

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 3, 2014

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on September 3, 2014.

Chairman Dobson called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

Board of Supervisors: Dobby Dobson, Chairman
 Dan McLaughlin, Vice Chairman
 Pete Stainthorpe, Secretary
 Kristin Tyler, Treasurer
 Jeff Benedetto, Supervisor

Others: Terry Fedorchak, Township Manager
 Jeffrey Garton, Township Solicitor (left meeting in
 progress)
 Mark Eisold, Township Engineer
 Kenneth Coluzzi, Chief of Police

PUBLIC COMMENT

State Representative Steve Santarsiero was present to give an update with regard to PECO. He stated there will be a public meeting on Thursday, September 18 at the Pennwood Middle School starting at 7:00 p.m. He stated this will be an opportunity for the public to hear directly from PECO as to what they are proposing with respect to both infrastructure upgrades to make the system more reliable and a more aggressive tree and vegetation trimming program. He stated the meeting will involve Lower Makefield, Yardley Borough, Newtown Township, Newtown Borough, Morrisville, Falls, Upper Makefield, and Solebury and members of the public from all of those communities will be invited to that meeting. Mr. Santarsiero stated he has also notified the Township of a meeting to be held on September 9 in Yardley Borough at 1:00 p.m. for Municipal Representatives and the purpose will be to give each of the Towns an overview of the Plan and to enable the Towns to coordinate with PECO so the work can be done as expeditiously as possible. The meeting in Yardley Borough next week is not a public meeting.

Mr. Santarsiero stated when he was before the Board of Supervisors in early May they discussed the two track process – one being what can be done in the short term locally to try to make the system more reliable and the other being what can be done longer term regionally to make the system more reliable and hardened against potential storm events in the future. He stated the meeting will address the localized

events but they have also discussed the more regional issues that will have to be done in the coming years. He stated next week when they have the meeting with the Municipalities, this will be a good opportunity to discuss that as well. He stated to make the Yardley meeting workable, it would be good to limit the total number of people attending; and the request from PECO was to have at a minimum the engineers and roads people involved from each Municipality so that there is a coordination of the work going forward.

Mr. McLaughlin stated they have struggled to get the reliability reports from PECO, and he asked Mr. Santarsiero if this is something they could get before the September 18 meeting. Mr. Santarsiero stated he did request this at the meeting last Thursday and also asked for an identification of the circuits that are the most problematic. He stated they have been reticent to identify exactly what those circuits are. Mr. Santarsiero stated he knows that at least one of them is in Lower Makefield Township, and he suspects there are more than that. Mr. Santarsiero stated he hopes to have this information by next week.

Mr. Santarsiero stated he, Mr. Stainthorpe, Mr. Benedetto, and representatives from Public Works were at the ball fields last week to look at where they are going to put the signage for the Caiola Baseball Park. He stated the dedication ceremony will be on September 20 between the baseball games scheduled for that morning. He stated those interested should check on the Facebook page where they will post the time.

Ms. Tyler stated with regard to the meeting to be held at Yardley Borough, their Electrical Reliability Committee includes a number of engineers; and she would like some of them to attend that meeting with her.

Mr. Harold Kupersmit, 612 B Wren Song Road, expressed his concern with the limited number of students that are able to attend the Bucks County Technical High School. He stated he is trying to ascertain the proper procedure to get a major expansion.

Mr. Zachary Rubin, 1661 Covington Road, stated he is opposed to the proposal to apply for the Bucks County Municipal Open Space Grant for \$438,355 to have a Conservation Easement on 93.28 acres at the Patterson Farm. He stated 71 acres has already been conserved by the County, and there is an extra 57.5 acres that have been set aside by the Township. Mr. Rubin stated this Board and previous Boards do not know the difference between farmland and farms. He stated a farm or an agricultural establishment has a barn, a farmer's residence, outbuildings, and places for animals where future generations would be able to see what the agrarian background of the Township is and not just see cornfields. Mr. Rubin stated the

Environmental Advisory Council has prioritized a number of parcels that should be purchased with the Open Space money that the Township can get from the County. He stated instead of taking the \$438,000 and putting it into the coffers of the Township and claiming they are conserving 93.28 acres, they should purchase additional open space as recommended by the EAC. Mr. Rubin stated the EAC has indicated that there are eight to ten properties up to twenty acres that could be purchased, and he believes this is a good use of the money. Mr. Rubin stated at the last meeting Supervisor Stainthorpe stated that the Board could protect the Patterson Farm for basically nothing. Mr. Rubin stated the Township solicitor stated they could put on a unilateral restrictive easement on the Deed, and they would not have to take \$438,000; and they could use that money instead to purchase additional open space and still preserve the Patterson Farm in perpetuity because the Township owns that Farm.

Mr. Rubin stated in 2008 there was a Referendum right after the worst stock market crash since 1929; and in that Referendum the people of the Township gave the Board the ability to borrow \$7.5 million to purchase open space by a vote of 71% in favor of indebtedness. Mr. Rubin stated in the last ten years, the Township has preserved six acres of open space and not touched the \$7.5 million Bond issue. Mr. Rubin stated while some Board members may say if you go out for a Bond there is a debt service and they would have to raise taxes, 71% of the people indicated they would not mind paying \$10 to \$50 per year to make the community more beautiful and livable.

Mr. Benedetto asked if the Application has been filed, and Mr. Fedorchak stated it has not. Mr. Benedetto stated during the last public discussion there was no idea of what the Township was going to do with the money. He stated he would like to see the Application made public. Mr. Fedorchak stated he expects it will be filed within the next month. Mr. Benedetto asked that it be put on the Township Website, and Mr. Fedorchak agreed to do so.

Ms. Donna Doan, 1584 Edgewood Road, stated she agrees with Mr. Rubin that they can preserve all of the Farm. She stated the designation of the fifty plus acres as the leaf recycling area is “nonsense,” since the leaves are spread over the entirety of the Farm.

Ms. Doan stated she is concerned about the music festival scheduled for October at the Patterson Farm. She stated there will be approximately five hundred attendees in addition to food trucks, crafts, artists, auctions, art show, etc. Ms. Doan stated the obligation of the farm fields is for crops, and there will be crops in the field when this event takes place. She stated there is not a place to park five hundred cars on the Farm when there are crops in the field. Ms. Doan stated she reviewed the Artists of Yardley’s Lease of the Janney-Brown House, and it specifically states that their

area of the Farm is to be contained within the yard of the Janney-Brown House; and she does not know how they would be able to have five hundred parked cars, six bands, food trucks, and vendors onto that space without damage to the crops in the fields. She stated she is also opposed to the unsupervised service of alcohol on the Farm. She stated she feels there are also issues with sanitation, security, traffic, damage to the crops, and possible injury to people who do not understand that farm equipment should not be played on. She feels this is a violation of the Zoning.

Mr. Benedetto stated he found out about this event in June and he asked that it be put on an Agenda. He stated he sent Mr. Fedorchak a memo in August asking a number of questions as to who approved this, was this within the Ordinances, and was this something permitted under the Lease. He stated he also sent a message to Maggie Robinson who responded to him and advised that they are selling five hundred tickets, they will have ten vendors, three food trucks, and musical entertainment Friday from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. He stated there is not expected to be any Police support since Ms. Robinson indicated she spoke to Captain Roche who indicated Police support was not necessary. Mr. Benedetto stated he was advised that there was a discussion whether Mr. Stewart was expected to remove his crops to accommodate the traffic, and Ms. Robinson stated he was not asked to do this. Mr. Benedetto stated Ms. Robinson indicated that they will be renting a dumpster, and they would be responsible for the clean up. He stated they will also have portable restrooms.

Mr. Benedetto stated when his sister-in-law came before the Board she was told by the Township Manager that she had to get approval for an event that was less than one hundred people. Mr. Benedetto stated that event was an "absolute catastrophe." He stated his sister-in-law was told that she had to get Contracts signed and approval from the Board of Supervisors. He stated the event coming up will have five hundred people and music. Mr. Benedetto stated Ms. Robinson advised him that she met with Mr. Stainthorpe and the Township Manager, and they approved it. Mr. Benedetto stated everyone should have a problem with this, and the Board should have oversight over this and it should have come before them at a public meeting as was the case with his sister-in-law. He stated the event is taking place when there was not a public discussion and not voted on by the Board. Mr. Benedetto asked Mr. Fedorchak how this is acceptable.

Mr. Fedorchak stated he feels this is consistent with the Artists of Yardley's use in general, and they already have a Lease for that property. He stated in the case of the wedding, that was not the case and it was something different. Mr. Benedetto asked if it is not necessary to have a discussion about this at a public meeting.

Mr. Dobson stated they would have to conform to all the rules and regulations.

Ms. Tyler asked if they did not hold this event last year, and Mr. Fedorchak agreed this is the second time they have had this event; and he feels they have done an excellent job. He stated there is no conflict with Mr. Stewart's farming operation, and they are very sensitive to that. He stated last year and this year they communicated very well with Mr. Stewart to make sure there was no conflict. He stated it a use that is consistent with the use that the Board of Supervisors has already approved, and he does not see that it is necessary for any special discussion or special Permit.

Mr. Dobson asked if there were any problems last year, and Mr. Fedorchak stated there were not. Chief Coluzzi agreed that there were no problems at all which is why when they evaluated it this year and visited Ms. Robinson, they decided that the Police Officers that were working could stop by and make sure traffic was okay and everyone was conforming but that no special Police were needed inside the event.

Mr. Benedetto stated he was at last year's event on Saturday, and he does not recall six bands or five hundred people being there. He stated he feels they are trying to expand this, and it is going to get bigger and bigger; and to characterize last year's event as the same as this year is a gross mischaracterization of the event.

Ms. Tyler stated there were four hundred people present last year. She also stated that these events are one of the very few opportunities that the Township residents have to set foot upon Patterson Farm and enjoy the property. Ms. Tyler stated if the Police Chief and Township Manager do not feel there is a problem, she does not have an issue with it.

Mr. Benedetto stated he feels it should have been publicly discussed, and everyone would then be fully informed as opposed to Ms. Doan having to come up during Public Comment one month before the event. Mr. Benedetto stated he asked that this be put on the Agenda, and he was totally ignored. He stated he does not understand how in an open, transparent Government, Mr. Fedorchak makes an executive decision to say it is fine because they have a Lease. Mr. Benedetto stated he does not see in the Lease or the Ordinances that music festivals are permitted on Patterson Farm.

Mr. Dobson stated Mr. Benedetto's and Ms. Doan's objections are noted for the record. Mr. Dobson added that Mr. Fedorchak has indicated that it is consistent with the Lease, and he and the Chief have indicated that this took place last year and there were no problems.

Mr. Benedetto moved that for future events held by the Artists of Yardley, Oktoberfest being the event, he would like it to be publically discussed and have the approval and voting – that the Supervisors have approval – not the Township Manager. The Supervisors should have approval of this type of event held at Patterson Farm. In next year's event, Oktoberfest, 2015 that the Supervisors have a public discussion – on the Agenda – and they vote yes or no.

There was no Second to the Motion, and the Motion died for lack of a Second.

Ms. Doan stated she feels at the least the Board should consider banning the use of alcohol on the Farm.

Ms. Doan stated she had filed a Right To Know Law request for documentation showing the expenses at the Janney-Brown House for a period of three years while the Artists of Yardley were in that House, and it was \$47,000 billed to the taxpayers for a group that does not pay rent. She stated she understands that they do some work at the House, but she feels the Lease should be re-negotiated. She stated she understands that it is on a month-to-month basis now as the original Lease has expired. She stated there is no reason why they should not pay a fair share for the occupation of the House.

Mr. Dobson asked the Township Manager to have the expenses available for the Board at the next meeting. He stated he would also like to know what the Artists of Yardley have done as to improvements, how much money they have expended in the upkeep of the House, and what the taxpayers have paid.

Ms. Doan stated as part of the Artists of Yardley's Lease, they were supposed to paint a barn; and that has not been done. Ms. Doan stated the \$47,000 does not include the part of the septic that was repaired or recent repair work that was done. She stated there is no reason why this property cannot bring in rent, and to give it away for free is unimaginable. She stated she feels there was no fair or unbiased process for screening an application. She stated it was not advertised, and it was just given to that group.

Ms. Doan stated they could preserve the Farm and bring in income that would keep the Farm preserved and intact. She stated the Farm has the ability to sustain itself. She stated she feels it is telling that sixteen years after the acquisition of the Farm, they still owe \$2.5 million on what was supposed to be a twenty year Note on the Farm. She asked where the funds went since the funds were supposed to be derived from taxation and put specifically to pay down that debt. She stated the \$483,000 that was received from PennDOT for the condemnation of the land obviously did not go to pay down the principal.

Mr. McLaughlin stated he felt it went toward the cost of the roof, and Mr. Fedorchak stated the roof was well over \$200,000. Ms. Doan stated she can document over \$1 million that came and went from that Farm.

Mr. Dobson stated he has directed the Township Manager to provide information on the expenses and what the Township and the Artists of Yardley have done, and they will discuss this at the next meeting. Mr. Fedorchak stated he will also include information on the years before the Artists of Yardley took over and what the Township was paying during those years.

Mr. Benedetto asked Mr. Garton when the Lease with the Artists of Yardley ran out; however, Mr. Garton stated the Lease was negotiated before he became the Township solicitor again. Mr. Benedetto stated he understands it is a month-to-month situation, and the Artists have been waiting for it to be renewed. Mr. Fedorchak stated he believes it is a month-to-month Lease at this time, but he does not know when it expired. Mr. Dobson asked that Mr. Fedorchak provide this information for the next meeting as well.

Ms. Wendy Desantis, 1451 Robinson Place, stated with the exception of Mr. Benedetto, there is very little transparency on the Board. She stated she was before the Board two weeks ago about problems with the elevation project on her home and had provided all the details of what she feels is corruption and incompetence that has been visited upon she and her family from the contractor's bidding and raising the price by several thousand dollars after the Bid was awarded to the contractor. She stated her neighbor, Mrs. Duffy, is present this evening; and she had the exact same experience with the Township and her elevation. She stated the Board expressed surprise about what had happened to her two weeks ago, but none of them have contacted her since that time after they had indicated they were concerned about she and her family being effectively homeless for all these months.

Ms. Desantis stated at the last meeting she asked Mr. Fedorchak why the contractor who damaged her home and goods to the tune of at least \$60,000 has been given a final payment as if he was done. She stated the check was signed by Mr. Fedorchak and issued through Remington Vernick after she had provided numerous e-mails and photographs.

Mr. Fedorchak stated this is incorrect. He stated he has not issued the final payment, and there is also a Performance Bond in place with the Township which covers many of the issues that Ms. Desantis has identified so there are two layers of protection that are in place right now.

Mr. McLaughlin stated they did instruct their solicitor to look into this matter, and Ms. Desantis stated he has been very responsive. Ms. Desantis stated Mr. Fedorchak indicated the final payment was not made, but she saw a copy of the check for \$67,000; and what Mr. Fedorchak is speaking about is the \$12,000 retainer that is standard for projects. She stated the last large and true payment made to the contractor of \$67,000 was paid by Mr. Fedorchak who knew for several months the issues with this contractor. Mr. McLaughlin stated they have already asked the Solicitor to go after the contractor and to stop any payments that are due. He stated if there were payments made and the performance was not to the letter of the Contract, they can utilize the legal system.

Ms. Desantis asked why nothing has been communicated to her in the last two weeks. Mr. Stainthorpe stated there was a meeting held since the last meeting with the engineer and the solicitor. Mr. Garton stated he reached out to Ms. Desantis very quickly after the last meeting, and he asked her for her list of things she felt were deficient; and she generated that list along with other things she felt might be deficient although she did not know yet. He stated they also generated from Remington Vernick their list of deficiencies. Mr. Garton stated Mr. Eisold visited the property and also talked to the Building Inspector as to what would be necessary to get a Certificate of Occupancy. He stated they gathered all that information and had a meeting today of which he notified Ms. Desantis. He stated today he dictated a summary of that meeting; and when it is finished, he will make sure those that were present agree; and he will send it to Ms. Desantis hopefully tomorrow so she knows where there is agreement and disagreement. Mr. Garton stated at this point he does not feel they should worry about the contractor until they can make sure that Ms. Desantis can move into her house which is his primary objective, and he had explained this to Ms. Desantis.

Mr. Dobson stated this is not what Ms. Desantis indicated as she stated she had not heard anything for two weeks. Ms. Desantis stated that is not what she is asking for right now although she does appreciate Mr. Garton's efforts adding he has been very responsive. She stated this is not the question she asked, and the question she asked was why was the \$67,000 check signed and given to the contractor. Ms. Tyler stated it was because the engineer authorized it. Mr. Dobson stated Ms. Desantis indicated that she had not heard anything for the last two weeks, and the Solicitor indicated he had reached out to her. Ms. Desantis agreed Mr. Garton was responsive. Mr. Dobson stated Ms. Desantis stated she did not hear from them for two weeks, yet she has just acknowledged that Mr. Garton, who is part of the Township was responsive. Mr. Desantis stated what she said was that none of the elected Officials were responsive. Mr. Dobson stated the Board members are not engineers, and they have a whole group of professionals that do this work for the Township.

Mr. McLaughlin stated the Board directed the solicitor and the engineer to do certain things. He stated the Township professionals charge the Township money, and they are doing what the Board told them to do. He stated the Board directed on Ms. Desantis' behalf both the solicitor and the engineer to work on rectifying her situation. He stated to say that she has not heard from them is incorrect since she has heard from the Township agents. Mr. McLaughlin stated when Ms. Desantis states that she has not had any response from the Board this is incorrect as the Board operates through its Township Manager, the solicitor, and the engineer.

Mr. Benedetto stated he and Ms. Desantis have been exchanging e-mail messages, and he feels this is very telling as to transparency. He stated there was just an acknowledgment that there were two meetings, and Ms. Desantis was not invited to either of them, and he questions how this is transparency. Mr. Benedetto stated while they are doing this on her behalf, he feels she should have been included in the process.

Ms. Desantis stated there were promises from Mr. Fedorchak that he would work with her to make her whole, and he made a "casual" request that she not follow through with her threat to contact the media and the Attorney General's Office; and she then backed off from contacting them. She was then told that only \$19,000 would be given toward the construction deficiencies in her home, and she feels this is the opposite of transparency.

Mr. McLaughlin asked what will be done going forward to get Ms. Desantis back in her home. Mr. Garton stated Ms. Desantis will have a list tomorrow of things that are open, things she has agreed are done, and things that require further discussion. He stated he had no prior history of any of this so the first meeting was to find out what had happened and how they were going to solve the problem. He stated by the second meeting, Mr. Eisold had visited the property and met with the Code Enforcement representatives. He stated Ms. Desantis will have the opportunity to review the list he hopes to provide by tomorrow, and he would like to get feedback from her to make sure there is a clear understanding of what has to get done.

Mr. McLaughlin asked about rectifying the issue of appliances she indicated were damaged; and Mr. Garton stated that is one of the issues they are going to be discussing, and this has been included on the punch list. Ms. Desantis stated this was included on the punch list from Jim Majewski.

Mr. McLaughlin asked what they will do about Mr. Sakoutis. Mr. Garton stated he felt it was more important to get Ms. Desantis back into her house as opposed to spending a lot of time determining what they will do about Mr. Sakoutis and the Performance Bond. He stated once there is a plan for getting Ms. Desantis back in her house, they will then determine what should be done about the contractor.

Mr. McLaughlin asked Ms. Desantis if she is satisfied that this is a good plan; and she stated while it is, with the exception of Mr. Garton she does not see any urgency. Mr. McLaughlin stated she is being provided information tomorrow, and they will proceed from there. Ms. Desantis stated she is skeptical because she has been told this for months.

Mr. Benedetto asked Ms. Desantis if she has a copy of the Revised Contract, and Ms. Desantis stated she would have to locate it because of all the moves she had to make it is very difficult. She stated she did ask Mr. Fedorchak that she be provided copies of all Contracts, and he said he did not have them. Mr. Fedorchak stated this is not true. Mr. Benedetto asked if she could be provided a copy of the new Agreement. Mr. McLaughlin stated they are getting a list of items that need to be rectified and Mr. Eisold and Mr. Garton will sign off on this and they will provide it to Ms. Desantis to review, and the next step would be to secure a contractor to perform that work; and Mr. Fedorchak agreed. Ms. Desantis stated she asked Mr. Fedorchak to provide her with all Contracts signed by her and Mr. Sakoutis, and he indicated that Mr. Majewski had them all. Mr. McLaughlin asked if that is relevant to getting her into her home, and Ms. Desantis stated it is relevant to her attorney. Mr. McLaughlin stated he feels they should first focus on getting her back into her house, and then they can pursue the legal aspects.

Ms. Desantis stated while she agrees with this, the problem she has is that today she spoke to three of her neighbors who experienced elevations through the Township; and there was a recurring theme of being told it will cost one amount, and then told later it will cost tens of thousands more. Ms. Desantis stated Mrs. Duffy was not able to follow through because she did not have the funds to do so. Ms. Desantis stated she herself was able to trade out certain aspects of the project and had other funds which are now gone. She stated there is a recurring theme where a Grant is given through PEMA and given to the individual residents who are expected to pay their share, and then they are told they need another \$30,000.

Mr. Benedetto asked if you cannot afford it, does the Township take your property; and Ms. Desantis stated Carolyn Weaver who works on the Grants indicated that the Township would acquire the property as an option. Ms. Desantis stated this disturbed Mrs. Duffy a great deal as she had already put in several thousand dollars into the project which was nonrefundable. Ms. Desantis stated this is a lot of money for a retired woman. Mr. McLaughlin asked Ms. Desantis if she is stating that if you do not elevate your house, the Township will buy it; and Ms. Desantis stated this was the impression that Mrs. Duffy got. Mr. McLaughlin stated the Township is not in the business of buying houses that are not elevated.

Mr. Fedorchak stated there are two programs available to the residents. He stated the first is the elevation project which they have been discussing. Mr. Stainthorpe stated it should be made clear that this is not a Township program, but rather is a program from PEMA and FEMA; and the Township just administers it.

Mr. Fedorchak stated the Township is trying to be helpful on behalf of the residents, and they are accessing two programs that FEMA has available for residents who are experiencing these chronic flooding situations to help them out. He stated the first is the elevation and the second is the acquisition. He stated the residents have the opportunity to go one way or the other. He stated he believes that there have been three elevation projects in Lower Makefield and one acquisition project. He stated for the most part, with the exception of Ms. Desantis' situation, they went reasonably well.

Mr. Fedorchak stated there is some truth to Ms. Desantis' statement about the increased costs. He stated when you are raising a house that has been there for forty to fifty years that has experienced a number of floods, once the house has been raised, they find that there is perhaps much more wrong with the house than what was first thought. He stated this accounts in many cases why the costs may go up. Ms. Desantis stated this is not what happened since her house had not yet been elevated. Mr. Fedorchak stated what has also been problematic over the last three years with this program is that FEMA, while trying to be helpful, tends to be a "moving target" as far as certain construction requirements; and they may change something mid-stream within a project. He stated it is therefore a challenge for the Township and the residents to work with FEMA. He stated he still feels this is a good program for the residents, and the Township should continue to be involved in it; and despite problems they have had in the past, in every case, they have been worked out. Mr. Fedorchak stated Mr. Sakoutis was also a contractor for another project; and while it did not go perfectly, they did finish the project.

Mr. Dobson asked if the contractor indicates it will cost a certain amount and FEMA agrees to pay that amount, and then they find out there are other issues, does the homeowner or the Township acting on their behalf have any recourse to go back to FEMA to advise them it will cost more; and Mr. Fedorchak stated they do. He stated this is exactly what they are doing in this particular case, and they have gone back to FEMA and are having discussions with them about acquiring additional funds.

Mr. Benedetto stated Ms. Desantis has discussed damage to personal property on a number of occasions. Mr. Benedetto stated Ms. Desantis indicated she had a discussion with Mr. Fedorchak who had stated there was an offer of \$25,000 for damage to her personal property, and Ms. Desantis agreed that this was around July 21. Mr. Benedetto stated Ms. Desantis indicated that this would not be enough, and Mr. Fedorchak requested an itemized cost which was approximately \$32,800; and Ms. Desantis agreed. Mr. Benedetto asked Ms. Desantis if it is her understanding

that money is from the Township or from FEMA. Ms. Desantis stated she has no idea. She stated she left a message with Mr. Fedorchak and indicated she was going to continue with her plan to contact the media and the Attorney General's office, and "uncharacteristically" he returned her call in seven minutes. She stated during that call he indicated that he would offer up to \$25,000 to replace her personal items. She stated she advised him knowing everything that had been destroyed, that this would not be enough. She stated Mr. Fedorchak asked for an itemized list which she did, and he returned her e-mail indicating he felt the \$32,000 was manageable; however, she had no idea how at a moment's notice he could offer her \$25,000.

Mr. Fedorchak stated once again he challenges this, and he never gave Ms. Desantis a hard number of \$25,000. He stated he does recall that the first time she sent him a list of outstanding construction items and damages that when he looked at those lists, he did make the statement to her that he felt the numbers were manageable. He stated since then Ms. Desantis has revised those numbers three times significantly upward, and that is what they are dealing with now; and this is what Mr. Garton is handling on the Township's behalf

Mr. Benedetto asked where the money would come from if it is manageable, and Mr. Fedorchak stated he feels a good piece of this would go back on the contractor. Mr. Benedetto asked if they are going to pay her from Township funds and then get reimbursed from the Contractor, and Mr. Fedorchak stated these are the details that they are working out with Mr. Garton working on the Township's behalf. Mr. Benedetto asked if there was an offer of \$25,000, and Mr. Fedorchak stated absolutely not; however, Ms. Desantis stated her son was with her when this took place, and he could testify as to that.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated they are moving the process forward and the primary objective is to get Ms. Desantis back into her house. Ms. Desantis stated she feels it should never have come to this point, and Mr. McLaughlin stated they all agree with this. Ms. Desantis stated with regard to transparency, the Board was surprised two weeks ago that this was taking place; and she questions what else the Township Manager does without the Board's knowledge. She stated since the Board did not know about this, there may be other things they do not know about.

Mr. Benedetto stated he feels she should at least be included in meetings moving forward. Ms. Tyler stated there is the potential for litigation, and Mr. Garton agreed. Mr. Garton added it was premature to include Ms. Desantis in the meetings until he understood all the issues. He stated she will be provided the list tomorrow; and he assumes that once she gets the list there will be the need for further discussion with her to try to come to a resolution. Ms. Desantis stated she does have a contractor who is ready to proceed. Mr. Garton stated they also feel he is a good option.

Ms. Lisa Gage, 1117 Glen Oak Drive, stated she is present representing the Interfaith Community of Lower Bucks which is partnering with the Khalsa Healing Arts Center to hold the Second Annual Day of Peace at Buttonwood Park in Yardley on September 21 from 12 to 6. She reviewed the events to take place that day.

Mr. John Lewis, 1550 Surrey Brook Court, stated on July 17, 2013 the Board approved a Bond Issue which included \$248,000 in Capital improvements at the Golf Course. He stated part of the investment was entry into the wedding business with a tent for banquets and weddings. He asked how many weddings have been hosted since the tent was installed. Mr. Dobson stated the tent has not been installed, and they are in negotiation now with a company that would do this for the Golf Course.

Mr. Fedorchak stated the amount set aside was \$400,000 for several capital improvements on the Golf Course. He stated one of the initiatives was expanding the food and beverage aspect. Mr. Stainthorpe stated initially they were discussing buying a tent and running this through the Golf Course management company, but they are no longer pursuing that option. He stated they are in discussion with Open Aire Affairs who is in the wedding business and had managed the tent at Elm Lowne. He stated Open Aire Affairs would put in the pad, buy and install the tent, and manage it; and the Township will share in the revenue. He stated he feels this is a better way to proceed since Open Aire Affairs knows the wedding business. He stated the objective is to increase the food and beverage revenue at the Course, and they feel this is a good alternative.

Mr. Lewis asked when this decision was made since they borrowed the money last year and are paying interest on it. Mr. McLaughlin stated in that \$400,000 were other Capital improvements, but costs for the projects came in higher than estimated. Mr. Fedorchak stated several months ago, the Golf management company put together several cost proposals for the tent and the anticipated expansion of the kitchen. He stated when those costs came in, they were substantially higher than what was originally anticipated. He stated everyone agreed this was not the way to proceed, and they looked for a Plan B. He stated the Golf Committee and the Citizens Budget Committee developed a variety of alternatives and came up with the proposal that Mr. Stainthorpe identified which they may be able to implement at very little cost to the Golf Course.

Mr. McLaughlin stated there was a leak in the pond liner which took up much of the \$400,000. He stated if they follow the proposal, the Golf Course will still have the ability to have a banquet facility to be managed and built by another party; and the Township will get a percent of the revenue

Mr. Lewis stated when they were discussing the Bond Issue last year, they discussed the amount of revenue to be realized; and at that time Mr. Attara indicated it could be approximately \$100,000 in revenue. He asked if they have a new estimate, and Mr. McLaughlin stated he feels they should re-visit this now that the plan has changed. Mr. Dobson stated they are still working on the details of this. Mr. Tyler stated Mr. Joe Menard and Mr. Rodger Owen will be coming to the Board with a presentation on their cost estimates and the amount of revenues to be realized going forward with the Plan in place that has been described. Mr. Dobson stated he feels the \$100,000 number is still the number they are discussing.

Mr. Lewis stated he feels this relates to a lack of transparency if they borrow a large amount of money, hold it for a year, do not tell people what is happening with the money, and do not earn any revenue; and this is a cause for concern. He stated he feels the Board should look into this more given the past failure at Elm Lowne with the wedding business. He stated while they are outsourcing this, the revenue should be significant because there are impacts to people who live next to the Golf Course who have not been consulted in this process. Mr. Lewis asked if this will be limited to April to October or all year round, and Mr. Stainthorpe stated they have not worked out all the details. Mr. Dobson stated they were discussing April to October and he feels it behooves the Board to work out the Agreement with Open Aire Affairs so that they can get the infrastructure built at their expense so they can start selling these affairs.

Mr. Fedorchak stated they are in the process of working on items at the Golf Course. Mr. Dobson stated by the end of the year money will be spent on the kitchen, a bridge, and restrooms.

Mr. Lewis stated he is concerned about how the Township manages Capital projects. He stated in his business they have recurring analysis of how Capital projects are being managed to see if the project is on time, on Budget, and if it has the same scope as it did originally. He stated the community is providing the tax dollars for this investment which did not pay out, and they deserve to know this as do the Board members.

Mr. McLaughlin stated listed on tonight's Agenda is the Mid Year Financial Report which is the opportunity for the Board to be transparent with the citizens about how they are doing versus the Budget. He stated they do this quarterly. He stated he does not feel it is reasonable for Mr. Fedorchak to report on every single Capital project. He stated at the last meeting there was a discussion on the Road Projects. Mr. Lewis stated it is of concern when the data is not up to date and they are not sure of the status of projects. Mr. McLaughlin stated they did not have financial reviews before this Board of Supervisors were on the Board, and this Board

mandated that there be a quarterly review of the financials. Mr. Lewis stated the Citizens Budget Committee pre dates the current Board that is in place. Mr. McLaughlin stated they still did not have financial reviews at Township meetings prior to most of the current Board members being on the Board. Mr. McLaughlin stated in reviewing the Record, you would see that he was the one who mandated this to make sure that they had accurate and consistent reviews of the financials.

Mr. Fedorchak advised Mr. Lewis that no taxpayer dollars are being invested in the Golf Course, and it is totally self-supporting. Mr. Lewis stated it is 47% of the debt. Mr. McLaughlin stated the users of the Golf Course pay for that debt, and no taxpayer dollars pay for that debt. Mr. Lewis asked if this is true for the \$400,000 in the Capital Budget, and he was advised that this is paid for by the Golf Course. Mr. Benedetto stated that is true for now; but they will see when the “bubble bursts,” and revenue is not coming in.

Mr. Benedetto stated with regard to the management of Capital projects, he had asked for the ball fields to be put on the Agenda; but it was not put on the Agenda. Mr. Benedetto stated at the meeting on August 20 there was an engineering report, and the Community Center and ball fields could have been added to that. He stated the ball fields should be discussed tonight because there are a lot of concerns by members of the public and himself about managing projects. Mr. Benedetto stated he agrees with a resident who indicated “If someone ran their business like this, they would go bankrupt.” Mr. McLaughlin asked why the Township has such an excellent Bond Rating if this is true. He stated their Bond Rating is AA1 and only two other Townships in the Commonwealth have a higher rating than Lower Makefield.

Mr. Benedetto stated he is not comfortable with how they are managing the Community Center or the ball fields; and there are people filling the room tonight, including the Planning Commission and PAA, who are concerned.

Mr. Lewis stated he feels the Board benefits itself by being transparent even if they just put something on the Website listing where they stand on the Capital projects. Mr. McLaughlin stated there are a significant number of Capital projects taking place at the current time including sewer projects and infrastructure projects, and he questions how they could go through a list of every Capital project and provide a status report at a meeting. Mr. Lewis stated if they are spending over \$50,000 or \$100,000 of taxpayer money he feels they should put together a spread showing if they are on time and on Budget which would quell a lot of concerns.

Ms. Sue Herman, Foxwood Drive, stated she is a proponent of open space preservation and voted yes on the 2008 Referendum. She asked what they need to do to get the Patterson Farm preserved in perpetuity at little or no cost.

Mr. Garton stated as he noted previously they could record a Unilateral Declaration of Restrictions and Covenants and provide the right to enforce that to a third party so that a future Board could not set it aside. Ms. Herman asked the Board to make a Motion to do this.

Ms. Tyler stated when they add the third party to the Patterson Farm, they will have lost some aspect of control over the property. She stated if they can obtain Grant money for placing an Easement to benefit the taxpayers, perhaps that is the better way to pursue preservation. She stated she does not feel it is a good idea to give up control of the Patterson Farm with a third party in there which is why they did not move forward with the Heritage Conservancy. She stated she hopes that they will move forward with the Application Mr. Fedorchak discussed this evening, and they will then get additional funds for locking down that property.

Mr. Benedetto stated he would like to make “that” Motion.

Ms. Herman asked that they put in layman’s terms the pros and cons of the third party situation with the Heritage Conservancy. Mr. Benedetto stated there are other groups beyond the Heritage Conservancy including the Land Trust. He stated he was not in favor of the Heritage Conservancy’s presentation because Mr. Marshall spoke on behalf of the Veterinarian for the Satterthwaite property which he feels is an automatic “no.” Mr. Benedetto stated with the greenhouse they had to have this signed off by the County so he does not see what the difference is between the Land Trust or the County having a say in this. He stated having someone else have a say is the point of having those other layers of protection so that the Supervisors would not have the ability to sell off Patterson Farm if they needed money.

Ms. Herman stated she hears that there are pros and cons involved with the “free” route, and she asked that they get information on this and have the different groups evaluated who could be the third parties. She stated she would like this done before they spend \$430,000. Ms. Tyler stated they are not spending \$430,000 – they are receiving it. Ms. Herman stated this is money they are receiving that they cannot use to buy other space. She stated she would prefer buying other open space if they can.

Mr. McLaughlin stated he feels the facilities at Patterson Farm are in disrepair, and he would like to see the Township get the \$438,000 from the County and put it into the House and see that the barn is preserved. He stated he feels a prudent use of open space money is to purchase land that the Township people can have some enjoyment of, and he does not feel buying one acre parcels here and there provides value to the taxpayer.

Ms. Herman stated she believes that the EAC indicated that there were twenty acre parcels; however, Mr. McLaughlin stated they only have \$438,000, and that would not buy twenty acres. He stated there is an opportunity to preserve Patterson Farm in perpetuity as well as receive \$438,000 which he hopes would be put into the structures at Patterson Farm. Ms. Herman asked if this means that the House could not then be sold, and Mr. McLaughlin stated no one came forward to express interest in it once it was subdivided other than the Veterinarian. He noted the Veterinarian issue is still in litigation. Mr. McLaughlin stated while he is just one Board member, he would like to put the \$438,000 they will get from Bucks County into the House.

Mr. McLaughlin stated it has been indicated that they did not spend any of the Bond Referendum money, but they did spend \$3.5 million on the Golf Course. He stated with regard to the Satterthwaite House this is an opportunity to fix the House, and they do not have other funds to do this since there are other competing interests that the Township has to consider. Ms. Herman asked if they would put the \$438,000 into the House and then sell it to the Veterinarian, and Mr. McLaughlin stated he did not state this. Ms. Herman stated the property is for sale, and the Veterinarian wants to buy it.

Ms. Herman stated she feels the Township could have raised money to upkeep the House, and the public would be willing to work on the House. Mr. McLaughlin stated it was very hard for the Veterans group to raise the money they needed for the Veterans monument; however, Ms. Herman stated they did this on their own. Mr. McLaughlin stated it took them over five years to raise \$125,000, and the Satterthwaite House needs \$500,000. He stated what he is suggesting is a win/win situation because they can have preservation in perpetuity for free. Ms. Herman stated she would still like to see a layman's form of the pros and cons of a third party preserving it in perpetuity at no cost. Mr. McLaughlin stated he feels every other third party would probably have the same issues as did the Heritage Conservancy. Mr. Dobson stated other Townships have also tried to find third parties that would do this at no cost, but have been unable to find them. Mr. Dobson stated he would like to get as much money as they can for any open space that is available to the Township.

Mr. McLaughlin stated Lower Makefield is not limited to the \$438,000 as other Townships have been giving back their allotments to the County because they cannot find adequate candidates so there is more money available. He stated when they apply for the Grant, they will apply for more than the \$438,000. Ms. Herman stated she would like the Township to apply for what they need to purchase the twenty acre parcels. Mr. Dobson stated they will ask for as much as they can get. He stated he feels this discussion is premature as to what they will eventually do; and once they get the money, they can decide what they are going to do with it.

Ms. Herman asked Mr. Garton if any Township has successfully preserved property in perpetuity with a third party. Mr. Benedetto stated there is a Township in Bucks County that had the Heritage Conservancy and the Land Trust come in, and they were evaluating the different pros and cons. Mr. Benedetto stated the Township is filling out an Application that has Patterson Farm as the land they are preserving. Mr. Dobson stated that does not mean that they have to spend the money on Patterson Farm. He stated the Application is to get the money; and if the Township gets the money the County indicates that the Township can do what they want with it. He stated once they get as much money as they can, they will discuss what to do with the money.

Mr. Benedetto stated the Bucks County Advance lists a specific Municipal Open Space Grant in Tullytown in the amount of \$295,000 for the development of a Canal and Park. He stated each Township has designated a use for the funds when they apply for them. He stated to be filing an Application without indicating what they are going to do with the funds is not transparent, and they should tell the public what they are going to do with the money.

Ms. Herman again asked Mr. Garton if any Townships have preserved property in perpetuity with a third party; and Mr. Garton stated they have, and he noted Upper Makefield, Buckingham and Doylestown Township. Ms. Herman asked if they have experienced negative results; however, Mr. Garton could not answer this. He stated Upper Makefield did it as part of a cooperative venture with a developer and it was a very complicated process. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels fifteen years ago there was a development in the Township off of Oxford Valley Road where there was a relationship with the Heritage Conservancy although he did not know the specifics. He stated while he is not in favor of the Heritage Conservancy, there are other groups such as the Land Trust; and he would like to have the Land Trust come in and make a presentation.

Mr. Benedetto stated he did make a Motion to Ms. Herman's point, and when asked for a clarification on his Motion he stated Mr. Garton could revisit the comment. Ms. Herman stated while she asked that the Motion be made, she now needs more information rather than a Motion.

Ms. Herman asked who people can talk to at the other Townships about the downside to having a third party. Mr. Garton stated she could talk to the Township Manager in Buckingham, and Ms. Herman asked that individual's name. Mr. Garton suggested Ms. Herman e-mail him, and he could provide her some names.

Mr. Benedetto stated his Motion is Mr. Garton's comment about how they could do it without any cost to preserve Patterson Farm. Mr. Garton stated he did not say they could do it without any cost, he stated they could do it with a third party. Mr. Garton stated he indicated they could unilaterally file a Declaration to preserve it, and would need a third party participant to enforce it so it could not be undone by a future Board.

Ms. Herman stated she had asked what steps needed to be taken to do it at little or no cost because she felt that was an idea that had been discussed a number of times. She asked about the costs associated with this; and Mr. Garton stated it would depend on the property and what needs to be preserve, and there is no finite number. Ms. Herman asked if it would be significantly less than the \$438,000, and Mr. Garton stated he believed so. Mr. Benedetto stated the Township can direct Mr. Garton to write an Easement with no third party involved, although other Boards could come in and overturn that. He asked if this is another option.

Ms. Tyler stated she feels they should continue this discussion at another time since they still need to discuss the Community Center this evening and it is already 9:05.

Mr. Benedetto asked Mr. Garton to answer his question whether the Supervisors have the ability to pass a Conservation Easement or Resolution to preserve the Farm that subsequent Boards could overturn it, and Mr. Garton agreed.

Mr. Benedetto stated "that" is his Motion.

Other Board members indicated they did not understand what the Motion was.

What was believed to be the Motion was read back as follows: "File a Unilateral Declaration of Restrictions and Covenants and provide the right to enforce to a third party." Ms. Tyler stated she feels this conflicts with the Application they have pending. Mr. Garton stated he does not believe Mr. Benedetto stated, "with a third party."

Mr. Stainthorpe stated at the last meeting, the Board voted to apply to the County, and he feels they should continue with that to see where it goes. He stated he would be willing to put that money into an Open Space Account so that the Township controls the money and not the County. He stated they would give them the development rights to the Paterson Farm which would be the third party, and the Township would then have the money to set aside for open space.

Mr. Benedetto withdrew his Motion.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Stainthorpe moved, Mr. McLaughlin seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of August 20, 2014 as written.

DISCUSSION OF COMMUNITY CENTER LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Mr. Mark Eisold was present with Mr. Ron Jackson from his office and the architect, Mr. George Hibbs. Mr. Eisold stated at the March 5 Board of Supervisors meeting, Mr. Hibbs provided a number of Options for the Community Center. He stated at that meeting Option 3 was selected which was a 7,600 square foot building showing a location set off the road and a portion into the wooded area between the ball field sites – Fred Allan and the new Samost ball fields.

Mr. Jackson showed a copy of the Land Development Plan showing the location of an approximately 7,500 square foot building based on a footprint provided by the architect. Mr. Eisold stated in addition they have shown a number of parking spaces in front of the building along Oxford Valley Road and along the side and rear of the building. He stated to the north above the parking area is a triangular area which will be an above-ground stormwater detention basin. He stated there is parking along the bottom to the left, and there is a center aisle with regular pavement, and the lighter gray is pervious pavement. He stated that parking lot will actually contain quite a bit of stone underneath that will act as additional stormwater BMPs to filter the water and control the run off from the site. Mr. Eisold stated there are also a number of trees shown around the area. Lighting is also shown. He stated this Plan is basically in agreement with Option 3 which was selected by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Eisold stated once the Land Development Plans were prepared, they were submitted to the Township on June 30, 2014. He stated there is no Zoning relief required for the Community Center on the site at this location even though at one point initially they felt that some Zoning relief may be required. Mr. Eisold stated even though they have been calling this a "Community Center," per the Township's Ordinance it is actually classified as a "Public Recreation Facility." He stated a Community Center is something not typically owned by a Municipality. He stated he consulted about this with Mr. Garton who reviewed all the details and determined that from a Zoning standpoint this would be described as a Public Recreation Facility. He stated it is a facility owned by the public for the use of the public.

Mr. Eisold stated they have received a number of review letters from the different Boards and Commissions within the Township. He stated they have also received a review letter from the Bucks County Planning Commission. He stated they have also attended two Township Planning Commission meetings to discuss the design details and lay out of the project. Mr. Eisold stated the majority of the letters they received had a number of comments, and some of them involve changes to the Plan set which have not yet been made.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated he would like to give the Planning Commission the chance to review this at another meeting.

Mr. Benedetto stated when they were before the Planning Commission on July 28, there were some Zoning issues presented at that time apart from calling it a Community Center or some other name. Mr. Eisold stated there were two Zoning issues if this were considered a Community Center, and they were getting to the point where they were going to submit for a Variance before the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated they researched this further with Mr. Garton, and it was determined at that time that the facility was not really a Community Center but a Public Recreation Facility; and with that change in terminology those two issues that would have required Zoning relief were not part of the Public Recreation Facility Zoning requirements. Mr. Benedetto stated he felt there were more than two; however, Mr. Eisold stated there were only two Zoning issues although there were other Subdivision and Land Development comments.

Mr. McLaughlin stated there is an Ordinance with regard to LEED Certification, and he asked if this complies with that. Mr. Eisold stated this did come up at the Planning Commission meeting. He stated while the LEED Certification is related to the whole site, it is more particular to the building itself. Mr. McLaughlin also asked for a brief synopsis of the LEED Certification.

Mr. Hibbs stated LEED is a way in which one can define environmental sustainability, and it is a set of guidelines and principles that one can follow, with certain options, to provide a facility or building that is more sustainable than another. He stated there are a series of divisions within LEED that speak to the site, the building, indoor air quality, finishes, etc.; and there are differentiations between the Base Level Certification which is the minimal LEED Certification. He stated above Certification there is Silver, Gold, and Platinum. He stated with LEED and the Certification there are also some issues that third party consultants need to confirm.

Mr. Hibbs stated this project is not required to be LEED Certified. He stated the requirement states, "The Township may, but shall not be required to, apply for and obtain official Certification under the then current standard. In the event that the Township determines that it is not necessary, appropriate, or prudent to apply for Certification, the Township by and through its Green Building Administrator shall verify that the documentation required to achieve at a minimum the LEED Silver rating has been properly completed and processed." Mr. Hibbs stated this means that the Township building should meet the general standards of LEED Silver, but they are not required to go through the process of submitting it to the Green Building Council and have the full commissioning done and receive a plaque. Mr. Hibbs stated the Township is requiring that it be a sustainable facility and meet certain levels and requirements, but they will not go through the paperwork.

Mr. McLaughlin asked the cost to certify, and Mr. Hibbs stated it depends on the type and size of the building; but in general he has seen it cost up to 5% to 30% more.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated at one point he felt Mr. Hibbs indicated it would meet the LEED Silver requirements, but that they were not going to go through the Certification process. Mr. Hibbs stated this is correct, and they are aiming to meet the LEED Silver; but the issue becomes since there is not a Certification process, he would like to have the conversation with the Green Building Administrator since there is a catalog of items, and there are differentiations in the point structure.

Mr. McLaughlin asked Mr. Fedorchak who is the Green Building Administrator, and Mr. Fedorchak stated he is not sure if it is Ms. Frick or one of the members of the EAC.

Mr. Benedetto stated Mr. Hibbs is indicating that the LEED Silver Certification is not required by the Ordinance; and Mr. Hibbs stated it is an issue of semantics, and the Township by Ordinance is required to have a sustainable building and to follow the guidelines so that it is an equivalency of LEED Silver. He stated the LEED Silver Certification is a paperwork process that the Township is not required to do.

Ms. Tyler asked if the Plans have been drafted to provide that equivalency, and Mr. Hibbs stated they believe that they are on the threshold of meeting LEED Silver which is a step above LEED Certification so it is one level above the base.

Mr. Benedetto stated he feels Makefield Elementary and an office building on Big Oak Road are LEED Certified. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he believes that Makefield Elementary and 777 Township Line Road are. Mr. Benedetto stated there are buildings that were recently approved that are holding to the Ordinance; however, Mr. Stainthorpe stated the Ordinance only covers new construction of Township Buildings. Mr. McLaughlin stated a builder can build it to be LEED Certified, but they are not required to do so. Mr. Benedetto asked if building it to the LEED Certified standard would impact the square footage as he understood that it would potentially be a smaller footprint if they went through the process; and Mr. Hibbs stated if they went through the process, there would be a cost associated with the process that as of today is not part of the project. Mr. Benedetto asked if it would effect the size of the project in terms of square footage; and Mr. Hibbs stated the way in which it is currently designed to meet the guidelines of LEED Silver, they believe they are just meeting the threshold. Mr. Hibbs stated while the engineers' documents are ready for construction, the architectural documents are only the plan and elevation. Mr. Benedetto stated he was concerned that the Option approved was for the square footage, and he asked if that has been impacted by anything so that it is a smaller footprint; and Mr. Hibbs stated it is still the same as the approved Option 3 at 7,600 square feet. He stated they are however still at the schematic stage architecturally so that some of these issues that relate to LEED will come out in the process. He stated he has done a summation of the points, and it gets into the minutia of the project, and architecturally they are not there yet. He stated there is a matrix that they need to solve.

Mr. Eisold stated from the Land Development side, they did submit the Erosion and Sedimentation Control to the Bucks County Conservation District in June; and based on the Plans they submitted to them at that time, they did receive the approval. He stated the Bucks County NPDES Permit is still being reviewed, and they expect to hear from them in a few weeks. Mr. Eisold stated on June 30 there was a letter sent to Ms. Frick that included a number of Waivers which could be discussed further.

Mr. Hibbs showed a copy of the floor plan of the interior of the building. He stated this is the Revised Option 3 which is the 7,600 square foot Option from the March 5 presentation. He stated the overall square footage remains the same. He stated at that presentation, there was some debate in terms of getting to that selection; and at the end of the meeting it was determined it was really about the 7,600 square feet and not really where the boxes were and moving the pieces.

Mr. Hibbs stated there was a small work-out facility; however, due to liability and security concerns, that was deemed not appropriate for this facility. He stated the space itself was retained, but the equipment was removed. He stated there was also a game room which had fixed tables which limited that space within the overall facility. He stated they are trying to have each space be as multi-functional as possible such that the entire Township and lots of organizations can utilize the facility but no one would have a lock on the door for any of these spaces.

Mr. Hibbs noted a tan portion on the Plan which represents the entry vestibule, the lobby, and a corridor. Off of that there are a series of light blue colors off the lobby that represent a reception area and an office. He stated his recommendation is that there should be someone at the facility who people using the facility could go to in the event of an emergency or for scheduling. He stated off to the left of the reception/office area is a classroom that could be utilized with tables that could go together to form larger groups or separated to form smaller groups. He stated this could be used as a card or game room or a meeting place. He stated on the opposite end is another classroom. He stated they also are looking to have storage areas that can be locked. He stated the different organizations could have a closet which could be locked. Mr. Hibbs noted a meeting/Conference room which is another multi-purpose space. He noted the pink colored area which is the large multi-purpose room which would be 42' by 48' with small closets on either side. He stated there are also a series of coat closets that open off onto the corridor. Mr. Hibbs stated the large multi-purpose room is divisible by a folding partition so that it can be divided and still have means of egress out in case of emergency. He also noted the kitchen which has residential-scale appliances; and it is not a full, commercial kitchen. He also noted the location of the mechanical room and the restrooms.

Mr. Benedetto asked what these decisions were based on. Ms. Tyler stated she has been involved in meetings with the engineer, the architect, the Seniors, and the various organizations such as PAA, YMS, football, and Scout groups. She stated there was also discussion about this potentially being a shelter in times of need and this was discussed with Chief Coluzzi. She stated the overriding purpose of the building is to serve as many of the people in the community as possible, particularly the Seniors.

Mr. Benedetto stated he was at the Planning Commission and numerous people from the community indicated they were not part of the process. He stated at the last Planning Commission meeting there were people present who still felt the site had not been chosen yet. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels they could have sent a survey out to community members to get feedback. He stated he understands the Seniors are going to be using a lot of the facility and might have been part of the process from the beginning, but he feels that six months have gone by and they have come up with

this Plan, and he does not know where this came from and he is sure that there are other people who do not know where this came from either. He stated while Ms. Tyler stated they talked to all these groups, he does not feel that they did enough.

Mr. McLaughlin stated they discussed the Options at a public meeting where the public could come and voice their opinions. Mr. Benedetto stated at the public meeting held six months ago, there were no details; and now they have details. Mr. Stainthorpe stated at a public meeting the Board did vote on how to configure this. He stated there were Options which were presented to the public, they had input, and the Board decided on this configuration. Mr. Stainthorpe stated this project has been talked about for twelve years and at a number of public meetings over the last two years. Mr. McLaughlin stated it has also been in the newspaper and the Internet. Mr. Stainthorpe stated there was a meeting where they selected the site, and they had a Site Selection Committee so there have been a number of opportunities to have input.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated he feels it should be made clear that while this is a Community Center, the primary function initially will be for the Seniors; and this is how they are looking at the design. He stated he sees that other groups will be able to use it at other times, but currently the group that it is being primarily designed for are the Seniors.

Mr. Benedetto asked if they are going to have a Mission Statement that will state the purpose and that they are not going to allow for outside events, that it will be limited to groups in the Township, and that they will not have outside groups. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he does not feel they should lease it out for weddings or parties, and this is primarily for Senior activities and other groups who have a need for meeting and classroom space.

Mr. Hibbs showed a Sketch of the front elevation as seen from Oxford Valley Road and the rear elevation. He stated they wanted the facility to feel as if it was part of Lower Makefield with regard to the overall palette. He stated they want to use clapboard, horizontal siding, a fieldstone base, asphalt shingles, wood trim, and wood columns. He stated 7,600 square feet is rather large in terms of one story so in terms of making it Residential in scale, this is difficult. He stated the way they have divided the facility up is into a series of gables. He stated most of it is one story, but the multi-purpose room is a story and a half. He also noted the landscaping against the base of the building. He showed the rear of the building which has “punched openings” which allow natural light to come into the space.

Mr. Benedetto asked if the parking is definitively going to be in the front on Oxford Valley Road; and Mr. Hibbs stated per the March 5 Board of Supervisors meeting they had shown more of the parking extending along Oxford Valley Road, but after having discussions about this at the meeting, they tried to split the parking so that approximately half of the parking is off Oxford Valley and approximately half is parallel to the tree line adjacent to the softball complex. Mr. Benedetto asked if there is an ability to access the Fred Allan parking; and Mr. Hibbs stated because there is an existing curb cut off Oxford Valley that is utilized today for that softball parking, the plan was that there would be an open end at a location he showed on the Plan where there is to be pervious paving, and you would be able to continue down through and still park along the tree edge as people do today. He stated while they are structuring a certain number of spaces, there is the ability to expand once there is an overflow due to tournaments. Mr. Hibbs stated over time there is the potential to extend, pave, an connect; but that is not part of the current project.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated rather than debating the issues this evening with the Planning Commission, he would like there to be further discussion with members of the Planning Commission and the Supervisors as to how to move the Land Development forward; and possibly there could be a meeting with two Planning Commission members and two Supervisors. He stated there are a few items listed on the Planning Commission's memo that he does not feel are pertinent to the Land Development piece, but they could discuss this. He stated he would like the Board of Supervisors to get the Land Development portion approved soon. Mr. McLaughlin stated he is ready to proceed this evening. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he would like to get further input from the Planning Commission. Ms. Tyler asked that Ms. Friedman speak about the concerns of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Karen Friedman stated the Planning Commission was very disappointed that they never saw a Sketch Plan so they could have input on the lay out on the property. She stated they were not invited nor did they feel it was necessary to attend a public meeting because there is a process in the Township, and they were expecting the Sketch Plan would come before the Planning Commission as opposed to a full set of blueprints being presented with all the decisions having been made. She stated while the Planning Commission only had two meetings to address this, they have come up with something different taking into account public input. Ms. Friedman stated the Planning Commission would like to have one more meeting on this. Ms. Friedman stated the Planning Commission investigated the Grant through Mr. Santarsiero's office, and the Grant expires January, 2016 so there is still time to deal with this appropriately. Ms. Friedman stated she also found out that three months prior to that expiration, you can request an extension.

Ms. Tyler asked what specific concerns does the Planning Commission have with respect to the Plans being presented. Ms. Friedman stated she and Mr. Pazdera went to the site, and they are concerned about how the building is being anchored into the area of the woods she showed on the Plan which has one of the steepest slopes on the property. She stated Mr. Pazdera has expertise in this area, and he feels pushing the building into the woodlands and clearing the woods will impact resources and will require backfilling that will cost \$100,000 which could be saved if the building were re-oriented and put at a different location she showed on the Plan. She stated this would put the building on flatter land, they would impact much less of the woodlands, and they would save \$100,000 by not having to do the backfill. Ms. Friedman stated she understands there was an issue about bringing utilities to the property; and if that is the case, she feels it is short sighted to proceed with the Plan as shown rather than spending an extra \$50,000 to have it re-oriented. Ms. Friedman stated if the building were re-oriented they could reduce some of the parking in the front, and she showed where parking could be relocated. She noted the Boucher & James 12/7/12 aerial design which showed parking through the cut zone into the Fred Allan fields along the back where the playground is, and she stated that could be used as the overflow for the site and not over impact the Community Center site with so much impervious surface. She stated this would also bring the two properties together so that the ball fields could access the Community Center for restrooms. She stated to do this they would have to re-locate the playground.

Mr. McLaughlin stated the field is used for overflow for the Tournaments, and if they orient the building as she is suggesting, they are giving up any overflow parking for the Tournaments.

Mr. Eisold stated there were two lay-outs originally from Remington Vernick done a number of years ago, and he showed on the Plan where the building was proposed which would have removed the whole tree line and would have grossly impacted the potential for parking in that area. He stated there was also an option to have the building situated right up on Oxford Valley Road, and he believes that the Board had compromised so that the building would be as shown on the current Plan with the building being in the middle. He stated Option #3 was the location selected, and this is what is shown on the Plan being presented.

Mr. Stainthorpe asked if the comment made by Ms. Friedman that it will cost \$100,000 for fill and land work is accurate, and Mr. Eisold stated he does not believe that is accurate. He noted the low spot on the site which is where they propose to have the basin. He stated there will be some grading coming off the building, but it is not that expensive since there will be three feet of stone, and they will not have to take the material away and they can use it on the site. He stated there is a cost to

moving material around, but they felt with the way the patio is shown at the back of the building it will be overlooking the site from a high level which he feels will be very attractive.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if they re-oriented the building as suggested by Ms. Friedman where would they put the overflow parking for the Tournaments; and Mr. Eisold stated although he is not certain, possibly they could access it through Fred Allan and come back at a location he showed on the Plan. Ms. Friedman asked if they could not just park on the grass at a location she showed on the Plan; however, it was noted there is a swale there.

Mr. Hibbs stated he did advise Mr. Pazdera at the Planning Commission meeting that they are trying to even the cut fill; and by not doing what they are proposing on the current Plan, they would need to have a structural retaining wall which would be a very expensive element. He stated they were trying to keep the building site away from the ravine and keep it as tight as they could to the tree line without impacting another tree line he showed on the Plan because that was a visual buffer. He stated a number of neighbors were also not happy with stretching all of the parking along the front. Ms. Friedman stated she feels they need to speak about this in more detail at the 9/8/14 Planning Commission meeting when they will have available the expertise of the rest of the Planning Commission members. She stated because they did not come to the Planning Commission with a Sketch Plan, they had no way to discuss this previously.

Ms. Friedman stated they are trying to minimize the front area of parking and get as much as they can to the back of the building where it will not be as obtrusive for the residents. She stated they also want connectivity to the ball fields, and she is in favor of the Sketch with the parking lot in the back of the Fred Allan field where the playground is.

Ms. Friedman stated she understands that the Seniors have requested a bocce court, a putting green, and a picnic area. She noted an area where these could be located on the Plan. Ms. Friedman stated because they did not come to the Planning Commission with a Sketch Plan, the Planning Commission had no way to provide their input.

Mr. Eisold stated connectivity was discussed, and he feels they could do this in the future; however, the constraints of this project do not allow for all the other improvements within the budget. Ms. Friedman stated they should still be laid out. She stated they made this mistake when they located the baseball fields and did not plan for the Community Center properly.

Mr. Benedetto stated he is concerned about the lighting in the parking lot. He stated he is in favor of the Planning Commission's idea of connecting it through Fred Allan. He stated when there are Tournaments, they can park at the Township Building or at the Pool. Ms. Friedman stated the goal of the Planning Commission was to reduce the parking in the front.

Mr. Eisold stated the Plan shows eighty-five parking spaces which was based on the maximum capacity of the building. He stated this does not mean that they have to install all these spaces. He stated they also wanted to have enough spaces with handicap spaces in front of the building so that especially the Seniors would not have far to walk to get to the building. He stated they also have additional parking in the back which is pervious paving to accommodate more people when there are larger functions. Mr. Eisold stated there is also the option to park on grass behind that if there is an even larger affair. He stated looking at the topography from Oxford Valley Road, it drops down and then goes up, so you will see the building, and the parking is sitting down somewhat. He stated they are also discussion landscaping the berm along Oxford Valley Road.

Ms. Friedman stated the Planning Commission has a lot of good ideas and ideas from the citizens they would like to work with which is why they requested more time to consider this to come up with a Plan they feel is more palatable as they do not feel the existing Plan meets what they would like to see from a planning perspective.

Ms. Friedman questioned why the setbacks do not apply simply because they are changing the name of the project, and Mr. Eisold stated Mr. Garton reviewed the Use and it was found that it is not a Community Center according to the Use Standards, and the requirements for the 100' setback only applied to the Community Center Use and not the Public Recreation Facility Use.

Ms. Friedman stated with regard to LEED, the Ordinance does request that the Township adhere to the LEED standards; and the Planning Commission feels it is important to adhere to that because the building will be expensive to maintain, and they feel a little extra cost up front will pay for itself within a certain number of years and going forward will be very efficient. She stated the Planning Commission recognizes that they do not expect them to go for the Certification which could be an expensive process, but they would like the building to be built at that level.

Mr. Benedetto asked their opinion of the façade; and Ms. Friedman stated the Planning Commission was unhappy with it, and they feel it looks institutional. Mr. McLaughlin stated it is not a house; however, Ms. Friedman stated they originally felt it was going to be a Senior Center, and it could have been a smaller building with a more Colonial look that would have fit into the neighborhood.

Mr. McLaughlin stated he agrees with Mr. Stainthorpe that the Planning Commission should have an additional meeting to review the Plan; but he is not interested in a re-design or moving of the building as they have already discussed this, and the Plan presented seems to be a reasonable compromise. Mr. McLaughlin stated he is concerned about moving the building that would impact the baseball tournament parking. Mr. McLaughlin stated the Board of Supervisors voted on the location and size of the building already. Ms. Friedman stated while it is the purview of the Board of Supervisors to make these decisions, the Planning Commission was not included other than the two recent meetings they had to address it. She stated she feels they could have discussed it a long time ago.

Mr. Garton stated with regard to the parking, they could meet the Zoning Ordinance by putting parking in reserve; and this would provide more green space. He stated if they find they do not need the parking, they would not have to build it.

Mr. Benedetto asked the size of the fitness room, and Mr. Benedetto was reminded that there is no fitness room. Mr. Benedetto stated in the Bucks County Advance on August 24, they indicated that there was a 290 square foot fitness room, so he does not feel this has been a transparent process and there has not been community input. Ms. Tyler advised Mr. Benedetto that if he had been engaged in the process as he should have been, he would have been in discussion with the engineer, architect, and the residents and he would have known what is going on. She stated because Mr. Benedetto does not know, does not mean that the Board is not doing their job. Mr. Benedetto stated the Liaison's responsibility is to provide an update, and the Liaison to the Planning Commission has not been at the Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Tyler stated she has been acting as the Liaison. Mr. McLaughlin stated he was unable to act as the Liaison because of a family medical issue he is involved with on Monday evenings, and he asked Ms. Tyler to act as Liaison because he could not fulfill that assignment.

Mr. Benedetto stated he has attended Planning Commission meetings and participated in Public Comment at the Planning Commission. Mr. Benedetto stated the Planning Commission has indicated they have not been engaged in the process, and he has heard from community members who indicated they have not been involved in the process. He stated there was also an article in the paper ten days ago which he guesses was put out from the Township that indicates there is a fitness room, and now they are changing it. He stated it is a "moving target," and he feels nobody has been fully informed of any of this. He stated they could have easily put a survey out to community members and talked to people in the community other than the Seniors and PAA, etc.

Mr. Zachary Rubin, 1661 Covington Road, asked the size of the main room shown, and Mr. Hibbs stated it is approximately 50' by 50. Mr. Rubin asked how that compares to the existing Township meeting room, and Mr. Hibbs stated the new room is approximately 25% larger than the Township meeting room. Mr. Rubin asked if there is any plan so that it could be expanded to a second floor. Mr. Hibbs stated there is an opportunity to expand it at grade which is why the building was situated the way it was, but they do not want to go to a second floor as it would require two means of egress and an elevator. Mr. Rubin noted the wood columns in the front, and since wood deteriorates over time, he feels they should have a maintenance free exterior; and Mr. Hibbs stated they will look at composite materials that will be acceptable within LEED.

Ms. Lynn Buie-Carter, Disabled Persons Advisory Board, stated they would like to be able to review the Plans as to accessibility. Mr. Fedorchak asked that she provide her contact information to Mr. Hibbs. Mr. Stainthorpe stated the Disabled Persons Advisory Board reviews all the Plans that come before them to insure that there is accessibility and enough handicap parking. Ms. Buie-Carter stated so that there is accessibility for Seniors, they would not want a big slope to get to the building particularly when it is icy. Ms. Buie-Carter stated they also need to meet ADA requirements for accessibility in the restrooms. Mr. Eisold stated the entrance to the building is actually very smooth. He stated while four handicap spaces were shown originally as required for this amount of parking, the Planning Commission asked that this be increased to eight spaces in the front of the building, and this will be adjusted on the Plan.

Mr. Frank Fazzalore, 921 Queens Drive, asked if they are considering using the eighty-five spaces as overflow for the baseball fields. Mr. Jackson noted an area on the Plan where overflow parking will take place. Mr. Fazzalore asked if this means the Seniors will still have their fifty to sixty parking spaces, and it was noted that this is correct.

Ms. Sarah Spangler-Campanella, 29 Green Ridge Road, asked what is the difference between a Community Center and a Public Recreation Facility and is one more restrictive than the other. Mr. Garton stated a Community Center is not publicly owned and operated. He stated a Public Recreation Facility is owned by a public entity like the Township. He stated the usage is comparable. Ms. Campanella stated when she attended one of the meetings, she asked about a Traffic Impact Study being done; and at that time she was told that would be addressed in front of the Planning Commission, and she has not heard about this being done or scheduled. Mr. Eisold stated the traffic engineer reviewed the Plan, and they did not make a comment on this. Mr. Eisold stated with regard to traffic, they are just moving traffic from the Township Municipal Building to this new facility across the street so it does not appear that they will have that much impact on the traffic. He stated the

traffic will mostly be Seniors during the morning and early afternoon hours, and it will not be during the major peak commuter times. He stated at night, there may be groups meeting there. He stated he does not feel it will create anything different from what is happening currently in the Township Municipal Building with regard to the road network in the vicinity. Mr. Eisold stated the traffic engineer did issue a review letter with a number of good comments that they will take into account.

Ms. Campanella asked if this included any allowance for the possibility of increased traffic on Oxford Valley given the increased train traffic they have been seeing, and Mr. Eisold stated it did not. Ms. Campanella asked if the traffic engineer felt that this might be an issue moving forward. Ms. Tyler stated the Township traffic engineer did not comment on this.

Ms. Catherine Beath, 1049 Countess Drive, thanked Ms. Friedman and the Planning Commission who are trying very hard to listen to the needs of the Seniors and also the residents who surround the building on both sides. Ms. Beath stated while she appreciates that the parking will be slightly depressed, it is still a parking lot; and there will still be cars, and she feels parking lots are ugly. She stated the parking is set back at the Fred Allan and the new ball fields, so she questions why the parking at this new building will look like a “strip mall.” Ms. Beath stated she understands that eighty-five spaces would be the maximum, but there are also eighty-five spaces at Fred Allan next to the building, and there are over three hundred near the Township Building. She stated the number between the Township Building and the Library is approximately ninety spaces which are used by the Library, those using the Township Building, and by the Seniors; and she has never seen it packed.

Ms. Tyler stated she has already had discussions with Mr. Eisold about the number of spaces; and while it is designed for the maximum, and they already intend to allow for the overflow, she feels they should have less pavement at this facility. She stated although they cannot move it all to the side of the building especially the handicapped spaces as they want to use the main entrance, they need to consider how to hide the parking from the existing neighbors. Ms. Tyler stated the Board, the engineers, and the architects have been discussing how to limit the impact on the existing residents since the very beginning. She stated this includes not only Countess residents but those on Waterwheel as well.

Ms. Beath stated this is in the middle of a residential area; and if they are considering eighty-five parking spaces, it will also involve more lights. Ms. Beath stated they could reduce the number of parking spaces and put in a path so that those using the Community Center could park on the next lot where there are eight-five spaces. Ms. Tyler stated this is fine for other users, but will not work for the Seniors so they do have to provide for the Seniors. Ms. Beath stated while

she understands that there are Seniors who cannot walk, she is a Senior and she just had both hips replaced, and walking is good for you. She stated they should not assume that just because people are older, they cannot walk.

Ms. Beath stated she understands the setback from the road is 20'; however, Mr. Eisold stated he believes it is 30' from the road. Ms. Beath stated as a homeowner she has to have 15' for the sidewalk and another 25' of a buffer easement which is 40'. She feels the Township Building should have more of a buffer than a home. Ms. Tyler stated it will be whatever is required by the Ordinance. Mr. Eisold stated it is 40' for the parking – not the building.

Ms. Beath asked that the residents along those roads be advised when they are going to start construction so that the residents can make appropriate plans. Ms. Tyler stated when the construction schedule comes out, they could provide notice to those who have been notified previously about the development.

Ms. Friedman thanked Ms. Tyler for all she has done at the Planning Commission meetings. She agreed to be in contact with Mr. Stainthorpe after the Planning Commission meeting on September 8.

APPROVAL OF DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR FREEMAN'S FARM

Mr. Garton stated the Board approved this Development, and the Development Agreement includes the Conditions of Approval. He stated the developer has posted the Letters of Credit.

Mr. Stainthorpe moved and Mr. McLaughlin seconded to approve the Development Agreement for Freeman's Farm.

Mr. Benedetto asked if all the Conditions of Approval have been included, and Mr. Garton stated as he noted they have all been incorporated. Mr. Benedetto stated there was a question about access roads, and Mr. Harvie came from the Falls Township Board of Supervisors. Mr. Benedetto asked if this is still to be for emergency vehicles only, and Mr. Garton agreed. Mr. Benedetto asked about construction vehicles as Mr. Harvie requested that Lower Makefield not use that as an access point, and Mr. Garton stated the Township engineer directs the construction access points. Mr. Eisold stated there is no desire to use that neighborhood for access, and they will come off Big Oak Road. Mr. Benedetto stated there was mention of the Fee-In-Lieu and another dollar amount as well for off-site improvements. He asked what the fees are to be used for. Mr. Garton stated the Board decides this. Mr. Benedetto asked if this is typical to have the off-site improvement fees or is this just something Freeman's Farm is doing; and

Mr. Fedorchak stated this is typical, and they have been doing this for several years. Mr. Benedetto asked if this goes into the General Fund, and Mr. Fedorchak stated it goes either into Special Projects or Capital Reserve Funds. Mr. Fedorchak stated they typically earmark it for a Capital type of project such as road resurfacing.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Garton left the meeting at this time.

MID YEAR FINANCE REPORT

Mr. Fedorchak stated this Report has already been posted on the Township Website. He stated on the Website you can also find Township Budgets back to 2007 and seven years worth of Audit Reports.

Mr. Fedorchak stated in general going across all twenty-two Township Funds, with regard to Revenue they are currently at over 60% of what was Budgeted. He noted that most of the Revenues are received in the second quarter of the year which is typical of Government funds particularly the property taxes. Mr. Fedorchak stated Receipts have been coming in a little higher in the General Fund area, higher in the Pool Fund, and slightly lower in Golf. Mr. Fedorchak stated Expenses for all the Government Funds are trending close to last year, realizing 42% of what was Budgeted; however, many of the Capital items will be expensed from this point forward such as the road resurfacing program.

Mr. Fedorchak stated with regard to the General Fund, it is the largest of all Funds including the Business Funds. He stated they are at 10.85 mills which is 70% of the total property tax levied, and this total is 15.12 mills. He stated they have not raised the property tax since 2009. Mr. Fedorchak stated Revenues are tracking close to what was expected with a few exceptions one of which is the Deed Transfer Tax. He stated last year 2013 was the best year they had in several years, and they realized approximately \$1,150 million. He stated this year their receipts are significantly lower than last year, and may be less than was Budgeted. He stated at this point he is projecting \$950,000 for the year.

Mr. Fedorchak stated Building, Electrical, Plumbing, and Mechanical Fees are already close to what was Budgeted for the year largely driven by Shop Rite and Kohl's. He stated \$360,000 was Budgeted, and they are already at \$340,000; and he feels they will exceed the four categories by \$100,000.

Mr. Fedorchak stated General Fund Expenses are at 43% at the mid point, and this is not uncommon. He stated assuming there are no significant storms, he feels they will end the year very close to Budget. He also feels there is a good possibility that they will be able to add to the Cash Balance by the end of the year.

Mr. Fedorchak stated the Pool revenues were excellent. He stated these number are close to final numbers for the Pool, and the Actual Revenue Receipts are \$21,000 over Budget which is the first time they have exceeded Budget in a number of years. He stated this year's Revenues will be in excess of 16% over last year's. He thanked the Pool Steering Committee, the Citizens Budget Committee, and Kristin Tyler who did a fabulous job with the Pool. He stated the Steering Committee has been extraordinarily successful in re-branding the Pool, and he has received numerous positive comments.

Mr. Fedorchak stated the Golf Course did not have a good first quarter due to the weather. He stated if the weather is good, they generate the revenue they expect and more. He stated they are starting to pick up, and he is cautiously optimistic that they will be close to where they should be by the end of the year,.

Mr. Fedorchak stated the Sewer system is doing fine with Revenues and Expenses as expected.

Mr. Fedorchak stated he feels they will have an excellent financial year with the qualifiers he has mentioned. He stated he hopes to have the 2015 Preliminary Budget at the first Board meeting in October.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated this is a good report on top of the outstanding Audit Report they just received and the AA1 Bond Rating. He stated there was discussion earlier tonight that "if a business ran like the Township, they would be bankrupt," and nothing could be further from the truth; and the Township is very well run. Mr. Stainthorpe thanked Mr. Fedorchak for all his work.

Mr. Benedetto noted the Local Service Tax which shows a delinquent amount on Page 6. Mr. Fedorchak stated the Revenues as of 6/30 were \$143,000, and the Budget was \$240,000 so at that point, they were \$96,000 but they have six months to go. Mr. Fedorchak stated he expects that it will exceed \$240,000. Mr. Benedetto stated this will be the largest ever collected; however, Mr. Fedorchak stated last year they had \$287,000. Mr. Fedorchak stated they discussed this when the Auditor was present, and he advised the Board at that time that he had asked the Auditor to look at the \$287,000 to see if that number was sustainable. Mr. Fedorchak stated he estimates this year they will get to \$260,000, although they could get to \$280,000 again. Mr. McLaughlin stated there are the new employees at Stop Rite; and Mr. Fedorchak agreed but added they will lose \$3,000 from Lockheed Martin.

Mr. Benedetto noted the Revenue Analysis and Expense Analysis for the Patterson Farm, and stated the Budgeted Revenue was \$766,000; and Mr. Fedorchak stated this was based on what they had hoped to receive from the Agricultural Preservation Program from the County. Mr. Fedorchak stated as promised they did set aside a special fund for the Patterson Farm. He stated unfortunately they did not receive that revenue.

Mr. Harold Kupersmit asked how much the Golf revenues are down because there is discussion that golf rounds are way down Nationally. Mr. Fedorchak stated by mid year they were down 9%; but he does not believe that is reflective of any National trend and the was only because of the weather in the first quarter. Mr. Kupersmit asked if they try to book a profit with the Sewer Authority at the end of the year, or are they trying to come out even. Mr. Fedorchak stated they first want to cover their expenses and they also want to have enough money set aside for Capital improvements.

Mr. Fedorchak stated with regard to the Golf Revenue going back to 2009 total Revenues were \$2.5 million, in 2010 they were \$2.7 million, 2011 they were \$2.5 million which was largely weather related, in 2012 \$2.9 million, and 2013 they were \$2.84 million. Mr. Fedorchak stated at the Golf Course they have a great product and a great management company.

Mr. Lewis noted Golf Participation Fees on page 36, and stated the greens fees are \$321,000 year to date. He stated the Budget is \$1.4 million so by late July they were at less than half the Budget. Mr. Dobson stated they were impacted by the weather in the first quarter and they anticipate from July to October they can expect heavy play. Mr. Fedorchak noted the last page of the Summary where there is a multi-year analysis on Golf Course Revenues going back to 2009. He stated from this chart you can get a better understanding of year-to-date and aggregate figures.

SUPERVISORS REPORTS

Mr. Benedetto stated in the most recent issue of Pennsylvania Township News there is an article about the Budget process, and the Township is mentioned specifically with regard to the Citizens Budget group and the outstanding job they have done.

Mr. Benedetto stated the Veterans Labor Day Concert raised \$2,500 and approximately 140 people were in attendance. He stated the Veterans Day Parade will be held on November 9 at 1:00, and there will also be the dedication of the Monument on that day.

OTHER BUSINESS – BRRAM DISCUSSION AND MOTION

Ms. Tyler stated she had a meeting with some local residents involved with BRRAM, and they are engaged in a Federal lawsuit with the Trenton-Mercer Airport.

Ms. Tyler moved, Mr. McLaughlin seconded and it was unanimously carried to authorize the Solicitor to contact Mr. Potter, who represents BRRAM, so that Mr. Garton can provide an update on the litigation and keep the Board of Supervisors informed.

BALL FIELDS UPDATE

Mr. Benedetto asked that Mr. Eisold provide an update on the status of the ball fields. Mr. Eisold stated they had a meeting with the contractor last Friday; and he has worked with this contractor on a number of projects in many other Municipalities, and they have a good working relationship. Mr. Eisold stated they put together a list of all the things they want done this fall and in the spring. Mr. Eisold stated April 1 is the date that PAA would like to start to use the fields for their spring play. Mr. Eisold stated the majority of the work will be done between September 8 and September 30. They will be over-seeding, fertilizing, treating the weeds, and doing a number of other items. In late fall there are additional items to be done between mid-October and the beginning of November, and beginning mid-March, weather dependent, the contractor will be there to put on the finishing touches so that the ball players can use the fields in April.

Mr. Eisold noted a well was dug yesterday on the site. He stated the pumps and electrical equipment has not yet been installed. He stated the estimate for the well was approximately 300', and they got 60 gallons per minute at 250' so there is quite a lot of water in that well. He stated they will get the peripheral work in place so that they can water the fields.

APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Stainthorpe moved, Mr. McLaughlin seconded and it was unanimously carried to appoint the following:

Richard Gorelick – Electric Reliability
Daniel Bankoske – Farmland Preservation
Frederick Young – Electronic Media

September 3, 2014

Board of Supervisors – page 38 of 38

Mr. Stainthorpe moved and Mr. McLaughlin seconded to appoint John Tracey to the Planning Commission. Motion carried with Mr. Benedetto opposed.,

There being no further business, Mr. Stainthorpe moved, Mr. McLaughlin seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 10:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Pete Stainthorpe, Secretary