.

Ms. Rock asked if instead of an assessment could there “be something fun like a summer-long 50/50 that people participate in,” and the money raised from the 50/50 would go toward that expense. Mr. LaBar stated you could not do that without having a certain kind of License. Ms. Tierney stated we could have fundraising effort for something specific. She stated Kids Kingdom is going to need to be replaced with a modern playground which will probably cost \$1.5 million to \$2 million for a playground of that size; and that may be a place where there could be a Capital campaign, and we could hire someone to do the Capital campaign. She noted Lion’s Pride Park which was a community-driven effort. She stated the Lion’s Club put on the Capital campaign.

Mr. Wysocki stated we did something similar to the with the Dog Park, and the Dog Park Committee raised money to help get that started; and Mr. Kraus agreed. Mr. Blundi stated he does not believe a lot of money was raised in that way.

Mr. Blundi stated with regard to the Pool Fees, he feels it would be helpful to know what the Membership was last year compared to 2022, and what was the revenue generated from each of the categories. He stated he believes a lot of people turned 62 years old, and a lot of the \$190 memberships turned into \$90 memberships because they became a Senior in 2023. He stated he does not know what that impact will be in 2024. Ms. Tierney stated that will continue to happen the same as children fourteen and older are charged as adults. Mr. Blundi asked what was 2022 versus 2023 change was, and Ms. Tierney stated she could provide the year-to-year. Mr. Krauss stated there were also residual COVID impacts. He added that the Fees are based on Ms. Tierney's projection of the membership. He stated each year there will be shifts between each category. He stated if we feel a 12% increase is the maximum that we can go, we need to recommend that to the Board of Supervisors. He stated if it is felt that there is more room in the rate increase from a non-resident perspective, then the Park Board could make that recommendation. He stated we should also consider eliminating the Discount Period and think of other ways to incentivize early sign up, and we can include that in the recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Brody moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that for the Pool we get rid of the early discount and that we offer one guest pass to each family. There should be a 12% increase over two years with 6% this year and 6% next year.

Ms. Tierney stated we cannot set next year's fees now. She asked if we offer one guest pass would it be one guest pass per member. Mr. Krauss stated if an individual were to sign up, they would get one; and if a family were to sign up, they would get one. Ms. Rock stated she feels that since the discount would have been per person, she feels if a family signs up, the guest pass should also be per person. Ms. Rock stated the pass may not get redeemed. Mr. Brody stated a paper pass should be given out.

Mr. Krauss asked if Mr. Brody is proposing that it would be a straight 6% increase for everyone including the non-residents. Mr. Brody stated he would be in favor of double for non-residents. Mr. Krauss asked if he is recommending a 12% increase for non-residents or just whatever the dollar amount is, and Mr. Brody stated it would be the dollar amount.

Mr. Brody asked if non-residents were allowed to sign up early and get the discount, and Ms. Tierney stated for the last two years non-residents could sign up early and get the discount. Mr. Wysocki asked how many of the Pool members are non-residents, and Mr. Blundi stated it is a third; and Ms. Tierney agreed.

Mr. Brody stated he would be in favor of 6% and the pass across the board.

Mr. Krauss stated the Motion is to remove the discount period, offer one free guest pass per person and a 6% increase in fees for both residents and non-residents.

Ms. Rock stated there were other issues to consider with regard to the Pool fees. Mr. Brody asked if anyone has an objection to the military discount of 10%. Mr. Blundi asked if it would just be a military discount and not Police or Fire. Ms. Blundi stated Fire already gets free passes. Mr. Blundi stated this would just be for the military and their families, and Ms. Tierney agreed. Mr. LaBar stated while he feels this is a good idea, he asked how this would be structured. Ms. Tierney stated to get the military discount it would be for military living in the same household, and they would have to provide identification. Ms. Tierney stated she was a military family and generally when you give a military discount, it goes to the family since the family serves as much as the soldier. Mr. Blundi asked Ms. Tierney if she can logistically apply that to the people who join, and Ms. Tierney stated within the family members, they can provide a 10% discount although it would have to be done manually and in person. Mr. Wysocki asked if the suggestion is for 10% because we are taking the discount away since originally there was discussion of a 12% increase in fees. Mr. Brody stated he was thinking about the guest pass, and he asked if we value the guest pass at \$15. Mr. Wysocki asked what was driving the increase in fees to be 6% rather than 12%. Mr. Brody stated he was thinking about the discount going away; but in reality, we are giving the same value in the guest pass, although he does not view a guest pass as a full value. Ms. Rock agreed.

Mr. Brody moved and Mr. Blundi seconded a Pool Fee structure as follows: Flex-Pass Membership in the amount of \$500 for residents and \$550 for non-residents. Discount window changes from current discount plan to one guest pass per member for the first 1,000 members with number to be updated by Ms. Tierney based on the number of people who signed up last year. Military discount for families with valid identification to be 10%. Remove the Caregiver Pass. Fee increase to be 6% for both resident and non-resident members.

Mr. Wysocki asked what is the total impact of the proposal since he does not see how we can vote on this if we do not know what the impact will be.

Ms. Tierney stated the impact of 12% was \$100,000 so she believes the impact of 6% would be \$50,000 plus the \$100,000 being regained with not having the discount period. Mr. Krauss stated the net change would be an increase of \$150,000. Mr. Wysocki stated that is assuming that there is no change in membership as a result of this, and Ms. Tierney agreed. Ms. Rock stated it would also involve whatever value is being assigned to the guest passes being given in lieu of the discount. Mr. Krauss stated there might be a decrease in the purchase of guest passes. He asked how many guest passes were sold last year, and Mr. Blundi stated it was 2,000. Ms. Rock stated there could be a subsequent increase in memberships by people who used the guest pass and enjoyed the facilities. Mr. Brody stated he knows that Ms. Tierney likes to get the initial number of sign-ups, and he asked if the guest passes being given could be reduced to the first 500 signing up who would get the guest pass. Mr. Wysocki stated he feels that Ms. Tierney should pick the number that leaves her and her staff with a manageable amount to deal with by Memorial Day. He stated one of the benefits to the staff was having the Discount Period so that they did not have to deal with a rush. Ms. Rock stated she feels the key with the guest pass for the Discount Period would be to identify it differently from a purchased guest pass so you know how many are being redeemed.

Mr. Krauss stated there is the potential of \$140,000 in increased revenue with the 6% increase assuming the membership numbers that have been projected remain the same and we remove the discount less any discounts from the guest pass.

Mr. Wysocki stated he would like to discuss some of the other alternatives to a guest pass that could have an even smaller cost impact. He stated Ms. Tierney had indicated that at other pools there were options for preferred parking, and that would involve no cost. Ms. Tierney stated that was entering a raffle for preferred parking, and that could be done as well to encourage early sign-up. Mr. Wysocki asked why that could not be done instead of the guest pass, and Ms. Tierney stated there would only be only a few people who would be impacted depending on the number of spots that would be offered.

Mr. Krauss stated someone would have to be there to monitor the parking so that the preferred parking is not taken by someone else. Mr. Wysocki asked about charging for parking. Ms. Tierney stated that would have a

staffing cost associated with it, and she is not sure it would help with the revenue. Mr. Krauss asked if there are other things people need at the pool that we could rent out. Ms. Tierney stated the staff has discussed opening a merchandise store since we do get asked if we have t-shirts, hats, or towels; but that never came to fruition.

Mr. Krauss asked about the possibility of early-bird access like there is at Disney, but Ms. Tierney stated we do not have room to offer that. Mr. Krauss asked about extended-hours opportunities, and Ms. Tierney stated we would have to extend to 10:00 p.m. or 4:00 a.m.

Mr. Blundi stated he does not know that a guest pass is enough to provide an incentive to sign up early. Ms. Rock stated a family of four would get four guest passes, and they could then have grandparents or others come. Mr. Blundi asked if the Motion was one guest pass per person, and all agreed. Mr. Blundi stated a guest pass is \$20, so a family of four would save \$80. Ms. Rock stated that is assuming that all of the guest passes would be redeemed, and she does not feel that they will, although it has a perceived value. Mr. Brody stated when you have a give-away, it is a non-cash value. Mr. Blundi agreed that it would result in no more cost for us. Mr. Brody stated he is trying to meet in the middle bringing in some additional fees.

Ms. Tierney stated she received a text about the possibility of paying for preferred seating or chairs. Mr. Blundi asked if there could be a reserved section. Ms. Tierney stated it would potentially be more work. Mr. Brody stated while he would probably pay for preferred seating, it would probably break up the community nature of the Pool. Mr. Krauss stated he feels we could test it next year. Mr. Blundi asked who would tell someone if someone was in a chair that you paid for. Ms. Tierney stated the staff would have to do it. Mr. Blundi asked how anyone would know it was someone else's chair. Ms. Tierney stated those are logistics they would have to work out.

Mr. LaBar stated with regard to the 6% included in the Motion, he does not feel it gets us to where we need to be with the maintenance costs. He stated we know that we have a \$500,000 project coming in the future; and while he understands that we are eliminating the discount period, the 12% was just to have us break even, and we are not focusing on what will keep the Pool afloat for the coming years. He stated he would propose 10% as well as getting rid of the discount so that we have additional funds to pay for the painting. He stated at some point we need to make a determination as a community about the Pool which is a large expenditure; and there needs

to be a commitment by the Supervisors and the community that this is something that will be paid for given the huge expenditures coming in the future. He stated he does not feel a 6% increase or dropping the discount period will do that.

Ms. Laurie Grey asked if the Motion as proposed will get us to break even, and Ms. Tierney stated it will not, adding that even 10% would not get us to break even, because we have some “make-ups to do also.” Ms. Grey asked if we know what deficit we are running at for the Pool, what it would take to get us to break even, and what it would take to get us to start a Capital Improvement Fund which we need to do on every project. She stated we have been “kicking the can down the road” for a number of years.

Ms. Tierney stated we would probably need to increase the fees by 30% which would be a very high fee, and the loss of membership could be too great.

Ms. Tierney stated there needs to be a balance. Ms. Grey stated that needs to be analyzed. She stated she listened to the Board of Supervisors Budget meeting; and she is concerned that Park & Rec will go back to the Board with this Motion, and she questions if this is something the Board of Supervisors will buy into. She stated she feels they need to consider what it takes to get to break even and where they will go to get the Capital Improvement Fund.

Ms. Tierney stated many Municipalities do not use memberships to cover Capital improvements for pools, and the Municipality would cover that in another way such as Waste Management fees, etc. She stated for us it would be “a brush over from the Park & Rec Fund.” She stated while that is not how we have operated historically, we are at a place now that the Township needs to make a decision as to how they want to proceed.

She stated the Pool is very old and the infrastructure is aging so there will be a lot of replacements coming up in the near future. She stated we need to consider how to move forward with that.

Ms. Grey stated we know that with the Motion that is on the table that we will still run into a deficit and there is no money set aside for Capital improvement, and Ms. Tierney agreed.

Mr. Wysocki asked if we are going to entertain any other proposals, or just vote on this Motion. Ms. Tierney stated there could be an amendment to the Motion. Mr. Brody stated he understands that Mr. LaBar feels that the increase should be higher, and he would be willing to go to 9% or even higher. Mr. Blundi stated he would like to look at the Senior membership. He stated it is \$73 which he feels is a bargain without the discount, and he feels that could be \$100 although he does not know what the impact would

be. He stated there are about 1,500 people in that category, and he does not feel we would lose any of the Seniors by going to \$100. Mr. Krauss stated that would be 40% more than what is shown. Mr. Blundi stated there are 90 days in the summer so it would be about \$1 a day to go to the Pool.

Ms. Rock asked if it would make sense to have a Senior and child rate be the same price, and Mr. Blundi stated he would not be opposed to that. He stated currently it is proposed to be \$73 per child aged one to five and \$73 for a Senior. He stated if someone were to have three children under age five that would have more of an impact. Ms. Rock asked if the Seniors could move up to the same price level as children aged six to thirteen, and Mr. Blundi agreed that those aged six to thirteen and the Seniors could be the same price.

Mr. Wysocki stated he feels that those aged one to five could be included in that as well since he feels that younger children probably take a heavier toll on the Pool; however, Mr. Blundi disagreed. Mr. Blundi stated he does not feel we would lose anyone if that change were made. Ms. Rock stated she feels that would be logical, and Seniors would still be getting a discount although it is in a different category than the current one. Mr. Krauss stated that the Senior rate would still be 50% less than the regular adult rate.

Mr. Brody asked Mr. Blundi if he would also be in favor of a 12% increase across the board and also put the Seniors into the group with the higher rate. Mr. Krauss asked the number of Seniors, and Mr. Blundi stated the report from 2022 shows through June 30, 2023 there were 1,500 Seniors; and Ms. Tierney stated there may have been a few more by August. Ms. Rock stated that increase would bring in \$45,000. Mr. Krauss stated adding that to the \$140,000 gets us closer to about \$200,000.

Mr. Wysocki asked if the Board of Supervisors would entertain the idea of selling the Pool to a private party. Mr. Brody stated the Board of Supervisors talked about exploring having a management company come in and take over management of the Pool. Mr. Wysocki stated he was thinking of how the Board handled the Sewers by selling it to a private entity. Mr. Blundi stated he felt that their idea was to handle it more like they do the Golf Course where an outside company would manage it and get paid.

Mr. Wysocki asked if we have looked into that, and Ms. Tierney stated she did look into it after the meeting. She stated Warwick Township did get a management company and the primary reason was that they were not equipped with someone with Pool experience on staff. She stated there were benefits in that

that the Township would not have to do HR and some liability was reduced for the Township, but there were also some negatives in that the Township was paying a management company per employee and the management company would take some of the money off of what the Township was allocating per employee as part of their pay. She stated the employees were being paid less, and they were also expected to work at other facilities managed by the same company, and they would not just be allocated to our Township. Ms. Tierney stated our Pool is one of the few that was fully staffed this year.

Mr. LaBar stated he does not see that helping us with our maintenance issues, and Ms. Tierney agreed a management company would not be taking that on.

Mr. Krauss stated the rate as shown on the slide is that those aged one to five and Seniors would pay \$73, and the proposal is for Seniors to move to the aged six to thirteen category. Mr. Brody asked if the rate for those aged one to five stay would stay where it is, and Mr. Blundi agreed. Mr. Wysocki stated he would be in favor of that. Mr. Blundi stated he does not like figures 101 and 73, and he would prefer 100, 75, etc. Mr. Krauss stated they could round to the nearest 5 or zero. Mr. Brody asked if we would still be contemplating a fee increase for everyone else, and Mr. Krauss stated right now as shown on the slide it is for a Fee increase for everyone of 12%, but 6% is what is proposed in the Motion.

Ms. Tierney stated she could round the numbers as discussed if the Board wants to include that in the Motion. Ms. Rock stated 6% plus rounding would equate to a higher amount. Mr. Brody stated he would be in favor of a 6% increase rounding up the nearest 5 or zero.

Mr. Brody moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors moving under 1 to 5 and Seniors to mirror child 6 to 13 and that there be an 9% increase rounded up to the nearest 5 or zero.

Mr. Blundi stated a 1 to 5 year old Resident as shown on the slide was \$65, and a 9% increase would be \$75.85; however, Ms. Tierney stated that would be adding to the 12% shown. Mr. Brody stated that he is proposing that the 1 to 5 price point is going away. Ms. Rock stated it was her understanding that they were still having the 1 to 5 category, but that the Seniors were moving to the 6 to 13 category; and Mr. Brody agreed. Mr. Blundi stated last year a Senior was \$65; and if we add 9%, it goes to \$70.85. Ms. Rock stated in that case, she feels we would round down to \$70. Mr. Brody stated

he would suggest rounding that up to \$75. Ms. Rock stated that is more than a 12% increase. Mr. Blundi stated a child was \$90, and if you add 9% it would be \$98.1 so that should go to \$100. Mr. Blundi stated adults were \$190, and Mr. Krauss stated that would be \$207 so we would do either \$200 or \$210. Mr. Blundi stated it was \$110 for the third adult in the family, and Mr. Krauss stated that would go to \$120.

Mr. Krauss stated the proposal would then be that 1 to 5 would be \$70, child and Seniors \$100, adults \$210 with additional adults in the family being \$120. Mr. Wysocki stated the result would be lower than the numbers shown on the slide being shown, and Mr. Krauss stated that is because we did 9% instead of 12%. Mr. Wysocki stated we were not covering the deficit with the 12% increase, and with what we are now proposing we are making it worse. Ms. Rock stated we added \$45 for the Seniors, and Mr. Brody stated this will add a bigger increase to a large group of users that we think are being undercharged. He stated also instead of giving a cash discount, we are giving a guest pass. Mr. Brody stated he would be in favor of guest passes being given to adult members only and not to a Senior, child, or toddler.

Mr. Wysocki was in favor of that. Ms. Rock stated she would agree since they are already getting a discount. Mr. Brody stated he would be in favor of giving one guest pass to only the full-paying adults other than the military who would also get a guest pass. Ms. Tierney suggested that we call it a Discount rate for 1 to 5, child 6-13, and Seniors so that the appearance is that they are getting a discount.

Mr. Blundi asked about the non-resident rates, and Mr. Krauss stated it would be a 9% increase rounded up.

Mr. Brody moved and Mr. Blundi seconded to amend the Motion to eliminate the discount period, fully-paying adults will receive a guest pass for signing up by a date determined by Ms. Tierney, the Senior Discount will be combined with the Child 6 to 13 Discount, and that there be a 9% increase across the board with a military discount.

Mr. Blundi stated with regard to the Flex-Pass membership for non-residents, a non-resident is \$280 right now at full price and three memberships would be \$840, and the Flex-Pass would be \$600. Ms. Tierney stated the Flex-Pass would allow them to bring in their children who are in another household or a Mom who is watching a child all summer, and the Flex-Pass offers

flexibility which does not exist now. Mr. Blundi asked how many non-resident families have three or more people since they could be trading down to the Flex-Pass. He stated non-residents are a third of the Pool membership.

Mr. Brody asked if the Flex-Pass should be offered to residents only, and Mr. Blundi he would be in favor of that. Mr. Brody stated he believes that there are some people who will take advantage of the Flex-Pass, but not that many. Mr. Blundi asked if it would be appropriate to leave it out at this time and consider it at a later date. Ms. Tierney stated that could be done but it would not be part of the Fee packet, although it could be added in at a later date. Mr. Krauss stated we could call it a pilot program and add it at a later date, and Mr. Blundi was in favor of that.

Mr. Wysocki asked if we know what the total dollar impact will be, and Mr. Brody stated he believes it would be around \$200,000 to \$250,000. Mr. Krauss stated from the Seniors it was about \$40,000, from the Discount it was about \$92,000, and going from 12% to 6% it would be about another \$25,000 for a total of about \$200,000. Mr. Wysocki asked if that is versus last year or versus the proposal shown on the slide, and Mr. Krauss stated it is versus last year. Mr. Brody stated we are getting back \$100,000 in cash minus whatever the guest passes being given away are valued at.

Mr. Brody stated while he understands that we are only allowed to budget for the year, which is what he is proposing, he believes this is a transformative phase, and we cannot solve all of the thirty-year Township issues in one Budget.

Mr. Krauss stated the Motion would need to be amended to take out the Flex-Pass option.

Mr. Brody moved and Mr. Blundi seconded to amend the Motion to take out the Flex-Pass option.

Mr. Krauss stated for the 2024 Pool Fees the recommendation to the Board of Supervisors is to eliminate the Discount cash period and instead offer one guest pass per full-paying adult. There should be a 9% fee increase across the board. All Fees will be rounded up to the closest \$0 or \$5 mark. The Senior category will move to the Child segment and will be called a Senior Discount and under 1 to 5 Discount as a regular price. There will be a Military Discount of 10% for the military person and their family in the same household. The Caregiver option will be removed in 2024. There will be no Flex-Pass.

Motion carried with Mr. Wysocki opposed.

Mr. Blundi asked Mr. Wysocki what he would change, and Mr. Wysocki stated to make this either a break-even or profitable, he would like to understand what the differentiations are that could get us there; and he does not feel we have done that, and he is not in favor of just this singular proposal.

League/Athletic User Fees

Mr. Krauss stated in 2023 the expected shortfall is about \$45,000. He stated currently the Fee is \$15 for residents and \$36 for non-residents. Mr. Krauss asked when the Fee was last changed as he believes it was a considerable amount of time. He stated what is being proposed is \$25 for residents and \$50 for non-residents. Mr. Krauss stated the DCNR requirement is that the non-resident fee cannot exceed double the resident fee for Grant-related property projects, and he assumes that applies in this case; and Ms. Tierney agreed.

Mr. Krauss stated he believes that most of the Leagues are 80% residents and 20% non-residents on average; and Ms. Tierney stated it varies from League to League, but that would be the average. Mr. Krauss stated when we charge the Leagues for residents and non-residents he believes that most of the Leagues do not charge different rates for residents versus non-residents, and they use a blended charge when they charge their customers. Mr. Krauss stated when the Leagues submit the rosters it has to be determined who is a resident and who is a non-resident so that the proper amount can be billed. Mr. Krauss asked the Board if they feel that there should be just one blended fee to the Leagues and Ms. Tierney would then bill based on total number of participants and not have to do the extra work on the back-end to determine how many are residents and how many are non-residents. Mr. Krauss stated there is a policy as to what the split should be as to residents and non-residents so that if there is a concern that not having a higher fee for non-residents may encourage the Leagues to bring in more non-residents, there is a policy in place as to the protocols in terms of residents and non-residents. Mr. Krauss stated he does not believe the fee has been changed for at least ten plus years.

Mr. Blundi stated anecdotally he heard that Richboro charges their non-residents \$60, and he feels \$50 may be too low. He stated he does not know what other Townships charge. He stated YMS has a fall season with a Rec Program with

about 900 participants, and a spring program of about 900 participants. He asked if we capture 1,800 User Fees, and Mr. Krauss stated it is 900 for spring and 900 for fall. He stated if a League has two seasons, they pay two separate fees.

Ms. Tierney stated it is very different from Township to Township. She stated some Townships charge resident/non-resident/non-resident in School District, and some Townships do not charge their Leagues at all. Mr. Krauss asked if the fee Mr. Blundi noted being charged by Richboro was that for a specific activity; and Mr. Blundi stated he had talked to the Council Rock Soccer League, and they indicated they charged their non-residents \$60 and that was five to seven years ago. Mr. Blundi asked if we were to do \$25 and \$50 would that make up the gap, and Ms. Tierney stated it would. Mr. Blundi asked Ms. Tierney in terms of a blended fee do the Leagues advise her who are the residents and non-residents or does she get a roster and have to go through it. Ms. Tierney stated we get a roster and go line by line and check the Board of Assessment for ones that they are unsure of. She stated while the Leagues do identify residents and non-residents, we still check. Mr. Blundi asked if Yardley Borough residents are charged the resident or non-resident fee and Ms. Tierney stated they are considered non-residents.

Mr. Wysocki asked if any of the League Liaisons are still present at the meeting, and it was noted that Mr. Schlieben, representing YMS, was still present. Mr. Wysocki asked Mr. Schlieben what portion of the cost to the average player do these fees represent. Mr. Blundi stated he believes that a recreation player pays \$125 or \$150; however, Ms. Tierney stated it is not that amount anymore. Mr. Wysocki stated we could ask the League reps what they feel they would be reasonable to absorb. He added that the Board of Supervisors is looking to close the gap and create a little buffer.

Mr. Brody stated he does not like the idea of a flat fee. He stated the Leagues will be charging their members so it will be a bigger tax on the residents. Mr. Wysocki stated the League is doing a blended rate and the rate is the same for a resident and a non-resident. Mr. Brody stated he understands that is what the Leagues are doing. He stated if PAA is 70% residents, they will be paying a certain amount and if YMS is 80% residents, then proportionately their residents are going to pay the same amount. He stated he does not feel it should be changed to a flat rate.

Mr. Brody asked if we are going to have a Motion to increase the Park & Rec millage. Mr. Krauss stated he wanted to get through the individual fees first to try to close the operational gap and put some money away, but there is

also an opportunity to recommend an increase to the millage. Mr. LaBar stated he would be in favor of a Motion recommending an increase to the millage since that will go toward maintenance moving forward. Mr. Krauss stated while the Board should consider that, he would like to continue with the League/Athletic Fees at this time. He stated there is a gap of about \$40,000, and the Fees Ms. Tierney has proposed would get us to that point. He stated the Board may also want to consider if they want to go a little higher. He asked if the Board also wants to consider simplifying it and have a blended rate which would relieve the burden from Ms. Tierney having to go through the registrations to see if they are accurate or not. Mr. Brody asked Ms. Tierney if she is looking for a blended rate of \$5,000 per League or a blended rate of \$36 per person in the League. Ms. Tierney stated the blended rate was Mr. Krauss' idea, and Mr. Krauss stated it would be a blended fee per person. Mr. Wysocki asked how much time it would save Park & Rec staff if we went with a blended rate versus the resident/non-resident. Ms. Tierney stated the blended fee would save the staff time, but she feels it would be interesting for the residents to know the statistics on the Leagues anyway so they would still have to look into those statistics and would be doing that work anyway. Mr. Krauss stated his point was "that the revenue that comes in to Ms. Tierney would not have to wait for her to do all of that work, although she would still be doing a back-end at some point of a recap of residents versus non-residents." He stated for billing purposes and getting the revenue paid, that work would not need to be done, and it would just be a total number.

Mr. LaBar asked if the increase to \$25 and \$50 would get us above \$160,000; and Ms. Tierney stated it would if the Leagues continue to grow. She stated where they are now, it would get us to the \$160,000. Mr. Krauss asked if we could go to \$30 and \$60 which would provide a little bit of a cushion to cover unexpected costs. Mr. Blundi stated he would be in favor of \$30 and \$60, adding that the fees have not increased in at least ten years. He stated the Leagues are up in their Registrations, and he feels \$30 and \$60 is fair.

Mr. Wysocki stated we recommended an increase in the assessment to pickleball players. Mr. Kraus stated the new rate went from \$27.50 to \$120. Mr. Blundi noted that was for the year. Mr. Wysocki asked how much of the \$120 was a User Fee, and Ms. Tierney stated all of it was. She stated it incorporates staffing. She added the League Fees will also incorporate \$125,000 in staff-related expenses.

Mr. LaBar moved and Mr. Blundi seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to increase the League Fees to \$30 for residents and \$60 for non-residents.

Mr. Schlieben, YMS President, asked if they have considered Pennsbury School District versus non-Pennsbury School District since it seems that a lot of the players are going to school with children they want to play in the League with. Ms. Tierney stated there are Pennsbury non-resident players and other non-residents. Mr. Krauss asked what would happen if you live in Lower Makefield but go to Holy Ghost would you pay resident or non-resident Fees, and Mr. Schlieben stated you would be considered a resident. He added that he is suggesting a third layer for those who are not Township residents, but are in the Pennsbury School District. Mr. Krauss stated that would have to be done for the other sports as well and not just for soccer, and Mr. Schlieben agreed. Mr. Schlieben stated there are not enough girls playing sports, and as they get older they drop out. He stated if you want to have teams for your residents in some of these age groups, you are going to need non-residents, and most of them are in the Pennsbury School District. Mr. Krauss asked how many of the non-residents would be impacted.

Mr. LaBar stated he feels that is a good idea, and he would amend his Motion that the Fee be \$30 for residents, \$50 for Pennsbury residents, and \$60 for non-residents. Mr. Blundi did not agree to the amendment.

Mr. Wysocki stated he understands that what Mr. Schlieben was asking for was a fee for residents, a higher fee for non-residents and something more favorable for non-residents who live in the Pennsbury School District; and Mr. Schlieben agreed. Ms. Rock stated if the Leagues are not putting on these fees to their members how would it discourage Pennsbury students who are non-residents from joining if it is not costing them more. Mr. Blundi stated it is not a discouragement. He added that the fee has not increased in at least ten years, and he feels \$30 and \$60 is commensurate with other Municipalities in the surrounding area. He stated he does not see adding that third layer is reasonable. He stated he does not feel this increase will deter a player from participating in sports.

Mr. Krauss stated the reason he does not think we need to add another layer is because the Leagues do not promote any discounts based on resident/non-resident/Pennsbury School District. He stated if people are interested in

participating they are not signing up because there is a discount being offered by the League based on where you go to school or whether you are a resident or a non-resident. He stated he agrees with Mr. Blundi that this is not necessary unless we require that Leagues pass that discount on to their participants. He stated they do not do that today, and we do not know if they will do that in the future.

Mr. Wysocki stated he feels that there is room to increase fees; however, there are comments being made that we have not changed he fees in more than ten years, and he does not know if that is true or not. He asked Ms. Tierney if that is true. Ms. Tierney stated in 2013 the Resident Fee was \$13, but she does not know what the non-Resident Fee was. She stated after that, she was not able to find any records. She stated as long as she has been with the Township it has not changed.

Mr. Blundi stated we are non-compliant now as to DCNR Grants. He stated the non-Resident Fee cannot be more than double the Resident Fee, and Ms. Tierney agreed that we are currently non-compliant.

Mr. Blundi asked Mr. Wysocki if he feels that \$30 and \$60 are enough, and Mr. Wysocki stated he likes the fact that the \$30 and \$60 seems to more than cover the anticipated gap, and it starts the process of creating Capital funds. He stated he does not know that it would be appropriate to go much higher since that was a highly-contested topic in the past. He stated directionally what is proposed seems to be in the zone.

Motion carried unanimously.

Summer Camp Fees

Ms. Tierney stated the Park & Recreation Board recommended approval of a 12% increase across the board, but the Board of Supervisors felt we could increase that a little bit more. Ms. Tierney stated she was looking at private camps versus Municipal camps, and we are about \$200 more for an eight-week session than an eight-week Municipal camp; but we are about \$5,000 less than an eight-week private camp. Ms. Tierney stated she feels our Camp has a high value and there might be room for an increase. She stated what had been proposed was for a break-even operation. She stated the Board of Supervisors had indicated that there was increased usage of the Community Center and our other facilities and amenities should be considered as it relates to an increase in fees.

Ms. Tierney showed the slides related to the rates. Mr. Wysocki stated if they were to round everything up to the nearest \$10 increment that would give coverage plus a start to a buffer. Ms. Rock suggested going up to the nearest \$25 or \$50.

Mr. Blundi stated he understands that Ms. Tierney indicated that we were about \$5,000 less expensive than private camps, and Ms. Tierney stated it is about \$4,000 to \$5,000. Mr. Brody stated that would be a full-on day camp with climbing walls, lakes, sports, indoor gym facility, arcade, and a number of trips. He stated there is also swimming twice a day including instructional swim and free swim.

Mr. Krauss stated he feels if everything is rounded up, it would result in another approximately 2 ½% increase on top of the 12% originally proposed. Mr. Blundi agreed. Mr. Wysocki stated he would suggest rounding it up to the nearest \$100. Ms. Rock stated she does not feel that the proposed rate of \$1,511 should go to \$1,600. Mr. Wysocki suggested that the fees then be rounded up to \$50 and \$100.

Mr. LaBar asked if there is a reason we would want to keep the Discount Period, and Ms. Tierney stated Camp always fills up before the end of the Discount Period. Mr. LaBar recommended removing the Discount Period, do the flat rate, and round up. Ms. Rock stated she does not feel there is a need for the Discount Period since she believes that the people who are signing up at that time are not doing it for the discount, rather they are signing up so that they know that they will be able to get their child in.

Mr. Krauss stated there are limited spots; and if they do not register on day one, they may not get in.

Mr. LaBar moved and Ms. Rock seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors eliminating the Discount Period, keeping the 12% that was previously recommended but round up to the dollar amount above. He stated \$1,586 would equate to \$1,600 etc.

Mr. Blundi asked that we recommend the exact numbers in the Motion. Mr. LaBar stated eight-weeks would be \$1,600, six-weeks would be \$1,250, and four-weeks would be \$900 for residents. For non-residents, it would be \$1,800 for eight weeks, \$1,400 for six weeks, and \$1,000 for four weeks. Mr. Wysocki stated the eight weeks for non-residents would be \$1,750, and Mr. LaBar agreed.

Motion carried unanimously.

Tween Camp

Ms. Tierney asked if the Board wants to go through this separately, and Mr. LaBar stated it would be the same thing of eliminating the Discount Period and rounding up. Mr. Krauss asked if there was a discount, and Ms. Tierney stated there was a discount for a non-resident Pool member, but that was recommended to be eliminated.

Mr. Blundi asked if the Tween Camp is hard to fill, and Mr. Krauss stated it does not fill up like the camp for the younger campers. Mr. Blundi stated it is a much small number, and Ms. Tierney agreed it is about twenty campers. Mr. Blundi stated he would recommend that the fees stay as proposed but to round up the numbers. Mr. Wysocki suggested rounding them up to \$10 rather than \$50.

Mr. Wysocki moved, Mr. LaBar seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the fees for the Tween Camp be rounded up to the nearest \$10.

Community Center

Ms. Tierney stated as she showed previously we cover 60% of the User Fees through Senior User Fees, rentals, and programming. She stated currently there are is an opportunity to increase the Senior User and Rental Fees. She stated she has a separate slide on Programming. Mr. Krauss asked which is the largest User group using the Community Center, and Ms. Tierney stated it is the Seniors. Mr. Krauss stated their Fee has not changed since they started using the Community Center, and Ms. Tierney stated their Contract is also up. She stated the Fee that they pay now is \$15 per resident and \$20 for non-resident. She stated that brings in about \$7,000 in User Fees. Mr. Krauss suggested going to \$20 per resident and \$40 for non-residents, and he asked how much that would recoup. Mr. Blundi stated there are about 450 Seniors. Ms. Tierney stated she believes it is primarily residents. Mr. LaBar asked what the amount they are paying is currently covering, and Ms. Tierney stated at this point we are covering 60% of our operational costs. She stated we also do a lot of free activities at the Community Center for the community as well. She stated the EAC and the Historic Commission use it for presentations, the Police Department

uses it to discuss safety and security with the community, Township staff training takes place at the Community Center, and there are free community events offered. She stated all program sign-ups take place in the Community Center and it is a shelter during extreme events.

Mr. LaBar asked if the \$15 per resident even covers the electric bills for the time that the Seniors are in the Community Center. Ms. Tierney stated the Seniors are subsidized by the Township.

Mr. Wysocki asked the total costs for the Community Center. Ms. Tierney stated it is \$50,000 in operational costs, and the tax is \$20,000. She stated the \$50,000 does not cover anything “big that might happen,” and it is just the daily, regular operations. Mr. Wysocki stated he believes the chart showed that the User Fees accounted for \$30,000 of the \$50,000. Mr. Krauss stated if they used the Senior rates from \$15 to \$20, they would get an additional \$2,200.

Mr. Brody stated he would propose that we be consistent with what we did at the Pool. He stated most of our User Fees are paid for children playing sports.

Mr. Brody moved and Mr. Wysocki seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the User Fees for Senior be \$30 for residents and \$60 for non-residents.

Mr. Brody stated this would be the same as the User Fees for the Leagues and it is subsidized just like all the other Leagues are subsidized. Mr. Wysocki stated initially when the Community Center was beginning, there was a proposal that the Senior rates match the League User Fees, and there was a lot of discussion by the Seniors; and in order to move forward, there was a concession that there be an interim discount rate for them. Mr. Krauss agreed that when the Seniors came in, we did give them a lower rate than what was originally proposed, but it has now been a number of years and costs have gone up and the Fee has been stagnant since they started using the building. Mr. Wysocki stated he believes that it was indicated at the time that it was going to be an initial Fee and the understanding was that it would have to go up at some point. Mr. Wysocki stated if the Fees were to be increased as proposed what would that bring in, and Mr. Blundi stated it would go from \$7,000 to \$14,000 assuming they are all residents.

Mr. Wysocki stated they are the biggest User group in the Community Center and it would cut \$14,000 of the \$20,000 deficit.

Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Tierney stated with regard to Fees being charged to rent the Community Center, we currently charge a set rate of \$100 security deposit which is returnable, \$100 an hour for the entire great room or \$250 for a four-hour block, and one side of the great room is \$75 per hour or \$150 for a four-hour block. She stated the classroom rental is \$25 per hour and \$50 for a four-hour block. She stated the kitchen is \$35 an hour and \$15 for each additional hour, but she cannot recall a time when we actually rented the kitchen. Mr. Wysocki asked the total contribution from rentals, and Ms. Tierney stated it was \$5,000.

Ms. Tierney stated non-profit groups currently get a 50% discount on rentals. She stated some of the non-profits use the Community Center regularly – once a month or once a week including the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, and the Quilters Guild.

Mr. Wysocki stated if they were to eliminate the discount, we would come close to doubling the \$5,000. Ms. Tierney stated she feels that we would lose a lot of our non-profit groups if we eliminated their discount. Mr. Krauss asked if there is a lesser discount that would be acceptable. Ms. Tierney stated she feels there would be, but if we doubled their costs, she feels they would go elsewhere.

Mr. Blundi asked for more specifics about the Boy Scout Troop 10 use, but Ms. Tierney stated she could not tell at this point details of every single reservation. She stated she knows that the Quilters Guild rents the room once a month most of the year. She stated sometimes they will also ask for Special Event time for a bigger event or a fundraiser. She stated some of the Girl Scouts use it for their regular meeting space once a week.

Ms. Tierney stated there are many things going on in the Community Center, and she cannot recall the full schedule. She stated the Daughters of the American Revolution are there once a month. She stated the Makefield Lion's Club is also there once a month for their regular meetings. She stated there are also two Lower Makefield Women's groups which she believes use the Community Center once a month.

Mr. Wysocki asked if rentals are the second largest income generator for the Community Center after the Seniors, and Ms. Tierney stated Programs generate about \$11,000.

Mr. Krauss asked if there are consistent users of the Community Center could they have them sign a one-year Contract for eleven months and give the twelfth month for free so that we can keep it full but not give away half of the potential revenue. Ms. Tierney stated there are limitless things that could be done, and that would be up to the Board how they want to do it. Mr. Krauss asked at what point does Ms. Tierney feel the groups would not use the Community Center if they increased the fees. Ms. Tierney stated she feels it would be different for each user group depending on their frequency. Ms. Tierney stated increasing rents for a non-profit is always a challenge.

Mr. Blundi stated these types of rentals defer our costs; and if we were to lose all of the rentals that we have, we would still have expenses associated with the Community Center although there would be a de minimus decrease in expenses. He stated they are essentially paying for space that we have to heat, air condition, etc. Mr. Wysocki stated everything that contributes is off-setting expenses, not just the rentals. Ms. Tierney stated they are community-based groups, and they do give back to the community in one way or another, and there is value in that.

There was further discussion about the income coming in to the Community Center, and Mr. Blundi stated with regard to the proposed increase in the Senior fee, we will not be getting an additional \$14,000 against the \$20,000 deficit as was noted earlier, and we will only be getting an additional \$7,000 over what had been previously proposed.

Mr. Blundi asked about Programming, and Mr. Krauss stated that is the Programming that we Contract out to use the space such as yoga, indoor soccer, arts and crafts, etc. Mr. Blundi asked what is the arrangement that we have with them, and Ms. Tierney stated she will discuss that later and show another slide.

Mr. Blundi asked if we should just let Ms. Tierney use her discretion with regard to rentals. Mr. Krauss stated it may be possible to move the discount from 50% to 40% for the non-profits, and that could help a little with the deficit. Ms. Tierney stated the way it is written it is a discount, and the discount could change. She asked the Park & Rec Board if they would like to increase the base fee at all. She stated there are other user groups that use the facility, and the fee could be raised a little bit for a one-time user.

Mr. Krauss asked how many of those are there, and Ms. Tierney stated the bulk of the users are long-term users. Mr. Krauss stated they could raise the fee, but not change the discount or do both. Ms. Tierney stated while she knows that any increase to the non-profits would be a burden, that does not mean that we should not do it. Mr. Krauss stated they are trying to fair and equitable across all of the groups that have been addressed today, and we know what we have been tasked to do this by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Wysocki stated they need to consider the base, and he feels we should consider raising the rate by 10%, and that would carry through to an automatic increase even if we do not change the discount rate. He stated he is not opposed to starting a discount rate deduction as well adding that we are still going to have a deficit. He stated the increase in the rate could be smaller and it could be 5%.

Mr. Blundi stated with the non-profit groups, they could decide to go elsewhere and we would lose that revenue altogether. He stated our shortfall would then become even greater. He stated he would not be opposed to a 10% increase in the rate and no change to the discount and feels that would be reasonable. Ms. Tierney again reviewed the existing rates for rentals.

Mr. Krauss stated if the rates were to be increased and rounded up, for the great room each of the numbers could be raised by \$25. Mr. Wysocki stated he would also suggest that for the four-hour blocks, for the great room instead of \$250 that be raised to \$300. He stated for half the great room that would go to \$200. He stated if they are not going to be there for the full four hours and are only going to be there for three, it would still be less expensive for them to do four hours. Mr. Krauss suggested \$10 increase for the classroom. Mr. Wysocki stated he feels for the four hours it should be \$75.

Mr. Wysocki moved, Mr. Blundi seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors increasing the Rental Fees at the Community Center for the full great room to be \$110 an hour, with the four-hour rate to be \$300, half the great room would be \$80 and the four-hour rate would be \$200. Classrooms would go to \$30 and the four-hour rate would be \$75.

Ms. Tierney stated with regard to Programs she does not know that they have to change. She stated the prices vary, but we always get a 25% split. She stated she reached out to other Townships to see what their splits were. She stated we contract these for a year so that when the Contracts are up, they are changed. She stated Upper Merion does a 70/30 split, but if the contractor pushes for it, they do go as high as 80% to the contractor. She stated Middletown Township is similar. She stated Cranberry Township also does 70/30 but their pickleball is a 50/50 split. She stated Cranberry pickleball is probably the biggest pickleball organization in Pennsylvania with between 1,500 and 2,000 members and a full complex with a dome fully paid for by the pickleball users. She stated their split for instruction is 50/50 between the Township and the instructor.

Ms. Tierney stated many Townships do a 70/30 split, and if we were to do that the Township would get 30% rather than 25%. She stated she feels we would begin to lose contractors if it were to go much higher than that. She stated we continue to increase their fees and we also charge 15% per non-resident participant so we get a percentage of that fee increase as well. Mr. Blundi asked if 70/30 is typical, and Ms. Tierney stated while it is not necessarily typical it is either 75/25 or 70/30. Mr. Blundi stated he feels 70/30 is reasonable. Mr. Krauss stated he assumes most contractors will pass that along to the participants if they have a certain amount in mind that they need to earn per session and what their time is worth.

Mr. Wysocki stated he understands that the total revenue stream from the programs is about \$11,000, and Ms. Tierney stated it is a little more than that and about \$10,000 of that goes back to the programmer.

Ms. Rock asked how many people pushed to get the 80%, and Ms. Tierney stated the Township she spoke to did not clarify that, and just indicated they allowed for some “wiggle room.” Ms. Tierney stated Lower Makefield does not do that.

Mr. Wysocki moved, Mr. Blundi seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors changing the split on Programming Fees to 30/70.

Pickleball Fees

Ms. Tierney stated this was discussed previously and was increased quite a bit. Mr. Wysocki asked if it was cost neutral with the increase, and Ms. Tierney agreed. Mr. Krauss stated it was a pretty significant change for the members, and he does not know what the impact will be in terms of member retention. He stated the current fee is \$27, and the new fee will be \$60 or \$120. Ms. Tierney stated in the estimate we did account for loss, so we are net neutral if there is membership loss.

Pavilion Rental Fee

Ms. Tierney stated there are some other fees that she is still analyzing that still need to be addressed including Pavilion Fees. She stated our Pavilion Fees are very low, and we also do not allow non-resident rentals; and there are times that non-residents want to rent the pavilions, and then they are empty all weekend when it could have been rented to a non-resident. She stated she feels we could charge non-residents double what we charge residents.

Mr. Krauss asked what is the rental income we get from the pavilions; however, Ms. Tierney stated she had not prepared that for this evening.

Mr. Wysocki asked if someone were to use the pavilion without having rented it, would the Police monitor that. Ms. Tierney stated they do not monitor it; however, if someone has a Permit to rent it and someone is there, they can call the Police. Mr. Wysocki stated he would advocate for a non-resident structure since if a non-resident came and asked to rent it and was told that we do not rent to non-residents, they could still go there and use it if no one was there, and they would be fine if they were not interfering with someone who had a Permit. Other Board members were in favor of non-residents being able to rent the pavilions. Ms. Rock suggested that rather than raising the Resident Fee we should just agree to non-Residents being able to rent the pavilion at double the Fee. Mr. Krauss stated we could see what that generates in 2024. Ms. Tierney stated if the Park Board wanted to recommend that, the Fee would be \$15 an hour for a resident and \$30 an hour for a non-resident. Ms. Tierney stated other Townships have \$100 to \$160 day rates.

Mr. Krauss asked what is the typical amount of time that people rent the pavilion, and Ms. Tierney stated we tell them that they should include the time of the entire set up and tear down period. Mr. Krauss asked if people

rent it mostly for three hours, and should it just be a three-hour rental minimum which would be \$45 for residents and \$90 for non-residents, and every hour after that it would be either another \$15 or \$30. Mr. Blundi stated he feels that makes sense adding that it is not policed. There was discussion if the rates should be even higher. Ms. Rock suggested that it be \$50 for a resident and \$100 for a non-resident. She stated at a park she was at as a non-resident was \$100 for three hours. Mr. Wysocki suggested that the additional hour beyond the three-hour minimum would be charged at \$20 for a resident and \$40 for a non-resident.

Mr. Wysocki moved, Ms. Rock seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the Pavilion Rental Fee be \$50 for a resident and \$100 for a non-resident for a minimum three-hour block and each additional hour after the three-hour block would be \$20 for a resident and \$40 for a non-resident.

Park Ranger Positions

Ms. Tierney stated there was discussion about Park Ranger positions, but that has been eliminated since there is no room in the Budget for that at this time.

Dog Park Fees

Ms. Tierney stated the Board had previously discussed the Dog Park Fees which were increased. Mr. Wysocki asked if that covered the deficit, and Ms. Tierney agreed.

Recommendation to Increase Park & Recreation Millage

Mr. LaBar moved and Mr. Brody seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they increase the Park & Rec millage from its current rate of 2.43 to 2.93.

Mr. Brody asked if what we are proposing came out of our last meeting, and Mr. Krauss stated we did not discuss or vote on it at the last public meeting. Mr. Krauss stated he does not believe the Park & Rec Board has ever talked about millage in the past and has always just addressed the Fees, but given the environment that has changed, the number of projects we have, and the

amount of on-going maintenance and Capital projects needed, he feels that it is appropriate that the Park & Recreation Board provide a point of view and recommendation on this to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Brody stated the Township is in a difficult situation and the Board of Supervisors has to make a number of difficult decisions and are going to be asking for more from residents across the board. He stated he feels in all of our actions tonight, the Park & Recreation Board has tried to take steps to move forward to getting money back wherever possible, and that millage should be considered as well. He stated it is in line with the Concept of Play for All, and everyone should be part of paying for it and not just user groups especially when a lot of these items have been decaying over the last thirty years.

Mr. LaBar stated he agrees adding that with Play for All we are asking the various members to pay increased Fees but we have been “kicking the can down the road” for the past ten to twenty years. He stated there are maintenance costs and without this millage increase, he does not feel we will be able to address that.

Motion carried with Mr. Blundi opposed.

Mr. Brody asked Mr. Blundi if feels we should not be passing a tax increase, and Mr. Blundi stated he does not believe it is the purview of the Park & Rec Board to levy taxes. He stated he does not know enough about Park & Rec Budget to say whether .5 is enough or if .5 is too much. He stated he disagrees that for twenty years it has been ignored. He stated he understands that Ms. Tierney had indicated that the millage was increased in 2015 and 2016; and then in 2019 it went to 2.67.

Mr. Wysocki stated he agrees with Mr. Blundi in that he does not understand the complete impact; however, when he voted in favor of it, he was thinking that we know that the changes that have been recommended to be made will not cover the gap. He stated while we do not have the right to levy taxes, we can make recommendations. He stated he wanted the Board of Supervisors to know that despite all of our hard work with regard to the Fee changes, there is still a deficit, and he wanted to go Record about that.

Capital Projects Discussion

Ms. Tierney stated we were also charged with looking at the Capital Projects. She showed a slide of the Capital Projects that were in the Budget at the Budget meeting on Wednesday. She stated we were looking at the 2016 Bond proceeds to cover a series of projects to include the Memorial Park shade structure and rubberized surface in the amount of \$330,000, the Heacock Pocket Park which has signed Contracts coming in January, a bike path match that we applied for and we have to Budget for even if we do not know that we will get the Grant, Pool filter replacement, which must be replaced in 2024 adding that there is another Pool filter that will need to be replaced in the following year although they would prefer to replace this year, and a diving board replacement.

Ms. Tierney stated there are also Capital projects proposed to be paid for with Fee-In-Lieu funds, and these include the Memorial Park East Expansion, Memorial Park basketball courts, and the pickleball drainage project. Ms. Tierney stated the Board of Supervisors had a lot of ideas as to what should be reduced, eliminated, or deferred. She stated she does not know what the Park & Rec Board feels from a priority standpoint. She reiterated that the Heacock Pocket Park has already been committed to.

Mr. Krauss stated the Bond proceeds are General Bonds that the Township obtained, and those proceeds are not specific to Park & Rec but are also for general Capital projects. Ms. Tierney stated there were other projects listed for the Township for those Bond proceeds. Ms. Tierney stated the Fee-In-Lieu funds are not taxpayers dollars, and these are development fee which are specific to Park & Rec. Mr. Krauss asked if we cannot use the Bond proceeds, could we use the Fee-In-Lieu dollars. Ms. Tierney stated after the projects shown there are no other Fee-In-Lieu dollars.

Mr. Krauss stated Ms. Tierney had indicated that the Memorial Park shade structure/rubberized surface would be from Bond proceeds; and he asked why she chose to use those funds for that project as opposed to the Fee-In-Lieu funds. Ms. Tierney stated she was just trying to make the numbers work.

Ms. Tierney stated initially they felt that Fee-In-Lieu could only be used for new projects which is why the Memorial Park East Expansion was there, but they recently found out that a few years ago that rule changed, and you can also use those funds for maintenance. She stated that is why the Memorial Park basketball courts and pickleball drainage were in there.

Ms. Tierney asked if the Park & Recreation Board has a priority with regard to these projects and what would they remove if necessary. Mr. Krauss stated with regard to the Memorial Park Expansion that includes a Grant, and Ms. Tierney stated the Grant is \$900,000, with about a \$130,000 match and the remainder of the money being budgeted for engineering. Ms. Tierney stated that expires in 2026, and Mr. Krauss stated since there is time, that would not have to be a 2024 project. Ms. Tierney stated while that is true, it is a big project, and we would need to start it early enough. Mr. Krauss stated he feels that anything that is a replacement or renovation of an existing facility that needs work should be prioritized over anything new.

Mr. Blundi stated he would not do the Memorial Park Expansion. He stated if he had been advised seven years ago when the Memorial Park playground was installed that we would be spending \$330,000 in seven years to replace the surface, and in another seven years we have to replace it again, he does not feel he would have spent the money that way. He stated he does not know what is in the Memorial Park Expansion, and he would not want to be facing the same things that we are facing now at Memorial Park by having to re-do the playground again at a much higher price. He stated he would like to understand before we start another new project what it will cost to maintain. He stated while there are matching dollars with it, he would want to know what we are talking about first.

Mr. Blundi stated with regard to the Memorial Park shade structure, he feels it needs to be smaller so that it is more cost effective but still maintain ADA accessibility. He stated he would hold off on that, and he would look for some public/private source to help offset the cost of that.

Mr. Blundi stated he understands that the Heacock Park Project has been committed to and he feels the Pool filters are a necessity as well as the pickleball drainage project. He stated those courts were just built, and they should be right. He stated he would also agree with the diving board. He stated he is unsure what to do about the basketball courts.

Mr. LaBar stated with regard to the basketball courts, he understands that there is significant cracking and they cannot be used. He asked how much it would cost to remove it, and consider doing the costs further in the future. He noted there are basketball courts at the Pool which could be used, and the basketball courts at Memorial could be gotten rid of now for safety reasons, and then prioritize those in the future. Ms. Tierney stated that is a possibility.

Mr. Krauss asked Mr. Blundi if his suggestion was that the shade structure be smaller or that the total playground be re-designed in totality. Mr. Blundi stated the big expense is the ground covering, and he would suggest keeping the same footprint, but instead of having 100% coverage with the rubberized surface, it could be half rubberized surface and half mulch. He stated the Philadelphia Eagles have an autism fundraising effort and maybe they would see a value to contributing to this project. Mr. Blundi stated he understands that Ms. Tierney has indicated that it is the only Park in the area that has this ADA accessibility, and he understands that it is also for children with autism. Ms. Tierney stated it is the first park of its kind in Bucks County. She stated she believes that there may have been a couple others installed in Bucks County since we put this in ten years ago. She stated it is also one of the only fully-accessible parks that she knows of nearby. Mr. Blundi stated he feels that could wait another year, and maybe when it is re-done there could be other funding sources from outside of the Township. He would recommend keeping the same footprint but use less of the rubberized surface when it is re-done.

Mr. Brody stated it is unfortunate that it will probably be the Memorial Park projects that will be eliminated at this time; although he does agree with Mr. Blundi that given the uniqueness of those who benefit from the Memorial Park playground that would be the easiest one to get public support and funding for. He stated Newtown residents might also donate toward that since that is one of the few projects that we have that touches more people than just Lower Makefield Township residents.

Mr. Wysocki stated he feels we need the Memorial basketball courts and we cannot just have one basketball court in the Township. He stated he feels it should be repaired and not demolished, and he would put those at the top of the Memorial Park list. He stated he is aware of a company which does milling of the bad areas and then recoats with about 2" of surface, and it can last up to ten years. He stated it is not a permanent solution, but would cost less than the \$231,000 that is being shown. Mr. Wysocki stated his next priority would be the shade structure because it is an existing facility. He stated he does not feel we can afford the Memorial Park expansion at this time.

Ms. Tierney thanked everyone for their input. Mr. Krauss stated he agrees and he appreciates everyone's dedication in meeting for so long this evening. He stated he will be drafting a summary letter to the Board of Supervisors based on what was discussed and recommended tonight.

November 14, 2023

Park & Recreation Board – page 42 of 42

There being no further business, Mr. LaBar moved, Mr. Wysocki seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kim Rock, Secretary

