

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SPECIAL MEETING  
MINUTES – MAY 30, 2017

A special meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on May 30, 2017. Ms. Tyler called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

Those present:

Board of Supervisors: Kristin Tyler, Chair  
David Fritchey, Vice Chair  
John B. Lewis, Secretary  
Judi Reiss, Treasurer (left meeting in progress)  
Jeff Benedetto, Supervisor

Others: Terry Fedorchak, Township Manager  
Jim Majewski, Director Planning & Zoning  
David Truelove, Township Solicitor  
Mark Eisold, Township Engineer  
Kenneth Coluzzi, Chief of Police

Ms. Tyler stated the purpose of the meeting is to discuss the Snipes Tract. She asked that those who wish to speak limit their comments and stay factual and to avoid repetitive comments. She asked that those wishing to speak approach the podium just once this evening. She stated tonight they will explain the origination of the project, what the Township has done thus far on the project, and try to alleviate many of the concerns presented by the residents. Ms. Tyler stated after the professionals have had the opportunity to make their presentation, the Board of Supervisors will have a discussion, and then they will open it to public comment. She stated the professionals can respond to the public's questions in the course of the public comment.

Mr. Mark Eisold was present with Ms. Judy Stein-Goldstein, planner/landscape architect, Ms. Maryellen Saylor, all from Boucher & James as well as Mr. Bob Zoeller, Musco Lighting, and Mr. Phil Wursta, TPD, traffic engineer, and Mr. Jeff Antinozio, design engineer.

Mr. Eisold stated the power point being presented will show an overview as to how they have gotten to this point over the years. He showed the Plan which was last revised May 19, 2017. He stated the purpose of the Snipes Tract is primarily to develop the site as an athletic field complex to serve the growing need for fields for

youth sports. He stated the proposed Park is the culmination of over twenty years of planning by the Township's Park & Recreation Board as well as the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Goldstein stated the timeline starts in 1990 with the Park & Recreation Open Space Master Plan. She stated in 1995 the Township prepared a plan of action to implement that Master Plan. Ms. Goldstein stated the 1995 action plan supported additional recreation land in the northern section of the Township to address the shortage of field space. She stated in 1997 the Township had a follow-up plan of action and again recommended a need for additional park land in the northern section of the Township. She stated in 2000 the Township targeted land to be developed as additional recreational field space and acquired the Snipes Tract. She stated the acquisition was in two parts, and she showed a slide noting the upper rectangle at the northern end of Dolington Road and I-95 which was acquired in 1998. She stated in 2000 the remainder of the site was acquired.

Ms. Goldstein stated the site was a thirty-six acre tree farm/nursery purchased for recreation and open space. She stated access was from Dolington Road and Quarry Road, and the land is suitable for recreation with a few environmental restrictions.

Ms. Goldstein showed a slide which shows an increase in population in ages 5 to 19 from 1990 through 2015. She stated in addition to this 55% increase in population of ages 5 to 19, there is also a documented increase in participation rates in organized youth sports from 1990 to the current time as children are less likely to play pick-up games as opposed to organized sports.

Ms. Goldstein stated in 2004 the Board of Supervisors formed a Sub Committee which was to study the Snipes Tract for athletic fields, and the Committee consisted of members of YMS, Elm Lowne Committee, residents, and the Park & Recreation Board. She stated in May, 2004 the Snipes Sub Committee presented their recommendations to the Park & Recreation Board who made a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to adopt Snipes Plan C in November, 2005. Ms. Goldstein showed a slide showing Plan C which showed ten fields, a skate park, 350 parking spaces, playground, concession/restroom and the land reserved for the northern fire station. Ms. Goldstein stated the Park & Recreation Board recommended the Plan to the Board of Supervisors in February, 2006, and further recommended that the Board of Supervisors include the funding for Snipes in October, 2006. Ms. Goldstein stated in January, 2007 an Alternate to Plan C was developed, and on March 21, 2007 the Board of Supervisors approved the Sketch Plan for Snipes which was Alternate Plan C. She stated on April 9, 2007 the Bucks County Courier Times ran a story about the Plans for this soccer complex which included a picture of the proposed Plans showing the fields, the playground, and the skate park.

Ms. Goldstein stated during 2008 and 2009 funding discussions were held, and a five-year plan was generated. She stated in November, 2014 the Snipes Tract was discussed during a Board of Supervisors Budget Workshop session, and again on November 10, 2015 at a Board of Supervisors Budget Workshop session. She stated there is a long history of **planning, documentation, and discussion with the Board in public.**

Ms. Goldstein stated between 2015 and 2016 Boucher & James met with the Park & Recreation Board and were directed to prepare the Sketch Plan for Snipes to provide three large athletic fields, one mid-sized athletic field, a loop around the fields with **parking**, a concession stand that also included restrooms, the main access to be off Dolington Road, and future plans for a skate park. Ms. Goldstein stated all of those elements appear on the current Plan. Ms. Goldstein stated on April 12, 2016 the Sketch Plan was presented to the Park & Recreation Board, and it incorporated the Site lay out and amenities as directed; and the Park & Recreation Board at that time recommended some minor changes to the Sketch Plan. She stated Boucher & James then went in to detailed engineering.

Ms. Saylor stated from June, 2016 through November, 2016 Boucher & James performed the following: boundary and topography survey, test pits and infiltration testing, engineered the Site Design of the Land Development Plan, and prepared the post-construction Stormwater Management Report. She stated the Plans included adjustments after that based on Township review and public input including moving the mid-sized field from the center of the site up closer to I-95, shifting the location of the concession/restroom building away from Dolington Road and further into the site; and based on information from the Police Department and the traffic engineer, added a second entry along Quarry Road.

Ms. Saylor stated on November 15, 2016 Boucher & James presented the Plan to the Zoning Hearing Board requesting two Variances having to do with setback requirements for equipment sheds, re-locating the salt shed, and the future skate park. She stated the Variances were granted at that meeting, and on November 18, 2016 the Preliminary Land Development Plan and Stormwater Management Report were submitted to the Township. Ms. Saylor stated on November 28, 2016 the project was presented to the Planning Commission, and there were residents present who lived near the site who voiced their concerns. She stated that meeting was adjourned abruptly. Ms. Saylor stated on January 10, 2017 the Zoning Hearing Board issued their Findings of Fact approving the requested Variances. She stated the NPDES and the ENS Permit Applications were prepared and submitted to the Bucks County Conservation District, were reviewed, and approved. On May 8, 2017 the Snipes Tract again went before the Planning Commission and concerns from the citizens, comments from the Advisory Boards, and a third-party review engineer were heard during public comment as well as support from the youth athletic

organizations. A Motion was passed to continue the matter to the next meeting. Ms. Saylor stated comments and concerns heard by the Township were taken into consideration, and the Plans were updated with the following: additional infiltration testing was conducted for stormwater management facilities and infiltration trenches, fifty-five parking spaces were converted to porous pavement to further reduce the volume of run off, they increased the size of two of the infiltration trenches that had the best infiltration rates, they provided an increased buffer along Dolington Road and around the detention basin at the intersection of Quarry Road and Dolington, and they added one hundred twenty-nine trees to the landscaped buffer and some berming as well. Ms. Saylor stated on May 22, 2017 the project was discussed again at the Planning Commission, and a Motion was made to recommend approval of the project with some recommendations.

Mr. Robert Zoeller, Musco Lighting, stated he was involved in the lighting design. He showed an overview of the lighting design which is standard for a recreational complex, and they are lighting the ball fields to 30 foot candles which is good for any recreational sport to be played on the surface of the fields. He stated they will have four poles around each of the fields to illuminate the fields with the proper lighting level as well as uniformity of lighting on the field. He stated because the fields are side to side, they were able to use common poles in between the fields so they are lighting three fields with eight poles rather than twelve poles. He stated the height of the poles on the outside are 70', and the height of the poles on the inside are 80'. He showed the small-sized field in the upper right hand corner which has four 70' poles.

Mr. Zoeller stated they have also provided lighting for the entire loop parking area including the two entry ways. He stated they meet the Ordinance requirement of .5 foot candles throughout the area with some 20' poles in conformance with the Ordinance. Mr. Zoeller stated the reason for the 70' and 80' poles is the Illuminating Engineering Society for aerial sports in their publication RP33-14 requires that the minimum pole height should be 70' to have proper illumination over the fields to be able to see the ball for safety and playability. He stated what is proposed is very consistent with the pole heights already in place at locations in Lower Makefield.

Mr. Zoeller stated with regard to the proposed technology he showed a picture of the evolution of lighting control from 1950 to today. He showed which light is at Macclesfield Park. He stated at Macclesfield on a few of fixtures on the fields that point to Cemetery side where there are adjacent residents, they came back years later when the technology was available, and they put some shielding on those fixtures to cut down on the light that was spilling from the property and to cover the lighting source inside the fixture. He stated the most glare from the lighting fixture comes from your ability to see the actual source of the light inside the fixture so they started being able to mask that.

Mr. Zoeller noted the fixture on the picture furthest to the right which is an LED lighting fixture which is energy efficient and totally hides the source of light up inside of the fixture. He showed a picture of what the fixture they propose looks like which is a full cut-off fixture with the LED tucked up inside at the back of the fixture which allows the light to be projected outward to illuminate the area you want to illuminate. He stated it cuts the glare, and you can control the light spillage.

Mr. Zoeller stated to evaluate the impact of the lighting to the adjacent area, they run a calculated, computer-generated set of values at 30' intervals around the entire property line surrounding the Snipes Tract fields. He stated those values incorporate all four fields completely illuminated, all of the lighting from the parking lot throughout and around the entire complex, as well as the two entry ways. He stated after the lights are installed, testing takes place to confirm that these values are achieved; and if they are not, the lighting has to be adjusted. Mr. Zoeller stated the values do not take into account any foliage, structures, or anything on the site that would block light from getting to the property line. Mr. Zoeller stated following the property all the way around there is no value higher than 0.0 measured in horizontal foot candles which is the standard. He stated because of the concern with light spillage, they went a step further and they did a calculation of max vertical foot candles which aims the light meter back at the bank of lights, and they were at 0.0 except for a small area where the entry is to Quarry Road where they were at 0.1 which is expected as they would want some lighting to spill out onto Quarry Road, and 0.2 and 0.3 at the other entrance on Dolington Road which is also to be expected. Mr. Zoeller stated there should be no impact anywhere beyond the property line of the Snipes Tract.

Mr. Phil Wursta, Traffic, Planning & Design, stated their initial involvement with this project was the lay out of the site making recommendations for access points and the internal circulation and parking lay out. Mr. Wursta stated access was proposed off of Dolington Road; and since Dolington Road is a State highway, it is subject to a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit Application. He stated part of that Permit Application requires the submission of a Traffic Study. He stated his firm also felt that by doing that Traffic Study, they would be able to see what else is going on in this vicinity of the Township. He stated when they met with regard to the internal circulation, he recommended a secondary access because by having two access points on two separate roads, it distributes traffic better for any type of land use that would be put on this site. He stated this would also reduce queuing and delays at each of the intersections as well as provide for emergency access.

Mr. Wursta stated the Traffic Study involved taking counts at intersections and doing capacity analysis. He stated they needed to determine the existing conditions at the intersections which is called Level of Service which can range from A to F with A being the best. He stated they did an analysis of existing conditions, base

condition, which adds traffic projections based on normal traffic increase, and site-generated traffic. He stated this is the same process that any land developer does. He stated they studied Yardley-Newtown and Mirror Lake Roads, Yardley-Newtown and Creamery, Quarry Road and Creamery, Quarry Road and Dolington, and Quarry Road and Quarry Hill Court. Mr. Wursta stated they also added in the site driveways one of which was the one on Dolington Road opposite a minimally-used private driveway and the other on Quarry across from Quarry Hill Court.

Mr. Wursta stated they determined that all the intersections operated a Level of Service A through C. He stated in some cases they found that there were a few movements within some of the intersections which had worse than a C Level of Service. He stated under the existing conditions they had a Level of Service F for the northbound left turn lane during the a.m. peak hour on Creamery Road. He stated they met with the Police Department to determine why that happens, and they narrowed it down to a twenty minute time between 8:30 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. when buses and parents are lined up on Creamery Road waiting to make a left turn at the stop sign at Quarry Road. Mr. Wursta stated he does not feel this has any impact whatsoever with respect to the Snipes Tract because it is the a.m. peak hour during a regular school day morning, when there will be very little to no traffic associated with Snipes. Mr. Wursta stated they also had a Level of Service D at the intersection of Yardley-Newtown and Creamery Road which is removed from Snipes. He stated this was the southbound left and right turn which is combined at that intersection.

Mr. Wursta stated PennDOT guidelines associated with Land Development recommend that mitigation must be shown if the delay is greater than ten seconds on an approach or at an intersection for the overall Level of Service. He stated if they had a greater than ten second delay based upon the new traffic volumes from the Land Development, they would have to show mitigation. He stated they have a Level of Service D that does not change based upon Snipes during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour of more than ten seconds. He stated they went from a forty-three second delay to a fifty-three second delay. He stated since they did not meet the ten second threshold, they offered no mitigation for that Level of Service D. He stated he looked into what they should be doing to rectify this situation regardless of the Park since it is already an existing condition. He stated at that intersection it ties together with Mirror Lake Road, and last year they put in an Application with the Department of Transportation for a Grant which is a red light enforcement Grant to incorporate better coordination between the two intersections and also to re-time the two intersections. He stated while they have not yet heard back about this Grant, that specific issue with regard to the Level of Service D can be easily accommodated by adding five seconds of green light time to the side street which is Creamery Road and taking it from Yardley-Newtown Road.

Mr. Wursta stated they assigned trips associated with Snipes using the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual which is a National compilation of traffic studies and actual volumes of land uses. He stated for Snipes they used a soccer complex; however, there were not a lot of soccer complex traffic studies done since traffic associated with soccer complexes for Municipalities are really after the p.m. peak hour use. He stated what they have done in the past is to determine how many children will be playing at one time; and they look at the worst-case scenario with all of the children coming in a single car during the p.m. peak hour, and they added all of that traffic even though it is very unlikely that would occur. He stated they ran an analysis with the normal trip generation, which they feel is more appropriate which would be seventy-one p.m. peak hour trips on a typical weekday, and they doubled that to one hundred forty-two trips. He stated by doing that for the a.m. peak hour, the p.m. hour, and the Saturday peak, there was no degradation in Level of Service. Mr. Wursta stated the p.m. peak hour is always the heaviest traffic volume on the main roads, and that is the case on Dolington, Quarry Hill, etc.; and all of them have heavier p.m. peak hours than a Saturday or the a.m. peak hour. He stated the p.m. peak hour is therefore their design control; and if they can make the p.m. peak hour work through improvements or signal timing, they know it will work for the a.m. peak hour and the Saturday peak hour. Mr. Wursta stated they found that no improvements were required other than normal Municipal maintenance of the traffic signals which would be the re-timing they uncovered based upon the study.

Mr. Wursta stated part of their recommendations that Mr. Eisold incorporated into his Plan was to add a left-turn lane on Dolington Road for entry into the Park, a right-turn lane on Dolington Road for entry into the Park, a right-turn lane on Quarry Road for entry into the Park, and they are restriping the intersection of Dolington Road at Quarry Road to separate the left and right-turn traffic as well as make the left turn a little less harsh than it is right now as you turn from Quarry Road onto Dolington. He stated they feel by doing this on Dolington Road, it will get cars out of the way; and they strongly recommend left-turn lanes being installed on higher-volume roadways regardless of whether they meet the PennDOT warrants or not. He stated this is also true with right-turn lanes as it gets the cars out of the way and lets people pass especially during rush hours.

Mr. Wursta stated they also discussed the School where there are a number of traffic issues. He stated the Level of Service F he discussed earlier was School related. He stated since that time the School has re-vamped their drop off situation; and while that is working well, you still have to stop at the stop sign at Quarry Road, so there is still a Level of Service F. He stated while he would not recommend this, if they were to make this an all-way stop stopping Quarry Road and Creamery Road, they could increase the Level of Service and the F at the left turn would become a C Level of Service; however, that would stop traffic on Quarry Road for the twenty

minute problem time, and that would become an enforcement issue. He stated they also discussed the re-alignment of Dolington Road directly across to Creamery Road. Mr. Wursta stated typically they like roads lined up; however, it would be on the verge of meeting the need for a traffic signal which means at some point you would have a green light on Dolington Road and Creamery Road and people would be speeding through there. He stated it would also cost approximately \$1 million to re-align the intersection as it would have to be started where the bridge comes in over I-95 and angled toward Creamery Road with a traffic signal. He stated if they were putting in a traffic signal, they would also have to put in left-turn lanes as whenever you put in a traffic signal, you increase the opportunity for rear end accidents so this would be a very big project for very little benefit. He stated they felt that the configuration of Quarry and Dolington at the current time and Creamery and Quarry Road allow for a traffic-calming effect for those going from Dolington to Creamery Road as they have to make a maneuver that keeps drivers tempered which they feel is good.

Mr. Wursta stated they also discussed School events and Tournaments at Snipes. He stated they spoke to the Police with regard to standard operating procedures associated with having a Municipal facility across from a School. Mr. Wursta stated they are building a lot of parking for the Snipes Tract, and the School has a lot of events where cars currently spill out into the neighborhood and park on Quarry Road. He stated they feel a benefit would be to come up with a relationship between the School and the Township to coordinate events so that when the School has Back-To-School Night, there would not be a sports complex event; and they would allow for parking back and forth across the street so that you could safely park in the Snipes parking lot, walk on a sidewalk down to Quarry Hill, and then cross the street safely. He stated they do not know what the Tournament situation may be, and this would have to be coordinated with the Traffic Safety Officers; and possibly there could be an Agreement entered into with the School District, and they could park in the empty School parking lot and safely cross the street into Snipes.

With regard to stormwater management, Ms. Saylor noted that the site drains down to the intersection she showed on the Plan where there is a low spot. She stated in order to meet the Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan and the NPDES requirements, they have taken a varied approach. She showed the location of the proposed traditional stormwater management basin to help control the one through one hundred year storms, and they have also incorporated low-impact design elements such as infiltration trenches at locations she showed on the Plan. Ms. Saylor stated they also have done stormwater disconnect to let it run overland at a few locations. Ms. Saylor stated they have a combination of overland and pipe flow into the infiltration trenches. She stated the infiltration trenches were designed to permanently remove the two-year storm increase due to the increased impervious surface on site. She stated they heard comments from the EAC, the



residents, and the third party review engineer, Carroll Engineering, so they looked at the Plans again and did some additional infiltration testing and found that it would be better to widen two infiltration trenches she showed on the Plan. She stated they have also incorporated porous pavement in certain areas of the parking lot at locations she showed on the Plan which will allow the water easier access into the infiltration trench. Ms. Saylor stated they also incorporated permanent inlet filters, and all the inlets that discharge into the detention basin will have a permanent inlet filter which captures oils, debris, grass clippings, etc. She stated these will be cleaned out seasonally so that the infiltration trenches stay functional.

Ms. Tyler asked Ms. Saylor to discuss today's condition with regard to stormwater management versus the engineered plans. Ms. Saylor stated currently it all runs overland and discharges toward the intersection. She stated with this Plan they have an average reduction of approximately 45% after development with their stormwater controls implemented.

Mr. Eisold stated the NPDES is issued by the Conservation District and the DEP, and they look at the infiltration systems which is for water quality so you are not discharging off of pavement area that could contaminate other areas. He stated they have already received the NPDES Permit. He stated they also have the Township's stormwater requirements which are for rate control, and they have gone over and above what is required with an average reduction of approximately 45% for each of the storms from what it is today. He added they also had a third party engineer, Carroll Engineering, look at their design to confirm that they had met the requirements. He stated Carroll Engineering had some comments which Boucher & James addressed to reduce the flows.

Mr. Benedetto stated in the EAC report they discussed the vegetation in the trenches, and Ms. Saylor stated they will be seeded, have topsoil, fabric to let the water through, and then the pit. Mr. Benedetto stated at the Planning Commission meeting it came up that the EAC indicated there was bedrock at the detention basin shown on the Plan. Ms. Saylor stated initially they did test pits in the area of the basin, and in some areas no stone was encountered at locations she showed on the Plan. She stated in one area she showed on the plan, they encountered sandstone. Ms. Saylor stated Carroll Engineering had also mentioned this; however, the basin is not an infiltration structure, rather it is a rate control structure. She stated despite this they looked at it again because they wanted to know if there would be additional construction costs if there is shallow rock; and with smaller equipment than will be used for the actual site construction, they were easily able to get under and move the rock that was there. She stated they also did other pits and did not find rock that shallow.

Mr. Benedetto asked if they would be able to move that basin or make it smaller and make two smaller basins as proposed by the EAC. Mr. Benedetto also asked if this would jeopardize the Permits that have already been issued by the State. Ms. Saylor showed how the site drains and the natural low spot which is what they would use according to the NPDES and the low-impact design requirements which are not to alter significantly the natural drainage ways of the site. She stated by reducing the size of the proposed basin and putting another basin at a location she showed on the Plan, they may have to go against grade to get the water there; and they would also have to construct two berms, two outlet structures, etc. so it would increase the costs. Mr. Eisold stated it would definitely be more expensive to do that; and at this point that has not been designed to show whether or not it would work. He stated by reducing the flows by 45%, they feel that they have the most efficient design. He stated he is convinced that if they did two smaller basins, they would not be able to get that kind of reduction in flow; and one of the guidelines they were working with was to reduce the flow. Mr. Fritchey stated there would therefore be more water, and Mr. Eisold stated he feels they could get to 10% to 20%, but not the 45% they are showing with the Plan proposed.

Ms. Reiss asked if it would be appropriate to put native plants in the area where the basin is; and Mr. Eisold stated they were asked to have a buffer along Dolington as well as around the basin, and this is where they have added the 129 trees to increase that buffer, and they also put in some low-lying berms to make the trees appear even bigger than they are. He stated they could also look into adding more materials.

Mr. Benedetto stated the 45% number takes into consideration the fifty-five spaces that will be porous pavers, the increase in the size of the two infiltration trenches, and the removal of the skate park. Mr. Eisold stated the skate park is included in the design; and if that impervious surface were to be removed, they could hold back even more water. Ms. Saylor stated their design is conservative, and she did not model the higher intense storms through the infiltration trenches, and she feels they will actually be reducing it more than the overall average of 45%.

Mr. Lewis asked what maintenance will be needed for the infiltration areas to make sure they are functioning correctly. Ms. Saylor stated with the permanent inlet filters, it should require very little maintenance. She stated their construction observers will be there to make sure that they are installed correctly which is very important. Mr. Lewis asked what the maintenance will be post implementation; and Ms. Saylor stated with regard to the inlet filters, they will have to make sure that they are changed once or twice a year and kept clean.

Mr. Benedetto stated a resident had asked about the ability to have retractable lights, and Mr. Zoeller stated they have looked at them over the years as have all the sports lighting manufacturers. He stated the problem is that when you get to this type of technology the aiming of the light becomes very critical; and to retract lights, and put them back up again, you do not have the ability to get the lights back in exactly the same position. He stated it does not take much in terms of positioning change to effect the uniformity on the field.

Mr. Lewis stated when they looked at the Level of Service for Quarry and Creamery Roads where they have the a.m. peak issue, they did not look at what will happen four years from now with an enhanced Scudder Falls Bridge which could fix that Level of Service. Mr. Wursta stated that is a good point, and they did not do that. He stated he agrees that they will definitely see a reduction when they get more usage from the bridge. Mr. Lewis stated currently during the a.m. peak period, there are a lot of drivers from Newtown Township seeking to evade the Newtown Exit. Mr. Wursta stated while that is correct, most of that will occur during the normal peak hour rather than 8:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. which was their peak hour for Quarry Hill because of the School. Mr. Wursta stated from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. there are no problems, although overall the bridge will help with the traffic.

Ms. Reiss moved to approve the Plan as presented.

Many people in the audience voiced their opposition.

Mr. Truelove stated this is a matter of Roberts Rules of Order; and in order for the public to be able to discuss, they have to have a Motion before them. Ms. Tyler stated this is just procedure.

Mr. Benedetto seconded.

Mr. Benedetto stated he supports the three fields, and he supports lighted fields. He stated he appreciates the work done by the Planning Commission; however, he feels the feasibility economically of doing two turf fields is not possible. He stated he also supports the fourth field, but he does not support lighting on the fourth field. He stated he is in support of the tree buffer and a natural walking path. He stated he does not support the skate park, and he does not feel it is something that they need; and he feels it would enhance the Park to have a picnic area with park benches in that area. Mr. Benedetto stated he does have concerns about the lighting; and he feels 129 trees seems significant, but if it could be enhanced, he would be in favor of that. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels the stormwater management piece is his biggest concern as certain residents in that area have a major concern, particularly the Faust family as he went on their property and saw what they have to deal with. He stated he would be in favor

they have to deal with. He stated he would be in favor of improving this if they can do so in any way through Boucher & James and Carroll Engineering; and he is hopeful that the 45% will actually increase based on the pervious pavers, the tree buffer, and removing the skate park. Mr. Benedetto stated the natural walking path was brought up by Dean Curtis, Lower Bucks Lacrosse; and he suggested that this could be done by an Eagle Scout.

Mr. Benedetto stated he feels this project will be an amazing addition to the community, and he is proud to support it although he understands the neighbors' concerns. He stated he feels they have listened to the neighbors and made some changes that will make it a project they can all be proud of. He stated they removed as many Waivers as possible, and they did the EIA. He stated this project has been a long time coming, and he is in support of it.

Mr. Lewis stated generally he supports the three and a half fields, and he feels it would be helpful to go through the components of the project so people understand what will be in the base and what will be the alternates.

A number of residents called out their opposition to doing this.

Ms. Tyler suggested that they get through the first Motion first and discuss this when they get to the Motion on the Bid.

Mr. Lewis stated the reason he is suggesting discussing this now is that residents may have specific comments about elements of the project; and the more they know, the better they can comment. Mr. Lewis stated the Base Bid would be the general site construction and they would build the three initial fields. He stated the estimate for that is \$1.3 million. He stated off-site roadway improvements would be approximately \$150,000 so the Base Bid would be \$1.45 million. He stated there is a Bid Alternate for changing part of the parking and main drive in terms of the paving material in the amount of \$100,000. He stated the second Bid Alternate is the small field which would be Phase II, and the small field component is \$65,255. He stated Bid Alternate #3 is small field lighting in the amount of \$120,000. He stated Bid Alternate #4 is relocation of the salt shed at a cost of approximately \$21,000. He stated Bid Alternate #5 is sodding the large fields in the amount of \$200,000, and this would be instead of the seeding process. Mr. Lewis stated Bid Alternate #6 are the goal posts associated with the three primary fields at a cost of \$60,000. He stated for a procurement requirement, they have to separate out the site lighting and the concession stand. He stated the site lighting for the three fields is \$600,000. He stated the concession stand is \$200,000. He stated he would also like to Bid out separately site inspection as part of this. He stated this would roughly total

approximately \$2.061 million. Mr. Lewis asked the original estimated cost of the Plan, and Mr. Fedorchak stated all in, which included the skate park, was approximately \$3 million.

Ms. Reiss stated her suggestion was that there be a naturalized walking path and not asphalt and landscaped possibly by some of the community groups to make it attractive, help with water, and act as a buffer. Ms. Reiss stated she would like to keep the discussion tonight civil as it has become uncivil at times, and she finds this offensive. She stated everyone has their own opinions and concerns. She stated she has read everything that has been sent to her. She stated this project is needed, and they want to make it as comfortable for everyone as they can recognizing that no one will be getting 100%, but no one should be losing 100% either. She asked that those wishing to speak make their comments short adding that tonight is her holiday, and at a certain point, she will be going home to her family.

Ms. Tyler asked that comments be kept to two to three minutes. She stated it is good to see the community engaged, and the Board will do their best to hear all the comments and concerns. She stated those speaking will have one opportunity to speak at the podium since there are a lot of people wishing to have the opportunity to speak.

Ms. Kate Sweeney, 1610 Fairfield Road, asked if all nine people sitting at the front table will be voting on this tonight. Ms. Tyler stated the five Supervisors will be voting on this. Ms. Sweeney asked if they plan to vote tonight, and Ms. Tyler stated they do; and there is a Motion on the floor. She stated they will take public comment, and then the Board may have additional discussion prior to voting. Ms. Sweeney stated she understands the Scudder Falls Bridge project will take four years, and she noted how they travel to get to New Jersey. She stated they will not be able to use Woodside to get to the Scudder Falls Bridge for a long time once construction starts. Ms. Sweeney asked if the Board approves the project when will they start and how long will it take. Mr. Eisold stated based on their construction schedule going through the Bidding process and some form of the Responsible Contractor's period, they would probably start construction some time in August; and it would probably be a three to four month construction cycle for the first Phase.

Mr. Charles Lombardo, 1511 Laurie Lane, stated there was a meeting of the Planning Commission a few months ago that was closed down, and at that time they were talking about the trees. He stated there will be hundreds of trees that will be cut down, and no one is talking about it. He asked if they have received permission to cut down the trees. He stated this is a beautiful wildlife area, and the Township should sell the property or convert it into a wildlife preserve of some sort, and put

paths in so people can enjoy it. He stated they do not need all of the “playgrounds” particularly since they are going to leave it open to outsiders from out of the community with our tax money paying for it, and there will be people from New Jersey coming here. Mr. Lombardo stated he does not know who is promoting this or making money on this project, but our tax money is being used for hundreds of people that have nothing to do with our community. He stated the lighting consultant talked about lighting going straight down which is “nonsense.” He stated he is a physicist, and the light will be dispersed far beyond the lines. He stated the traffic they have talked about is also “nonsense,” and there will be a few hundred cars at very tight time limits going in there; and it will be crowded. He stated on Dolington coming from the Bridge cars are going forty-five to fifty-five miles per hour, and the right turn into the Park is a couple hundred feet from the bridge so there will be crashes. He stated the first child who is hurt or killed going up and down the street in front of the two schools will be the responsibility of the Board because of all the extra traffic. He stated it is a “traffic and tree-cutting nightmare and a lighting and noise nightmare;” and the Board should be ashamed of themselves.

Mr. Gerald Arth, Heller Drive from Makefield Chase, stated he has lived there for twenty-four years. He stated he is opposed to this project as it has been designed. He stated he is not a NIMBY and is not opposed to any use of the Snipes Tract for recreational facilities but he is opposed to “Macclesfield north” being put in his backyard. He stated he feels this is an unnecessary project, is unwanted as proposed, and is fiscally-irresponsible of the Board to spend money on this. He stated he feels it represents a breach of promise that was made long ago to the residents of the neighborhood as to how the property would be used. He stated he has seen nothing that says there are not adequate facilities in Lower Makefield Township to accommodate Lower Makefield Township residents in their sports activities. He stated he has read all the Minutes of the Park & Rec Board, and this is a project designed to allow Yardley Makefield Soccer to have unfettered use of Macclesfield taking the football program from Macclesfield to Snipes and provide them lighted fields. He stated he has also looked at the use statistics from 2015 which showed that 47% of the players are non Lower Makefield residents.

Mr. Benedetto asked Mr. Arth if he feels any non residents should use Township fields, and Mr. Arth stated he does not feel the taxpayers should be paying for non resident children to come here and use our facilities. He stated he does not want to develop athletic facilities for use by non residents. He stated if they would exclude the non residents who play for these organizations, there would plenty of space for the Township children. He stated he has never seen any evidence that said that any child in Lower Makefield Township was denied the opportunity to play football, lacrosse, soccer, or rugby at any time.

Mr. Benedetto stated non residents play at the Township Golf Course all the time, and they pay a premium to do so. Mr. Benedetto noted this is also true for the Pool. He stated the Leagues pay a premium for non users. Mr. Benedetto stated the primary users of Morrisville Little League are Lower Makefield Township children so if Morrisville had the same “mentality” as Mr. Arth, they could throw all of those children out of Morrisville, and they would come back to Lower Makefield and use the Township fields. He stated the children in Lower Makefield who play lacrosse do not play in Lower Makefield, and they play in Middletown Township. Mr. Arth stated both of his sons played for Lower Bucks Lacrosse for a number of years; and the reason they play in Middletown is because under Southeastern Pennsylvania Youth Lacrosse Association, the rules require regional teams. Mr. Benedetto stated the point is that they do not play in Lower Makefield.

Mr. Arth stated he feels these are special-interest driven projects, and they are not projects driven by popular demand of the residents of Lower Makefield Township and certainly not by people who live in that neighborhood. He stated the Board’s responsibility should be to listen to the residents, taxpayers, and voters of this Township and not special interest sports organizations.

Ms. Tyler stated Mr. Arth is saying that this project is not supported by the residents of Lower Makefield; however, she sees a split. Ms. Tyler stated the Board cannot make a decision that will satisfy all of the taxpayers of Lower Makefield Township because all of the taxpayers are not in agreement so there are different points of view that they have to take into consideration.

Mr. Arth stated it would have been nice if the Board had asked for their input. He stated he has reviewed the meeting Minutes, and there were a lot of meetings held with the Park & Rec Board and the heads of YMS, PAA, and Lower Makefield Football, but there were no residents included in those meetings. He stated he watched the power point presentation that was done by the Township engineers going through the history of the project, and they barely mentioned the residents of the Township. Ms. Tyler stated every meeting that they had was a public meeting.

Mr. Fritchey stated Mr. Arth is “coping a plea to his own inattentiveness.” He stated he does not feel Mr. Arth is making persuasive comments, and Mr. Fritchey stated if Mr. Arth wants to persuade the Board, he should make cogent arguments.

Ms. Tyler asked that Mr. Arth to complete his comments given that he has already spoken for some time, and there are many others wishing to speak. Mr. Arth stated the biggest opposition he has to the project is to the lights. He stated there will be

light pollution every night and every day they will see 70' and 80' poles sticking up; and unless they are going to put up 100' trees all around the property, there is nothing they can do about it, and they will see those lights all of the time. Mr. Arth stated the lights also increase massively the intensity of the use of the property. He stated in 2004 and 2005 when he was paying attention, there were meetings that were held where there were representations made by Park & Rec people and by Supervisors of the Township that there would be no lights on that property.

Mr. Benedetto stated there was a Plan for this property in 2005 which included nine soccer fields, a northern fire station, and 350 parking spaces; and he asked Mr. Arth if he supported that Plan. Mr. Arth stated he would support that Plan more than he supports this current Plan. He stated he would support nine mini-soccer fields for young children to play on Saturday mornings.

Mr. Arth stated he is concerned about the intensity issues, the light pollution, and the noise pollution. He stated he has seen no study at all about noise and hundreds of extra cars will impact the noise level. He stated his back yard backs onto Dolington Road. He stated he feels the Traffic Study was inadequate because it did not take into account any traffic after 6 p.m.; and when there are lights on the fields, they will be used between 6:00 p.m. and 9:30 p.m. every night of the week; and there will be hundreds of cars. Mr. Arth read from the Traffic Study, Page 4, Existing Roadway Network which he does not feel describes their neighborhood and casts a question over the veracity of the entire Study.

Mr. Arth stated when the Board members ran for office they all stated they wanted to be fiscally-responsible, and the taxpayers demand this. He stated they are proposing to spend \$2 to \$3 million to build an athletic facility that most people do not want. He stated the Township has infrastructure problems that could be addressed with that money or they could use that money to oppose Mercer County's bid to expand their Airport which will continue to diminish the quality of life in Lower Makefield; and they should not be spending this money for this project that a significant portion of the residents do not want and do not need.

Ms. Kathy Hirko, 1450 Dolington Road, stated she provided letters to the Supervisors as well as the list of the 132 residents who were to receive letters about the Snipes project. She stated one letter was sent out October 17, 2016 prior to the Zoning meeting to be held on November. She stated she feels a lot of anger they are hearing in the room is because no one recalls getting the October, 2016 letter except a few people who were right near the property. She stated that letter was the one that provided the most detail on the project.



Ms. Tyler asked the Township's policy with respect to notifying residents regarding Zoning Hearing Board proceedings. Mr. Majewski stated residents within 300' of the site are notified for Zoning Hearing Board proceedings, and for Land Development Applications, all residents within 1000' are notified.

Ms. Hirko asked when the letters went out to those who live within 1000', and Mr. Majewski stated they sent those out for the Planning Commission meetings. Ms. Hirko stated she went to the trouble of trying to talk to as many of the 132 residents as she could, and only a couple who were very close received notification. She stated this is why people are angry because they did not know about the project. Ms. Hirko stated prior to June 1, 2016 when the BOS moved to proceed with the Land Development process, there was a Sketch Plan on May 2, and a Preliminary Plan on May 19. She asked if any letters went out prior to that since not one person she talked to received a letter. Ms. Hirko read Ordinance 363, Page 4 G regarding notification of surrounding property owners. Mr. Truelove noted a Sketch Plan does not qualify for this notification. Ms. Hirko stated it does state "Sketch or Preliminary." Mr. Truelove stated any time someone submits a Sketch Plan, the Township generally does not do that because a Sketch Plan is a concept plan. Ms. Hirko asked why it is in the Ordinance.

Mr. Benedetto stated the Supervisors are also residents, and they listened to what the residents had to say, and they did make changes converting fifty-five space to porous paving, increased the size two of the infiltration trenches, moved the mid-sized field closer to I-95, shifted the concession stand further back, added a second entrance, and they are going to eliminate the skate park, and add a walking path as well as a picnic/park bench area. He stated it is wrong to say that they are not listening. He stated they had multiple meetings with the Planning Commission and the Board has all received the e-mails and been responsive. He stated they had discussions with their engineers, and had a second engineer review it as well as a traffic engineer, and the lighting engineer present twice. Mr. Benedetto stated in the six years he has been a Supervisor there has not been a project that has been more thoughtfully reviewed and comprehensively discussed than this project. Mr. Benedetto stated all the changes he just reviewed were done as result of the resident comments.

A number of people in the audience called out that those changes were "meaningless."

Ms. Hirko stated the truth is although the Board feels there were meetings that everyone should have known about, they did not know about them; and everyone is angry because they are just finding out about this. She stated they were cut off at the Planning Commission meeting; and when they came back to the next meeting, they really did not let the residents speak, and it was more the sports organizations.

Ms. Hirko stated with regard to the walking trail, the group that wanted this looked at the site; and it would be a beautiful site for a natural walking trail if they do not destroy the tree buffer around it. She stated it would have to be done carefully. Ms. Hirko also stated she feels the biggest problem people are having is with the mid-sized field with the lights; and if they were to eliminate that field, the residents would be happier.

A number of people called out that they did not want any lights. Ms. Tyler stated it is not productive when people shout out. She asked that they be respectful of everyone's right to speak.

Ms. Ginny Torbert, Citizens Traffic Commission, read her remarks into the Record (copy attached).

With regard to Ms. Torbert's comments regarding PennDOT Connects, Mr. Benedetto asked Mr. Wursta if the Township would be required to comply with this. Mr. Wursta stated everywhere they can they are trying to have walkability and connect trails. Mr. Benedetto asked if they would be able to do this as part of a Grant. Mr. Wursta stated there are numerous holes in the trail system; and whenever they can either through Land Development or Grants, they are working on it. He stated he understands that they do not have the wherewithal with regard to money and eminent domain criteria to be able to put them in everywhere. Mr. Benedetto stated it is not therefore a requirement, and Mr. Wursta agreed.

Ms. Reiss stated she would like to see sidewalks surrounding it on both sides of the street. She added that she knows there are people who are claiming they want the children to be safe, but they would not want the Township putting a sidewalk on their property as she has already heard from them that they do not want a sidewalk. She stated she felt that there were going to be connections made. Mr. Wursta stated his recommendation was to make it a completely walkable area, and they are at least talking about adding the trail connection along the whole frontage. He stated it will probably meander through to get to Dolington Road. He stated they do not have the funds to complete the Dolington connection; and they have heard from cyclists about getting in bike lane, however, they do not own the property and they are doing what they can do. He stated while Ms. Torbert discussed having a right-turn lane, that is in someone's front yard. He stated they are trying to maximize what they can.

Ms. Reiss stated she feels there is a section across from the Schools on Quarry Road which is owned by Farmland Preservation Corporation; however, Mr. Benedetto stated he believes that is on Dolington Road. Ms. Reiss stated she feels Farmland Preservation would be amenable if the Township would put it in there. Mr. Wursta stated he would be a proponent of a Grant that would do something completely

rather than piecemeal; and when a development comes in, they try to make sure that there is a connection. He stated they would not want to put in something that goes nowhere. He stated they are working on pedestrian connectability within the parameters they have been given by the Board of Supervisors with regard to eminent domain and dollars.

Ms. Torbert stated she appreciates what Mr. Wursta is saying, and one of the first things they talked about with him was filling in the gaps. She stated with regard to PennDOT Connects, it was her understanding that it was not something they could pick and choose, and they cannot use cost as an excuse not to do it; and when they have a new development, and they are making an improvement to a State road, she understood it was mandatory to plan for it. Mr. Wursta stated PennDOT Connects is a brand new program, and the specifics associated with a Land Development and requirements associated with it have not been flushed out. He stated they would comply with anything they have to comply with; and if PennDOT tells them they have to do something, they would have to do it. He stated all of Southeastern Pennsylvania has issues with regard to pedestrian connections.

Ms. Torbert stated this Park is going to be very attractive to a lot of people. She stated children in the nearby neighborhood currently have to be bused to School because the road is not safe, and there are gaps. She stated she feels it should be mandatory that it is walkable to the Park. Ms. Tyler stated the issue is the taking of someone's land is something that no Board wants to do. She stated she appreciates all the comments and the discussions between the engineer and the Citizens Traffic Commission.

Ms. Torbert asked that they work with the School District on the area of the School regardless of whether or not they proceed with the Park.

Mr. Wursta stated with regard to the School issues, they are separate from the Traffic Study that was done for the Snipes Tract. He stated there are existing traffic issues with the School. He stated the peak hours at the School and the peak hours at the Park do not match; however, separate from the Snipes Tract, they did find out that if they extend the School Zone, during the a.m. peak hour, they could reduce the speed limit to 15 miles per hour from what cars are legally traveling now, and that would create more gaps and allow more people to make the left turn from Creamery onto Quarry. He stated they are not tying that to the development of the Park. He stated they have already discussed this with the Traffic Safety Officers about extending the School Zone. Ms. Torbert asked that they also talk to Pennsbury.

Ms. Torbert stated she knows from experience that if this were any other developer and they were putting in something where there was an existing issue, the Board of Supervisors would be demanding that the developer address that situation and

make it better. She stated just because it is a Township project, there is not any less of a requirement for the Township to look into this situation. She stated because they are putting this Park across the street, she feels this is a Township responsibility.

Ms. Lois Levy, 1640 Fairfield Drive, asked what would happen if there were to be a fire at her home while there is an event going on at the Park. Chief Coluzzi stated he does not feel it will hamper any response by fire or rescue squads at all. Ms. Levy asked how they would get around all the traffic on the road, and Chief Coluzzi stated they traverse much more difficult roadways than this. Ms. Levy stated if you look at Dolington and Woodside at dinner time when everyone is coming up Woodside and you want to make a left hand turn it is very difficult. She stated if games are letting out at 6 p.m., they will not be able to make a left onto Dolington. Mr. Wursta stated they did not look at the Dolington and Woodside intersection, and most of the flow at 6 p.m. would be toward the Park; but they will keep an eye on that.

Mr. Richard Gagnier, Heller Drive, stated he has only one issue with the Park which is the Quarry Road entrance. He stated the two Schools are very active and even after School lets out, there is still a lot of activity because of the fields and playgrounds there. He stated there are no sidewalks and no shoulder on that road. He stated it is a very narrow road; and when people are coming up Dolington they are going very fast. He stated Macclesfield and Edgewood have one entrance, and he feels they would be fine if they would have the Dolington entry point where there is good visibility both ways; and there are no Schools there. He stated he feels more than 80% of the population lives south of the Dolington/Quarry access which means that people will favor the Quarry Road entrance and they will not make a right to go to Dolington. He stated they should consider the liabilities for the Quarry Road entrance for the School children as there is activity there all the time seven days a week. He stated he feels they can live without the entrance on Quarry Road.

Mr. Benedetto stated he was at the Planning Commission meeting on May 22, and it was stated that there was need for the two access points in the professional opinion of the traffic engineer.

Mr. Don Faust, 1509 Dolington Road, stated he lives across from the proposed Park. He stated he agrees people will not wait for the stop sign at Dolington and Quarry and will go through the neighborhood. He stated one of the problems he sees that the Board has had recently is the discussion of need. He stated he believes the reason people are questioning the need is because it should be founded in data that people can look at.

Ms. Reiss left the meeting at this time. (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Faust stated he has asked numerous times for the need study, and he was advised by Mr. Malinowski, a member of the Park & Recreation Board, that it was in the Minutes. Mr. Faust stated he reviewed the Minutes and found only comments, but no real analysis. Mr. Faust stated he feels the job the coaches do is great and he does not feel anyone present would say that supporting the children is a bad thing; but there are also a number of Seniors present this evening, and he feels the Township needs to pay attention to them as well. Mr. Faust stated he understands this projects started out as a need to the Park & Recreation Board. He stated they were told that the need is also based on National standards for park space which come from the NRPA site which he has looked into. Mr. Faust stated there was a letter dated May 18 from the sports leagues to the Planning Commission indicating that the Nationwide standard for core active recreation is 350 acres for a Township the size of Lower Makefield. He stated this is calculated as ten acres per 1,000 residents. He stated they say in another statement that they revised this to 9.6 but they did not alter the 350 acres that was needed for the community. Mr. Faust read from the NRPA site which indicates they should “benchmark data to best identify the best practices to optimally serve your community.” Mr. Faust stated the NRPA standard pertains to “park land” and not “ball fields.” He stated it further indicates that because each community is unique, NRPA no longer publishes National standards.

Mr. Faust stated the statistics provided by the ball clubs were also incorrect, and they based their figures on a multiplier of ten which, as he noted earlier, they did revise to 9.6; however, they were basing it on a population of 35,000 and not the approximately 32,600 residents. He stated based on the LMT 2015 Census number which is 32,650 you would get 313 acres. He stated therefore the figure noted by the clubs was overstated by 37 acres which is larger than the Snipes Tract. Mr. Faust stated the NRPA site indicates that for Townships the medium is 9 acres per 1,000 acres so even 9.6 is overstated. He stated if LMT wanted to have the amount of park acreage that is typical for Townships, it would need 9 acres times the 32,650 residents which would be just under 294 total parks acreage including indoor and outdoor recreation facilities.

Mr. Benedetto stated the number does still not hit what they should have even with the addition of Snipes. Mr. Faust stated total LMT Park acreage including indoor and outdoor recreation facilities that are in process equals about 253 acres; and if they were to include the Golf Course, and/or State and County Park land near the Canal they would be considerable over the typical value for Townships. He stated if they added the 5 Mile Woods, they would be thousands of acres over the typical value. He stated if they do not add in the natural areas, but did include the Snipes Tract as any type of Park they would be at 289 acres which is very close to the typical value for Townships. Mr. Benedetto stated this would indicate he would support Snipes, and Mr. Faust stated it could but it does not say “ball parks,” it just says “park land.”

Ms. Tyler stated she can tell that Mr. Faust put a lot of time and effort into this, and Mr. Faust stated he feels this same amount of time and effort should have been required by the ball clubs in front of Park & Recreation. He asked what criteria was used to agree to spend \$3 million, and he questions why they are spending \$3 million for a need that technically has not been presented.

Mr. Benedetto stated the property was purchased in 2000, and the need was established at that time. He stated they have not filled that need for seventeen years, and the Township should have built the fields when they purchased the property for recreation use. He stated a whole generation of children have gone to other Townships including baseball, lacrosse, and field hockey. He stated people move into the Township because we have wonderful facilities like Macclesfield, the Golf Course, and the Pool. Mr. Benedetto stated since the need was established in 2000, he feels the previous Boards should be “ashamed that they did not have the will to do it.” He stated the need has been demonstrated for seventeen years, and it has in fact gotten worse.

Mr. Faust stated he agrees that Mr. Benedetto is listening, and he thanked him for coming out to his home. He stated he is just asking that they listen to what he is saying and would like to know what criteria they are using. He stated he reviewed all of the Minutes, and he did not find a needs assessment. He stated he does not feel this is the fault of the sports organizations, and he feels the Park & Recreation Board should have required a needs assessment. Mr. Benedetto stated those who served on Park & Recreation have served on that Board for a long time, and they have seen multiple Supervisor Boards do nothing. Mr. Benedetto stated Mr. Fritchey was the Chairman of Park & Rec for almost twenty years, and he gave an impassioned speech in 2009 about the need. He stated this project almost happened in 2009, but the Board changed; and they did not do anything. He stated he feels the elected officials should have had the political will to do this. He stated some have indicated that the residents are opposed to this; however he stated he saw an on-line petition of those in favor of this being developed as a multi-sports complex with 675 signatures compared to the number on a petition opposed to this with 300 signatures.

Mr. Faust stated that is not data. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels the current Board is the best Board he has worked with in six years. He stated they do not care about the politics, rather they care about doing what they feel is best for the community. He stated he feels politics played a role in this previously which is why it did not get done. Mr. Faust stated he does not question the Board’s intentions, but he wanted to bring up the fact that they have repeatedly asked for a needs analysis. He stated at the Planning Commission, Mr. Bryson indicated he had also repeatedly asked for a needs assessment.

Mr. Benedetto asked Mr. Faust if he is satisfied with the changes they have suggested this evening, and Mr. Faust stated he is not entirely satisfied. Mr. Faust stated he does not like the lights. He asked the lighting engineer if there is any technology for retractable lights; and Ms. Tyler stated Mr. Zoeller addressed that earlier this evening, and the problem was the positioning of the lights, and once you start moving them around, they could impact playability space.

Mr. Faust stated he provided numbers to the Board, and all of his numbers are cited from the Census Bureau and Park & Rec. He stated for the sports teams, he also broke down their highest seasons to be fair to the teams. He stated over the last six years, YMS is basically flat. He stated the PAA spring season has gone down a little. He stated while they were focusing on football which is going to occupy Snipes, he feels they should also look at the other sports leagues. He stated with regard to football, 47% of the growth shown in the total line are those who are not from Lower Makefield. Mr. Faust stated he also looked at the census numbers, and he showed numbers from 1990 to 2015; and while numbers for those aged five to nineteen have gone up from 1990, if you look at the last five to six years, they are actually going down, and what is going up are the Seniors. Mr. Faust stated if they are going to spend \$3 million for this use, for the next \$3 million they spend they will have to find something for the Seniors.

Mr. Fritchey stated they have not forgotten about the Seniors, and they are building the Community Center where the Seniors are expected to be a major user. He stated they have also been developing Memorial Park, and they have applied for a State Grant for next year for Memorial Park. Mr. Fritchey stated Snipes is an athletic complex, and it has been seen as that for the last twenty years if you look at all the Township Comprehensive Plans for the last twenty years. He stated every planning consultant they have had for the past fifteen to twenty years has indicated that the Township has a need for an active athletic complex, and that is what Snipes meets the need of. He stated Memorial Park is a community park designed to be 50% active and 50% passive with an emphasis on pick-up games, families, and corporate and church groups. Mr. Fritchey stated they have made a lot of progress at Memorial Park, and they recently built a 1K running/walking/biking trail, and started a major arboretum with over 200 trees installed and more going in. He stated they are also opening up the east end of Memorial Park and have sought a \$250,000 matching Grant for more biking/running/walking trails, and fitness stations so it is more adapted to adults including those adults who are aging.

Mr. Fritchey stated he raised his children in his home, but the home is big for just his wife and himself; and when he sells his home it will probably be purchased by a young family. He feels the Township housing stock and our location will guarantee that there will always be families living here. He stated the Board's mission is to meet the recreational needs of all age groups not the least of which are the youth.

He stated the Board has to look out for the needs of 33,000 people and the needs are diverse. He stated they have been told they need more active recreation space by every professional planner the Township has hired for the last twenty years, and those running the athletic organizations have advised the Board that they do not have enough fields. Mr. Fritchey stated they also know that Macclesfield is being overused; and if YMS had not spent \$800,000 of their own money to put in a turf field, Macclesfield would be a “mud hole.” Mr. Fritchey stated YMS made a huge contribution, and he is very grateful to them for having done that.

Mr. Faust stated he feels they should show documentation of the need, because if people just say they are “bursting at the seams,” those are just statements; and it is not founded in any scientific needs.

Mr. Kevin Cauley, 1355 James Court, stated what he heard from those doing the traffic study sounded very anecdotal, and he did not see any numbers. He stated when people are coming down Dolington and make a right hand turn onto Quarry Road, and then make a left hand turn onto Creamery with the people coming down Quarry Road making a right hand turn onto Creamery you are sometimes sitting there four to five minutes trying to make the left hand turn. He questions how much empirical data is being used with regard to the traffic study. Mr. Cauley stated he is also concerned that he does not feel they have done a real demographics analysis, and he hears a lot of anecdotal information. He stated there have been no metrics and no objectivity. He stated he feels they need to bring in a third party since he feels the Board of Supervisors is blurred in their vision of not so much worrying about accountability to the taxpayers of Lower Makefield, but accountability to Mr. Fritchey and the Park & Recreation Department. He stated he feels the Board’s role is to be accountable to the residents and not to Park & Rec.

Mr. Cauley stated Mr. Benedetto was very vocal with regard to the survey, and 50% of those who signed that survey indicating they were in favor of the project were out-of-Township residents. Mr. Cauley stated Mr. Benedetto signed that survey, and that is not being objective. Mr. Benedetto stated he indicated this evening that he is in support of the project, and he has always been in support of it. Mr. Cauley stated Mr. Benedetto should therefore recuse himself as should Mr. Fritchey because it is “his baby.” Mr. Cauley stated the Township residents are “in revolt and are angry.”

Ms. Judy Gordon stated she has lived on Buck Creek Drive for over thirty years, and she has seen how the Township has changed. She stated she heard originally that this parcel was purchased so that there would be a space at some point in the future if they wanted to develop something, and that is why it sat vacant for so long as well as not having the money. Ms. Gordon stated while other things were being built particularly in the north end of the Township, it was felt that if there was a parcel available, they should land bank it so they could have it for the future.



Ms. Gordon stated she has a lot of concerns about the traffic down Creamery Road; and every time there is a back up at the bridge, the cars speed down from 332 on Creamery to Quarry Road. She stated there is also a hump in the road on Quarry Road near the entrance to the stables which is also a deer crossing and many cars have been hit by deer. Ms. Gordon spoke about the problems getting into her neighborhood. She stated she is also concerned about getting to the Park safely from her neighborhood because there are no sidewalks. Ms. Gordon stated they have been promised for over twenty years that there was going to be a walking network built. She stated they are going to spend all this money, but they never kept the promise for the other infrastructure. She stated she is disappointed with the Board.

Mr. Matthew Eisenberg, Brentwood Road, stated he played organized sports since he was five years old; and he has a child playing on YMS. He stated he has heard by the experts that the fields are not going to impact he or his neighbors in any way, but he would like to know what will happen if their projections and reality do not mesh. Ms. Tyler stated the Plan has been engineered and reviewed by other engineers, and it is a well engineered plan. She stated she does not believe that the experts stated there would be no impact as there will be an impact; and what they are trying to do is minimize any controllable aspect of the project that they can. She stated if there is a problem that arises in the future, they will address it.

Mr. Greg Calabria stated he had prepared a power point presentation. Ms. Tyler stated Mr. Kelliher indicated that he was having an issue getting the presentation loaded, but the entire Board did review his power point. Mr. Calabria stated he feels the visual would be good for the audience. Ms. Tyler stated there was an issue, and she asked that he sum up his points. Mr. Calabria stated he attended the meeting on November 28 that was cut short, and one of the issues that came up was the issue of need and whether it was a real or perceived need. He stated after that meeting he did a physical exam of the facilities that were marked out on the Plan prepared by Park & Rec, and he visited eighteen sites, fourteen of which were Lower Makefield sites; and there were an additional four that Lower Makefield Township is a host community for four schools which have a lot of playing area. He stated he has summarized this information in a table, and he found that there are twenty-six soccer or football fields, three of which are lighted, twenty-four baseball or softball fields, four of which are lighted, nineteen basketball courts, one of which is lighted, four volleyball courts, thirteen tennis courts, and sixteen of the eighteen sites that he drove by had open space area not otherwise occupied by athletic fields.

Mr. Calabria stated looking at the data from the NRPA he feels with all the fields they have including the Golf Course and the Five Mile Woods that they exceed the 350 acres. He stated the chart they put out indicates that they recommend that there be one basketball court for every 5,000 people, one baseball field for every 5,000

people, softball is the same, one football field for every 20,000 residents, and soccer would be one for every 10,000 residents, and one golf course for every 50,000 residents. He stated according to the census data, Lower Makefield Township from 1950 to 2000 increased in population tenfold, and the average growth rate is approximately 4.6%. He stated the decisions that were made about the need were made in 1995/1997 and reiterated again in 2008. He stated if you project the average of 4.6% out to today, there should be 42,000 residents. He stated in 2000 there was actually a negative growth in the Township of -.01%, and it is flat until 2015. He stated the projected growth is only .35% which he feels is an optimistic projection which would bring the Township to approximately 35,000 people in 2040. Mr. Calabria stated from 1990 to 2010 there was an increase in the age group from under 5 to 14, but from 2000 to 2010 there was a drop in that population of 2.3%.

Mr. Benedetto stated the data he has is that from 1990 to 2000 the census data showed that there was growth of 30%. Mr. Calabria stated he does not disagree; however, it “hit the wall in 2000” where from 2000 to 2015 they had a negative growth. Ms. Tyler stated it appears that Mr. Calabria is indicating that he does not believe the census data supports the need for the fields, and Mr. Calabria agreed. He stated the age group of people from 35 to 64 over that same time period had a steady increase of over 4%.

Mr. Calabria stated he feels they should look at developing a resource utilization program to effect efficient and balanced use of the existing facilities. He stated they should evaluate the open fields they have at the sixteen sites to see which ones have the potential for the addition of fields adding he feels it will be less expensive to develop an existing site with the amenities they want. He stated he would also suggest that to take care of the needs of those who are 35 to 64 and beyond to use the Snipes property for a walking/bike riding picnic area not dissimilar to the Five Mile Woods so that they would have the 5 Mile Woods on the south side of the Township and Snipes on the north side.

Ms. Tyler thanked Mr. Calabria for the time he took putting this together.

Mr. Rich May, 1270 Creamery Road, stated he is 10' from where the fields will be built, and he never received any notice in the mail. Mr. May stated one of the reasons why he believes the Township originally started buying up open space was to cut down on the liability they would have of putting up additional Schools and how expensive that would be. He stated it was not to build baseball fields, but it was to cut down on the number of people that would bring young children in who would have to go to School. Mr. May stated he lives at the corner of Creamery and Quarry Roads, and he has seen a minimum of twenty traffic accidents. He stated no

one pays any attention to the stop sign there. He stated his driveway is next to the stop sign, and he has a very difficult time getting out of his driveway. Mr. May stated there is a tremendous amount of traffic in this area in the morning and the afternoon due to the Schools in the area. He stated there is also a tremendous amount of traffic during Elections since the School is a polling place. Mr. May stated he feels the numbers that were discussed of cars coming to the Snipes facility as proposed are flawed, and there will be more traffic than what was discussed; and he feels the 167 parking spaces will be filled, and cars will be parked all over. He stated Dolington Road is like a "raceway." Mr. May stated he is also concerned about flooding which he feels will be worse once the trees are gone despite what the engineer discussed.

Mr. Scott Fegley, 12 Delaware Rim Drive, stated he was a former Supervisor from 1/1/94 to 12/31/05; and he was on the Board when they purchased the Snipes Tract. He stated he feels the Board has already made up its collective mind. He stated Mr. Benedetto indicated earlier that he felt the former Boards should "be ashamed of themselves for not having the political will to build the Park at an earlier date." Mr. Fegley stated the top priority for the Board that he sat on was not to raise taxes since that was what the voters wanted. He stated this was especially true for the Seniors. He stated for fourteen years before 1998 when they had the Open Space Referendum, there were no tax increases in Lower Makefield Township. He stated they went out in 1998 for the Open Space Referendum because there was a desperate need as developers were buying up the land in Lower Makefield, and it was going away. He stated the Board knew at that time that if there was any hope for having park land for some future use, they had to buy the land at that time or it would be gone in another fifteen to twenty years. Mr. Fegley stated the Board did not make the decision themselves as they knew if they were going to raise \$7.5 million that was going to mean there would have to be a tax increase, and a majority of the Supervisors did not want to raise taxes unless the Lower Makefield residents were in favor of this. He stated the Open Space Referendum passed in 1998 by 80%, which was the largest positive vote for any subject in Lower Makefield history.

Mr. Fegley stated the money they purchased the Snipes Tract with was from the Open Space Referendum, and the reason why they did not spend another \$2 million at that time for any further development at either Snipes or Memorial Park was because that would have meant another tax increase; and it was not fiscally responsible which is why they did not do it, and not because they lacked the political will. He stated they saved the land so that future Boards could consider it.

Mr. Benedetto asked Mr. Fegley the use for which they purchased Snipes, and Mr. Fegley stated it was not meant to be open space in terms of trees and nothing else. He stated there was a Master Plan, and he has been told that the original Plan

for the Snipes Tract showed nine mini soccer fields; although he did not recall that. He stated he is not objecting to the use of the Snipes Tract for athletic facilities; but his objection is that he just found out about this one week ago. Mr. Benedetto stated Mr. Fegley was on the Board when it was purchased specifically for recreation use as it states that in the Settlement Agreement. Mr. Fegley stated he agrees, but he would have enjoyed having the opportunity to discuss this as there were different permeations over the year. He stated they did consider a sub station for the Fire Department at that location at one time, but he does not feel there were funds at that time to do this which is why it never occurred. Mr. Fegley stated had the fire station been constructed, that would have diminished the recreational use which would be a less intensive use than what is proposed now.

Mr. Fritchey stated the location where the fire station was proposed is where the detention basin is now going to be located. Mr. Fegley stated he felt it was close to where the proposed driveway is coming out onto Dolington Road. Mr. Fritchey stated the original plan was shown earlier this evening, and the location for the proposed fire station was shown on that Plan. Mr. Fegley stated he feels what was proposed earlier was a less intense use. Mr. Benedetto asked if he feels nine fields would be less intense than three fields; and Mr. Fegley stated he feels mini soccer fields with no lights would be less intense. Mr. Fegley stated he does not feel they ever proposed lights or 500 parking spaces. Mr. Benedetto referred to Minutes from 2005.

Mr. Fegley stated he just learned about this project from a letter sent to his office at the Makefield Executive Quarters and not at his home on Delaware Rim Drive recognizing that his home is not within the 1000' feet requirement. He stated if they felt it was important enough to send letters to the businesses in the Makefield Executive Quarters, they should have sent it out in the beginning of the process rather than at the end of the process last week. He stated he has questions, but feels that it is now too late; and nothing he says will make any difference because it is already a "done deal." Mr. Fegley stated he would be in favor of a Referendum when they are spending \$3 million. He stated he would also like to know why they would not have baseball fields instead of it being a football complex. He stated he also has questions about the two entrances and feels all the cars will be meeting at the triangle trying to get out. He stated this is not a Minor Subdivision, and it is the most expensive, most engineered, and most important project that this Board has had to consider in the time they have been on the Board; and he feels it should have been done with more notice.

Mr. Fegley asked the Board to withhold their vote and give the opportunity for residents to have more input on the project so that they can come up with a Park which will be understood and accepted. He stated he agrees that this property was intended for recreational use including some type of ball fields; but the type of

fields, the intensity, and the lights are all questions; and he does not feel the Plan meets the original intention of what the Board had in mind when they purchased the property.

Ms. Elizabeth Luciano, Ash Lane, stated her back yard backs up to Creamery Road, and stated she did not receive a letter even for tonight's meeting as the letter came addressed to her husband although she is also on the mortgage. She stated she is not against the parcel being used to benefit the Township, but she feels what is proposed is too much for this space. She stated she is very concerned about quality of life and the noise at 8:30 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. and the lights. She stated she is concerned about getting out of Ash Lane onto Creamery on Saturdays. She stated she is concerned about the dampness of the area around Dolington and Creamery where there is a creek; and if this is not done right, they will have problems in their neighborhoods with water. She stated a few years ago the Board tried having weddings at Elm Lowne, and it was very disruptive to the neighborhood with traffic and noise. She stated the Board in its wisdom stopped having the weddings. She stated the restrooms, concession stand, the loop road, and 70' high light poles cannot be mitigated once they are installed so if they vote in favor of this, they will be stuck with this which is a problem. She asked the Board to put this project to a Public Referendum so that all voices can be heard.

Mr. Truelove stated Pennsylvania does not have an Initiative and Referendum process, although they can have a Referenda when you have a question on the ballot as they did in 1998 to expend public money; and that is when you can do it, and not for projects. He stated the money for this project was non-Electoral debt which was approved last year as part of a refinancing of prior debt. He stated they discussed this last year when the Bond was approved.

Mr. Luke Butler, 2320 Weinmann Way, asked that they add a proper active use recreational path to the dark green space he showed on the Plan. He stated he would recommend that they add to this space a walking/jogging trail. He stated there are eleven acres of open space that are not being used. He stated a path is the only thing that could go there that people could get on. He stated he has walked that area several times, and it is very scenic; but it should be considered for active recreation and not just like the hiking trails that are in Five Mile Woods. He stated this would be to encourage people to run, fitness walk, etc. He stated this would be useful to the neighbors and to the families coming to the site. He stated while he recognizes that money could be an issue, Mr. Fedorchak had indicated earlier in the year that there was \$300,000 that had been Budgeted for open space and since the costs came in lower, those funds would be available; and he would ask that they commit that money to invest a little more in the infrastructure here to put in this active trail.

Ms. Tyler asked Mr. Butler what he would suggest for the surface of the walking trail; and Mr. Butler stated ideally it would be something people could have strollers or wheelchairs on although that might make it a impervious surface. He asked if they are going to add this trail, he would ask that it be added before they go out for engineering.

Mr. Dan Grenier, 3 Highland Drive, stated he is a member of the EAC. He stated the EAC provided a letter in January to which Boucher & James responded. Mr. Grenier stated he designs parks and infrastructure for a living, and he feels the Township should take a step back and consider some more details. He stated the Township has an Ordinance with regard to woodlands which are clearly defined, but there has not been a tree survey done; and he feels that they should conduct a tree survey to verify whether or not a woodland actually exists on the site.

Ms. Goldstein stated what is on the site is a former nursery which was an agricultural crop protected under the Right-to-Farm legislation. She stated when you have a cash crop, the owner of that cash crop is permitted to harvest the crop. She stated in this case, the site had been agricultural based; and they have aerial photos from 1938, 1958, and 1971 that show it was clearly in pure agricultural farmland at that point. She stated sometime between 1971 and 2000, it became a nursery; and in 2000 in the Stipulated Agreement as part of the sale, the former owner of the property retained the right to harvest additional trees which they did for several years. She stated the Township has been harvesting trees as well; and as part of the Land Development for the site, they were going to re-locate some of the trees from specific areas on the site to the buffer area. She stated it is not a woodland – it is a cash crop which was a nursery.

Mr. Grenier stated he disagrees what Ms. Goldstein. He stated there are many regulations when it comes to Land Development that allow for agricultural use; however, when a land use changes from an active agricultural facility to a park or a development of some other type, Permits and regulations are required to go through that process. He stated if a land use does not change, and the land has remained fallow for five years or more, it falls out of the agricultural protections and you then have to go through the regulatory process. Ms. Goldstein stated the term “fallow” would apply to a tilled field; but in the course of a nursery, the trees do not go fallow, but continue to grow. Mr. Grenier stated “fallow” in this case means active agricultural operations have ceased. Mr. Grenier stated as a means to protect the Township from future liability for not going through the full Zoning process, he would look into this. Ms. Goldstein stated if they were to consider the former nursery a woodlands, the Township would be permitted to disturb 10% of that; and they are disturbing less than 10% of that area so they still meet the Ordinance.

Mr. Grenier stated his recommendation is to do the tree survey to determine whether or not it is a woodland and proceed accordingly.

Mr. Grenier stated with respect to the needs statement in the EIA it is not a need statement as defined, it is a chronological listing of what has happened with the site over time; and he feels it would be helpful if a true purpose and needs statement were included in the EIA.

Mr. Grenier stated with regard to the stormwater design, the EAC issued a letter in January; and he recognizes that some additional testing and changes have been made to the design which he appreciates. He stated Mr. Goll has also reviewed the design, and he indicated that the proposed design was outdated twenty years ago; and Mr. Grenier stated he agrees with Mr. Goll. Mr. Grenier stated several Waivers have been requested which he feels are questionable. He stated infiltration trenches are a BMP that are known to fail regularly without extreme operations and maintenance upkeep; and he has seen these on sites, and nobody likes them. He stated most of them are covered under stone, fabric, and seed; and you never see it until it is too late. He stated as the major BMP dealing with the two-year storm, which is the most common storm, it is a concern. Mr. Grenier stated with regard to the basin in the southeast corner, it is a very basic basin; and there will be higher water levels across a longer period of time. He stated other civil engineers, such as Mr. Goll, have recommended the creation of a series of bio-filtration basins/rain gardens which would include trees and shrubs so it is a landscape feature that provides habitat, is cleaner, does not fail as often, and can be spread out around the Park.

Mr. Benedetto stated he feels this was addressed by Ms. Goldstein that this would be a significant cost increase. Mr. Grenier stated he has designed many of these and has been able to do them efficiently.

Mr. Grenier stated his firm's motto is "Design with Community in Mind," and he feels they should move any feature away from the southeast corner. He stated moving the basin away from there would allow them to keep the intersection open for future "fixes" so that they could get pedestrian/bicycle access across Dolington into the site. He stated with regard to the smaller field in the northeast corner, he appreciates the additional vegetation which has been added; and if they were able to rotate that field 90 degrees, it would bring it further away and allow for additional drainage if needed and a little more room for the nature path to go around the corner. Mr. Grenier was advised that there would be an issue with the setbacks; and Mr. Grenier stated while he recognizes that, they may be able to push it down to a location he showed on the Plan. Mr. Grenier stated if they were to have bio-retention facilities dispersed throughout the site, the Schools in the area may be able to use them as "living classrooms" that could be integrated into the curriculum

if the School District was willing to do so. He stated with regard to the path around the Park recommended by Mr. Butler, he would prefer that it be more of a natural surface because he feels there is enough pavement in the Township. He stated it could also be used for pee-wee level cross country. Mr. Grenier stated with regard to the tree buffer, if they can move anything out of the southeast corner, it will increase the tree buffer.

Mr. Grenier asked that they consider the lighting for the fourth field. He stated if they have a lot of trees, it will mitigate the lighting pollution. Mr. Fritchey stated Mr. Zoeller had indicated that they based their study assuming no shielding. Mr. Grenier stated he feels what people like even less is being able to see the poles, and one of the ways to attempt to mitigate that other than trees and sight lines is to change the color of the poles from silver to something darker that is not as shiny which would disappear at night.

Mr. Zoeller stated he hears this point all of the time; but normally when you are looking up at a 70' pole, your background behind the pole is the sky during the day so the silvery color of the pole blends into the clouds and the sky. He stated they have put up a number of other color poles; but every time they do that, when you are looking at the sky those poles stand out more as opposed to the silver poles against the daylight sky.

Mr. Grenier stated it would help if they had showed renderings to show people what the poles will look like from different angles.

Mr. Grenier stated with regard to Elcon he found out today that their Application was found to be administratively incomplete by the DEP, and their Application was sent back.

Ms. Chris Gray-Faust, 1509 Dolington Road, stated she feels the recommendations from the Traffic Commission and the Environmental Advisory Council should be taken into account before a vote; however, if the Board is going to vote on it, she likes the direction she is hearing with regard to not having lights on the fourth field, having more trees, and elimination of the skate park. She stated she appreciates what the engineers have done as well with the impervious surface; however, she is still concerned since she lives at the southeast corner, and she feels more could be done as it is possible that corner could get more flooding.

Ms. Faust stated she would rather have a park here than a fire station, and she would rather hear children than sirens. She stated she hopes there is room to incorporate some of the suggestions so that they can make this the best possible project for the neighborhood.



Mr. Benedetto thanked Mr. and Ms. Faust for opening up their property to him, and he did see the existing water there; and he understands their concerns given what they are dealing with.

Mr. Tony Kehoe, 476 Liberty Drive, stated he is a mechanical engineer with forty years experience. He asked the engineers how the storm system will work for the twenty-five, fifty, and one hundred year storms; and what the basin will look like for the hundred year storm. He stated if they can put it in layman's terms, he feels it will alleviate a lot of anxiety.

Mr. Eisold stated the one hundred year storm is the highest-design storm they are required to design to, and it is a very large storm. He stated there are a number of infiltration trenches that will take in the initial rain. He stated for the one hundred year storm, they are being surcharged. He stated when there is a one hundred year storm the basin will operate to the maximum capacity, and there would be approximately five feet of water in the basin. He stated the purpose of the basin is to hold the water. He stated the overall amount of volume of run off from the impervious surface will be greater after the construction than before, but what they are required to design to is the peak run off which is the instantaneous amount of water coming off the site. He stated part of their design is to determine pre-development what is the peak run off coming to the corner of the site which is where the water goes now; and after construction, they will use the basin to store water and allow it to discharge at a slower rate which is what they referred to with the 45% decrease.

Mr. Benedetto stated there are ten Waivers being requested, and he asked if any of them are with regard to stormwater management. Ms. Saylor stated with the May 19 Plan, which is the latest Plan, they had fourteen Waivers; but through discussion with the Township, they have looked at certain ones that they can probably eliminate. She noted specifically the Waiver with regard to the 15" diameter pipe. She stated that Section of the Ordinance was from years ago when standard pipes were 18" and higher, but now 15" has become a common size; however, they could change the 15" to 18" pipe which would eliminate the Waiver request not only for that but also the Wavier request for the 3" increments.

Mr. Kehoe asked during the one hundred year storm will water be overflowing the basins and going down to the houses that are below. Ms. Saylor stated for the original design, they were going to do a staged discharge; and just for the one hundred year storm, they would use a minimal part of the spillway and the outlet pipe, but they looked at that again, and they feel that they are able to eliminate the request for that Waiver also and keep all the water below the emergency spillway and discharge it at a controlled, reduced rate.

Mr. Kehoe stated for the one hundred year storm which is eight inches over twenty-four hours they would have no water coming out of the basin. Mr. Eisold stated that is incorrect as there will always be water coming out of the basin, but the peak flow will be reduced. Mr. Kehoe asked where the water will go, and Mr. Eisold stated it will go where it goes now into the culvert underneath Quarry Road. Mr. Kehoe asked if it goes on the Faust property, and Mr. Eisold stated it does go through the channel on the Faust property. He stated the requirements are that they cannot increase the peak run off. Mr. Kehoe asked if they have diverted the water, and Mr. Eisold stated they have not, and the only way it can go is through the low area through the Faust property.

Mr. Fritchey asked what would happen with the stormwater if they did not proceed with the Snipes project, and Mr. Eisold stated it would go the way it goes today.

Mr. Kehoe stated if the retention trenches get clogged that should not effect the one hundred year storm, since they are not used for that purpose; but they will have to be actively maintained. Mr. Kehoe asked if any of the rainwater will drain into the retention trenches from the top through the grass. Ms. Saylor stated they are infiltration trenches, and the water will go in through the grass. She stated the trenches will be wrapped in filter fabric to prevent sediment from getting in. Mr. Kehoe stated he feels there is nothing they can do about the water that is from the grass on top, and it will eventually clog over time. Ms. Saylor disagreed, and stated that is what the fabric is for, and it allows the water to get through but not sediment. Mr. Kehoe stated he feels the sediment will collect and clog. Mr. Eisold stated it will not. He stated it is a small layer of topsoil with grass over it. He stated it will be a depressed area that will hold the water, and the water will seep through the initial layer of topsoil and go through the fabric, although the dirt will not be able to get through the fabric. He stated if they are installed properly and fully wrapped, they should not clog for many, many years. He stated if there is a rip or break in the fabric, there could be a clog, and they would have to re-construct; however, if they are built properly, there should not be any sediment getting in.

Mr. Kehoe asked Mr. Fedorchak if the Township plans an active monitoring program of these; and in addition to changing the filters, will there be testing to make sure these have not failed. Mr. Fedorchak stated if that is what the engineers tell them to do, they will do it.

Mr. Eisold stated previously Mr. Grenier had discussed bio-retention basins; and Mr. Eisold stated that is a current design methodology which they utilize in many design projects. He stated unfortunately in this situation, their constraints were such that it made it very difficult. He stated if they had an additional six to eight acres of open space and did not have to take down trees, that could have been an option; and if they had an additional \$200,000 to \$300,000, they could design them.

Mr. Eisold stated they wanted to keep most of the buffer and wanted to effect as few trees as possible so they did not have a lot of space to do any kind of creative bio-retention basins. He stated if the skate park or possibly the fourth field were not built, they may have had an option to do that; but with the constraints they had, that could not be done. Mr. Kehoe stated they are designing "Class A" athletic fields, and he asked that they not design it with a "C minus" stormwater management system. Ms. Tyler stated they have already shown that there is going to be a significant reduction from what exists today. Mr. Kehoe stated he would like them to do bio-retention.

Mr. Kehoe asked the size of the basin and how long it will take to drain out after the one hundred year storm. Ms. Saylor stated it would take approximately twenty hours to drain the one hundred year storm.

Mr. Bakhshisk Sandhu, 1328 Jacob Drive, stated he has lived here for over thirty years; and he passes the intersection every day morning and evening. He asked how much it will cost to run the project annually – water, electricity, maintenance, etc. Mr. Benedetto stated the User Fees that the Township collects for the Township parks currently are in excess of what it costs to maintain the facilities. Mr. Sandhu asked if it is worthwhile to have all the people speak when the Board has already decided in favor of the project. Mr. Benedetto stated they have made a number of changes because of comments made by residents. Mr. Sandhu stated his point is that a majority of the people have already stated that they do not like the project, and he asked the Township Supervisors not to vote against the will of the people. He stated they should not vote on it tonight, and they should bring in an independent third party to determine if this is needed or not.

Mr. Benedetto stated the Supervisors are voted in to make these kinds of decisions, and they do not govern by Referendum. Mr. Sandhu stated this situation is unique, because the Party deciding the project is the Party that wants the project to happen so it is not an independent opinion. He stated he feels the traffic impact has been downplayed.

Mr. Steve James, 1423 Wheatsheaf Road, asked if there is not going to be lighting on the fourth field, and Ms. Tyler stated they have not determined this yet. Mr. James stated the lighting on that field is a huge problem because there is the width of I-95 and 70' to 80' of woods, and then his house. He stated if those lights are on, he will not be able to go into his back yard as he will be looking at a "shopping center parking lot." He stated he is also does not feel something this "grand" is needed.

Ms. Tricia Bunn, 1105 Gloria Lane, stated she is the longest-sitting member of the Park & Recreation Board, and she has lived in the Township for over forty years. She stated she was on the Park & Recreation Board when Mr. Fegley was a Supervisor, and he assigned she and two other members of the Park & Rec Board at that time to be on a Sub-Committee. She stated they met with user groups and residents for months to come up with the Plan showing nine mini and mid-sized soccer fields. She stated the Fire Station was also on that Plan; however, for a number of reasons, it was not constructed. She stated the reason for the soccer fields was to take some of the practice off of Macclesfield and for Tournament play.

Ms. Bunn stated she takes exception to the comments made by the EAC engineer as those recommendations would be fine for a client with a lot of funds; however, this is a Municipality. She stated what he was proposing would be difficult and expensive to maintain, and the Township Public Works employees are not trained to maintain a bio-infiltration basin properly which is why a lot of Municipalities do not use them. She stated she would be more in favor of a mowed basin so that it can be seen how much water is in there.

Ms. Bunn stated the Park & Recreation Board has been talking about this property for over a decade and very few of the people present this evening have ever come to one of their meetings. She stated she feels this project has been made very public. She stated she agrees that the needs have changed from 2004 when the original recommendation was made. She stated the Minutes clearly show that there is a need as the User groups attend the Park & Rec meetings every month, and twice a year they provide projections on their previous year and future projections. She stated it shows in the Minutes how the User groups need more fields. Ms. Bunn stated YMS agreed to give up one of their soccer fields at Heacock so that the Township could put in a Dog Park to serve that user group. She stated YMS needs more space at Macclesfield; and since football needs space and lacrosse wants to come into the Township, they recommended that Snipes be redesigned for football and lacrosse. She stated they have been reviewing this for two years. She stated Park & Rec meetings are public and all are welcome to attend. She stated Park & Rec has worked with the Township engineer, Township traffic engineer, and the Planning Commission so it is not being done in a “bubble.”

Mr. Todd May, 1242 Quarry Hill Court, stated he has been a resident for twenty-eight years. He stated he feels there will be light pollution. He stated with regard to the entrance, Macclesfield is over ninety acres, and it only has one entrance; and he asked why they have to have the entrance directly across from Quarry Hill Court. He showed an area on the Plan where he feels it could be moved.

Mr. Wursta stated one of the main rules and guidelines for traffic engineering is to line up driveways and line up streets. He stated the predominant issue is conflict which can result in accidents. He stated four-way stops are also more recognizable so the driver expectation is much clearer. Mr. May asked about eliminating this entrance/exit all together, and Mr. Wursta stated they feel there should absolutely be two access points for emergency access and traffic distribution.

Mr. May stated the Scudder Falls Bridge project does not include sound barriers along the side and all of the sound will come through when they cut down all the trees.

Ms. Beth Cauley, James Court, asked how many cars are present on a Tournament day at Macclesfield, and how many they expect on Tournament days at Snipes. Ms. Tyler stated she does not believe that football has Tournaments near the scale of YMS for soccer as football is a much smaller user group so they could not make a comparison. Ms. Cauley asked the hours that Macclesfield is in session because her parents live on Yardley Road, and they hear “screaming” from 8 a.m. to 10:30 at night, see the lights glowing, and there is constant noise with “whistles and cheering;” and she asked if it will be any different with football.

Mr. Gordon Workman, 1152 Kenneth Lane, stated he is involved with the football organization, and their parents do cheer. He stated they do not have Tournaments for football. He stated they anticipate thirty to forty players per field per game. He stated on Saturdays they would go from 8 in the morning until 2 to 3 p.m. and maybe some games that evening. He stated weekdays, they would typically go from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. or 9:30 p.m. Ms. Cauley stated Macclesfield goes a lot later than that. Ms. Cauley stated she feels it would be appropriate to have had the information before the Board was to vote.

Ms. Cauley asked if anyone on the Board of Supervisors has walked in Memorial Park because there are so many goose droppings it is unwalkable. Ms. Cauley stated Ms. Reiss advised her that she would have a goose remediation program although she is not sure how that would work. Mr. Lewis stated last week he spent two hours in Memorial Park, and he did not notice this problem. Ms. Cauley stated it was unwalkable when she went there three months ago. Ms. Cauley stated she does not consider Memorial Park a passive park because there is only a one kilometer trail. Mr. Fritchey stated they have plans to expand it next year. He stated they sought a \$250,000 matching Grant, and there will be additional walking/jogging/biking/running trails as well as fitness stations.

Ms. Cauley stated Snipes is not a passive park, and it will serve the people coming to play football; and if they want a quiet park, they will not come to Snipes because of the noise level. Mr. Fritchey agreed that Snipes was not intended as a passive park rather it is considered an athletic complex.

Ms. Cauley asked why lacrosse needs to move here from Middletown Township. Mr. Benedetto stated it seems Ms. Cauley is fine with Lower Makefield children playing in other Townships, but does not want children from outside Lower Makefield playing in Lower Makefield. Ms. Cauley stated Lower Makefield allows 20% into our Township, and she asked why other Township cannot allow our children in their Townships. She asked why Lower Makefield is the only Township accepting people in. Mr. Benedetto stated that is not correct. Ms. Cauley stated in the case of football, the number of non-residents is now 47%.

Ms. Cauley stated she has a Petition which she read into the Record last time which was signed by 200 Lower Makefield Township residents; and she would never have presumed to let a non-resident sign the Petition. She read her Petition into the Record which asks that the Board reject the use of the Snipes parcel for athletic or recreational purposes. Ms. Cauley stated Mr. Benedetto brought up the on-line Petition that had 675 signatures, but many of them were not Lower Makefield residents.

Mr. Lewis stated he did review Ms. Cauley's Petition in detail and contacted some of the people who were on the Petition to ask them why they were opposed to the project. He stated some of them indicated that they wanted the land to remain as it was. He stated a number of the signatures seemed to be signed by one person for members of their entire family. Ms. Cauley stated each of those people were voting members of Lower Makefield Township. Mr. Lewis stated the premise of a Petition is that each individual person signs whether they are opposed or in support. Ms. Cauley stated every member of the household opposed it so she does not feel Mr. Lewis did his due diligence. Mr. Lewis stated he looked at some of the actual signatures, and one person was signing for the entire family. Ms. Cauley stated their family might have been of similar thought. Mr. Lewis stated each individual should have signed for themselves. Mr. Lewis stated when someone addresses one of Ms. Cauley's concerns she responds with an ad hominem attack. Ms. Cauley stated the people do not want this project in their back yard.

Ms. Cauley stated she was not notified but she saw a list of people in her neighborhood who were notified, two on either side of her, and some further from the property. She stated she felt the list was a "strange compilation." She stated she never received notification of the November meeting. She stated when she took her Petition around, no one had heard of the project even though their addresses were

listed as being notified in November. She stated she feels the Township should have put a big wooden plaque or banner at Creamery and Quarry where every person within a certain radius would have seen it about the development of this project.

Ms. Cauley stated this project benefits a very small slice of the Lower Makefield Township population of 2,000 children per season – spring and fall – and it is a very small, but vocal special interest group who is determining the future quality of life for thousands of people who will be effected by the noise, the light, and the traffic. She stated the sports users, Park & Rec, Mr. Fritchey, and Mr. Benedetto are determining how the land will be used yet it impacts a huge number of people on their quality of life on a daily basis. Ms. Cauley stated she feels there is an ebb and flow that takes place; and while they may have purchased the land in 1998 for athletic usage, as time has passed, their needs changed. She stated they should re-evaluate this to see if what was needed in 1998 is still needed today.

Mr. Benedetto stated they did include information about the Snipes Tract in the Township Newsletter that went out to all the residents the end of last year. He stated the project has evolved from what was considered originally. Ms. Cauley stated the demographics show that the need is not there, and they do not have the same needs today that existed in 2000. She stated she feels they should alter the use of the land for something else such as a passive park without 80' lights.

Ms. Virginia Loebel, 1396 Heller Drive, stated they were told repeatedly at Park & Rec meetings that they would be specifically notified. She stated in 2004 Mr. Fritchey was at those meetings, and he commented that the use of the facility would have minimal impact on the surrounding residents. She stated in 2008 Mr. Fritchey stated that the Snipes project was basically a grading and parking lot project. She stated at no point were lights considered. She stated even as the project changed over the years at no point were lights considered. She stated repeatedly residents closest to the project were not notified despite the fact that they were specifically told that they would receive notification. She stated perhaps they were wrong in trusting that their Board would do the right thing by them. She stated the Board has not kept the promises that were made. Ms. Loebel stated she feels the Board should re-visit the concept.

Mr. Steve Beede, 336 Robin Hood Drive, stated he is in support of the Park, and they have been looking forward to it for a long time. He stated he is a lifetime resident of LMT; and when Macclesfield was built, they watched the sports programs in the community “explode” bringing a vibrant and youthful feeling to the Township. He stated he volunteers a lot of his time to YMS to make sure the program is the best that it can be. He stated those with questions about the need should go to Macclesfield during the week in the fall to see all the fields that are completely in use so that they understand the need for more fields. He stated he

sees the changes that have been made to the Plan after listening to the comments; and he feels the Board has tried their best to incorporate the changes that they can to make this a project that everyone can be happy with and one that they can afford. Mr. Beede stated the engineers have done their due diligence, and third party engineers have evaluated it.

Mr. Roger Deininger, 430 Hidden Oaks Drive, stated he goes back to 2007 with this project as a member of YMS; and the Plan has been scaled back in terms of the number of fields. He stated in 2009 they came before the Board; and while it was initially approved, he understands it was withdrawn due to funding. He stated in 2007 and 2009 there was a need and they were at 30% of what a Township of our size should have in terms of athletic fields, and that has not changed. He stated he is surprised to hear people saying that they were not aware of this project. He stated YMS moved forward with a turf field at Macclesfield which cost the Township no money. He stated at Macclesfield now when they have practices, they have three to four teams on one field because they do not have enough space. He stated during the hours that they can practice when their players are not in School, they do not have enough space to run an organized practice as they should. He stated as a Township resident, he is disappointed that they had not moved forward on this project. He stated while he does not live in the area where Snipes is located, he does live in Hidden Oaks where there are softball and baseball fields; and he feels there is nothing better than hearing children playing on weekdays and weekends. He asked that the Board move forward with this as it has been ten years since he saw the Plans, and he felt they were moving forward then; and he knows the need has not changed.

Mr. Jason Simon, 514 S. Ridge Circle, stated he is the Commissioner of PAA, and is in support of this project. He stated there has been unprecedented cooperation amongst the user groups over the last several years in order to find a way to make this work. He stated they work extensively with Pennsbury School District to be able to find places to put their overrun when possible. He stated they run expensive programs for the parents and the participants and to pay their way with the Township and the School District. He stated they try to mitigate their costs through extensive fundraising in order to keep it affordable for families to be able to participate.

Mr. Simon stated the characterization of youth sports groups as special-interest groups does not “sit well with him.” He stated PAA has 800 community children under its watch. He stated he also has hundreds of volunteer coaches who give of their time to teach the children how to play and keep them in an environment which is safe. He stated they have made no “back-door deals,” and everything is done in public, recorded, transcribed, and visible for all. He stated they are all people who live here together. He stated he and other volunteers have spent hundreds of



hours dedicated to the sports programs. He stated they understand the need to respect their neighbors. He stated they had sixty teams over the weekend for a Tournament, and they worked with the Police to ensure that the parking would not interfere with the neighborhoods or the Pool parking lot.

Mr. Simon stated it is important that they do this project. He stated at one point it was a much larger project, and they have adjusted it understanding the needs. Mr. Simon stated lacrosse needs to be here so that the Township children can be here. He stated football, Lower Bucks Lacrosse, rugby, women's field hockey, and ultimate Frisbee can all take advantage of rectangular, multi-purpose fields. He stated he will always put the children first.

Mr. Gordon Workman, 1152 Kenneth Lane, stated he started the Petition that was at 721 signatures when he saw it last. He stated there were some signers who were from outside of Lower Makefield, but 95% were Lower Makefield residents so he feels there is clearly support for this project. He noted the significant use of Macclesfield between football, soccer, and other activities taking place there. He stated his children walk to Quarry Hill so he is familiar with the traffic in the area but use at Snipes will not be at the same time as the School traffic. He stated with regard to Lower Makefield Football, they do have a higher number of those who are out of the Township compared to some of the other sports; but it is because they accept people who do not have a good opportunity in their area, and they have a strong program that people want to be involved with. He stated the non-residents also pay a higher premium which helps pay for the ongoing maintenance of the fields. He stated they are proud to work with all the other sports organizations. He thanked the Board for considering the new fields.

Mr. Dean Curtis, 183 Aspen Road, stated SEPYLA, which is their boys' governing body, does not require them to be regional; and they have been regional as Lower Bucks Lacrosse primarily because they were the pioneers for bringing lacrosse to Lower Bucks County. He stated 69% of their participants are Pennsbury School District residents although he does not know exactly how many are from Lower Makefield, and they will add this to their Registration next year. He stated fifteen of their eighteen teams play in Middletown Township Park, and the other three play at Charles Boehm on "terrible" fields that they would like to move them off of. Mr. Curtis stated at Middletown this evening three teams were practicing on a portion of one field which was under repair just so they could get practice in. He stated he is thankful for the opportunity to bring lacrosse to the community. He stated their numbers are somewhat lower, and they are not growing at the rate he would like; but they have not been promoting the sport through free clinics since they do not have a place to hold them. He stated he just invested his own money in an indoor facility so that he could run clinics. He stated building the Snipes facility is about building life skills, community, and relationships. He reviewed his coaching

experience. He stated the sports programs collectively provide opportunities for thousands of children to compete and build life skills. Mr. Curtis stated no project will benefit everyone, but he believes that this proposal is a way to effectively lay a foundation for more children to learn life skills, build relationships, and improve the community.

Mr. Steve Severino, 1374 Revere Road, stated he is the President of Yardley Makefield Rookie Rugby. He stated they started the organization last year and they had approximately seventy children come the first year. He stated YMS let them use some of the Edgewood fields. He stated they are chartered by USA Rugby who is forecasting their organization to double every year. He stated these proposed facilities will be fantastic looking forward the next three to five years. He thanked the Board for their potential support of this project which will be tremendous for the organization and the Township.

Ms. Suzanne Blundi, 1541 Old Farm Court, stated she lives in the end of the Township where the Park is proposed, and she has been waiting for these fields since they built their home. She stated while her children will be too old to play on them, she looks forward to coaching other children playing there. She stated she is representing field hockey, and currently there is no room for them to play in the Township even though the other sports organizations have been very welcoming to them. She stated it is because there is not enough space, and she cannot understand why her neighbors do not understand that the Township children need places to play. She also noted the positives that come from youth sports, and she added she is “heart broken” to hear some of the comments she has heard including the comment made by an individual that she did not want to hear cheering.

Ms. Natalie Tyler, 1625 Fairfield Road, stated she has lived here for twenty-five years; and she stated she has heard wonderful comments made on both sides. She stated as a designer when she looks at the Plan, she feels there are a lot of things she could change and also feels there will be a lot going on; and this is not what she came to Lower Makefield to see. She stated she feels it would be wonderful for any child to come to and participate, but they have heard a lot of statistics and she feels it is too much to digest in one evening. She asked how the Board could make a real decision when they will influence the lives of so many people. She stated monetarily they do not know what the housing market will do, how it will effect the Schools, and how it will effect the community. She stated while people coming in from other areas playing on these fields will bring in revenue, they need to know how it will effect everyone in their community. Ms. Natalie Tyler stated she feels people should submit questions and concerns to the Board, and the Board should respond on-line so everyone can see. She stated at this point the community is divided, and she questions how the Board can know that this is the best thing for the community when the community is so divided; and she does not feel they can say tonight that

this is the final plan. She stated this is a great plot of land that could benefit the community, and it may need to be changed again. She stated they should go back to the “drawing board” and make changes to the retention basin, the running path, and remove the extra field and the lights so that it becomes a mixture of what everyone is looking for. Ms. Tyler stated if she cannot sit on her patio at 9:00 at night and listen to the sounds of nature but instead hears the “hum” of lots of people and screaming and she sees bright lights, it will take away from why she came to Lower Makefield. She asked that the Board not make a decision on this tonight and consider it further to decide how they will submit it to the community such as with a “huge” sign and announcements on Facebook and in the Yardley News. She stated the children of the community might also want to have a say, and people may have other ideas that have not been heard.

Ms. Karen Hanyok, 1426 Wheatsheaf Road, stated she understands it sounds like they are saying “not in my back yard;” however, her biggest problem is the lights although she does not feel the traffic will be ideal either. She stated she assumes the Chief will be patrolling to make sure it is safe since that could be a problem with vandals and adding a lot more people to their area.

Ms. Christine Sanchez, 1358 Brentwood Road, stated she is against the lights and feels they will impact her neighborhood, Fairfield. She stated the trees are deciduous; and when the leaves are off the trees, they will be seeing the light poles 24 hours a day, 365 days. She stated they will see the light, and the traffic will impact safety. She stated her children played at Macclesfield, and she feels they should maintain the fields they have and use the Middle School fields. She stated if they have to go ahead with the Snipes project, she feels it should be on a smaller scale and not have the lights.

There was no more Public Comment, and Public Comment was closed at this time.

Mr. Truelove stated a Motion was made, and he knows that some Waivers have been eliminated from the original draft he had.

The Motion made was read as follows: Moved to approve the Plan as presented.

Mr. Lewis stated the first Motion would be to consider the Snipes Athletic Field Complex and Land Development Plan; and if they are approving the Plan, they have to be specific that the Plan includes Alternates that may or may not occur depending on the final outcome of the Bidding. Mr. Truelove stated the Bid process would include the Alternates.

Mr. Fritchey stated there were some comments made by Mr. Benedetto following the Motion that proposed that they delete the skate park. Mr. Benedetto stated he also had indicated that the fourth field, the smaller field, not have lights. Ms. Tyler stated that part would be a Bid Alternate.

Ms. Tyler stated at this point the Motion would be to approve the Plan as presented with the exception of the Skate Park. Mr. Truelove stated that would also remove the necessity for the request for the setback Variance which has already been granted.

Mr. Truelove stated since the Plan as presented includes the Skate Park, the Motion would have to be amended; and he feels since Ms. Reiss is no longer present to re-make the Motion, they should have a new Motion.

Mr. Benedetto moved and Mr. Fritchey seconded to approve the Plan as presented with the removal of the skate park.

Mr. Benedetto stated if they remove the skate park, he had discussed replacing that with a picnic area and park benches. Mr. Lewis stated that could be considered later. Mr. Truelove stated in the Bid process, they will have the Alternates; and when they get the results, the Board can decide what they want to do up to the amount they have approved as far as the Plan is concerned.

There was discussion on the Waivers; and Mr. Truelove stated originally they had fourteen, and he believes they have been reduced to ten. Mr. Truelove asked Ms. Saylor to list the Waivers which she did as follows:

- 1) Section 178-20.C.9 – to not be required to show significant manmade features within two hundred feet of the site; and to instead accept an aerial photograph of the site and surrounding area;
- 2) Section 178-20.C.(10) regarding the tree inventory;
- 3) Section 178-20.E(29)- to not be required to provide core samples of adjacent roads;
- 4) Section 178-53.A - to allow the lighting fixtures for the athletic fields with a mounting height exceeding twenty (20) feet;
- 5) Section 178-56.A – to not be required to provide a thirty (30) foot wide easement for the storm and sanitary sewer since the Township owns the site and already has full access;

- 6) Section 178-56.C – to be permitted to install a paved bike path within the existing (unused) sanitary sewer easement on the site in order to minimize disturbance of steep slopes;
- 7) Section 178-93.F(3)(h) – to be permitted to provide less than two (2) feet of cover over storm sewer in grassed areas;
- 8) Section 178-93.F(5)(b) – to not be required to match pipe crowns or provide a two (2) inch drop across the bottom of inlets two (2) and three (3) which are at the top and bottom at one of the infiltration trenches and inlet seven (7) in order to provide sufficient pipe cover and pipe slope;
- 9) Section 178-95.C(7)&(8) – to permit grading at less than 2% slope in the areas of the athletic fields, skate park, and swales in order to meet athletic field design standards, minimize tree disturbance, and BMP standards;
- 10) Section 178-95.C(10) – to not be required to provide a six (6) inch drop within fifteen (15) feet of the proposed concession stand due to the proximity of the proposed sidewalk around the building.

Ms. Saylor stated there are also two Stormwater Management Waivers which Mr. Truelove noted as follows:

- 1) Section 173-12.K – to not require that the stormwater runoff detention facilities completely drain both the volume control and rate control capacities over a period not less than twenty-four (24) hours from the end of the design storm;
- 2) Section 173-14.C.(6)(g) – to not require a groundwater mounding analysis due to the favorable onsite infiltration test results.

Mr. Truelove stated approval would also be subject to compliance with the following Conditions:

- 1) Bucks County Conservation District
- 2) Bucks County Planning Commission
- 3) Traffic engineering letter
- 4) Carroll Engineering letter

Ms. Tyler stated the Motion is to approve subject to the items itemized by Ms. Saylor and Mr. Truelove.

There was discussion about the Waiver for the tree inventory, and Mr. Lewis stated they have looked at aerial photographs of the trees; and when the siting of the fields was done, it was to minimize tree loss. He asked if there was a count of trees done; and Mr. Eisold stated he does not feel there was a full count done, but they tried to concentrate the fields in the area that had been most cultivated where most of the trees had been removed, and that was the least dense section of the Site. He stated the most dense section is along the perimeter.

Mr. Benedetto stated he does not feel it would take that much to inventory the trees that are going to be removed. Ms. Goldstein stated they are in the process of meeting with people for a tree transplant relocation Bid, and they will go out to choose which trees are most appropriate to relocate so they are actually doing an inventory of what is appropriate to relocate although it is not the inventory of existing trees. Mr. Benedetto stated he understands approximately fifty trees along Dolington will be transplanted there which will be taken from the interior; and Ms. Goldstein stated that was what was on the original Plan, and they are actually looking at possibly doing more. She stated they will do whatever they can within a reasonable amount of money and time.

Motion carried unanimously.

#### AUTHORIZE SNIPES TRACT ATHLETIC FIELDS COMPLEX TO BE PLACED OUT TO PUBLIC BID

Mr. Lewis moved that the Board authorize the Snipes Tract Athletic Fields Complex to be placed out to Public Bid in the following manner:

- 1) The Base Bid will include General Site Construction of the three primary fields
- 2) Section B Offsite Roadway Improvements would be bid out as part of the Base Bid so there would be two components of the Base Bid
- 3) The first Bid Alternate would be a wearing course (parking and main drive)
- 4) The second Bid Alternate would be the small field – Phase 2 which is the field in the upper corner

- 5) The third Bid Alternate would be small field lighting - Phase 2
- 6) The fourth Bid Alternate is a relocation of the salt shed
- 7) Bid Alternate #5 would be sodding the three large fields as opposed to seeding them
- 8) Bid Alternate #6 would be site amenities goals and goalposts
- 9) Bid Alternate #7 would be construction of a natural path around the three fields
- 10) Bid Alternate #8 would be a separate inspection process.

There are also to be two separate Contracts as follows:

- 1) Primary Site lighting – installation of lights, poles, electric lines and conduits for the three primary fields
- 2) Concession Stand – general, electrical, plumbing, Prime Contractors and restroom building

Mr. Fritchey seconded.

Mr. Lewis stated he has answered over one hundred e-mails related to this project, and many people want the concession stand included; but there is a contracting reason why it has to be a second Contract. Mr. Fedorchak agreed adding it is a different pathway, and they will need an architect to put this together; and since it is a structure, under State law you have to bid it out with multiple primes.

Mr. Lewis stated they would have eight Bid Alternates from a Base Bid and two additional separate Contracts. He stated when the Bids are opened, they will make an assessment as to whether they will accept the Bids to complete construction and whether they will accept individual Bid Alternates. He stated they may re-bid as they have done in the past if they feel the pricing is not there, and they could re-bid a particular component. Mr. Lewis stated he understands they would be looking at approximately sixty days post the Bid process; and Mr. Eisold agreed that it would be four to five weeks of Bidding, and then the evaluation. Mr. Lewis stated potentially at an August meeting they could consider acceptance of the Bids.

Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Tyler stated this has been a long process, and she recognizes that some people will be disappointed. She stated they will move this forward in a responsible manner and will continue to request the cooperation of the user groups that they have always been able to rely upon. Ms. Tyler stated continued input is welcome.

Mr. Fritchey stated the Board tries to use their best judgment to determine what is in the best interest of the 33,000 people who live in the community recognizing that 100% will not agree. He stated he feels youth sports is a valuable and critical part of any community, and he discussed the importance of sports. Mr. Fritchey stated he took exception to some things that took place including a flyer that was distributed in an effort to engage in fear mongering. He stated this project has been needed for over twenty years, and there are National standards showing the need; and those involved in the Township organizations have indicated there is a need. He stated he feels the project has been thoroughly studied by qualified professionals. He stated a number of recommendations have been adopted to make the project better.

Mr. Fritchey stated he was concerned with the discussion about “outsiders” being allowed to use the facility. He stated all of the Parks in Lower Makefield Township as well as all the Parks in every other community are open to whoever comes there to use them. He stated when you are involved in competitive sports you play away games, and he feels we need to be inclusive and hospitable to our neighbors. He stated the talk about outsiders was offensive and disappointing. He stated he feels people should consider what kind of message talking about outsiders sends to our children as he feels our children should grow up to be effective citizens of the world.

Mr. Fritchey stated he feels they have tried to make this project be as “minimally painful” to those people who have concerns. He thanked everyone for their participation in the process and their membership in the community to make it a stronger community in Lower Makefield Township and Lower Bucks County.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



John B. Lewis, Secretary



Remarks to BOS re Snipes Athletic Fields May 30, 2017

Virginia Torbert, Chairperson, LMT Citizens Traffic Commission

The Citizens Traffic Commission was created by the Board of Supervisors in 2006 in recognition of the importance of traffic safety and the free flow of traffic in Lower Makefield.

By analyzing relevant complaints and information from residents of Lower Makefield, traffic statistics and with input from Township employees, including traffic engineers, police and others, we try to improve existing traffic situations as well as advise the Board on potential traffic impacts from new developments.

**Let me say at the outset that the CTC is in no way questioning the need for new ballfields.** We recognize, however, that the Board of Supervisors must balance this need with sensitivity to the concerns of neighbors surrounding any new athletic complex and the need to avoid or at least mitigate further traffic congestion.

**Our only concern is traffic congestion and safety.** Our main issue with the Township's traffic study for the Snipes development is that it is not based on actual data from the sports leagues and so we do not know if it is representative of the actual number of additional trips which will be generated by the new park as proposed.

**Why is this important?** It is important because several nearby intersections may become further congested and therefore require improvements. One of these intersections, Creamery Road and Yardley-Newtown Road, is already operating at a Level of Service D (wait times of almost a minute) for one of its turning movements during the weekday pm peak hours. Will the

Remarks to BOS re Snipes Athletic Fields May 30, 2017

increased traffic reduce the LOS to an E or an F, with wait times well over a minute? We simply don't know, so how can we plan for needed improvements, including adjustments to signal timing?

According to the Township's own traffic study, **65% of new trips to the Snipes Park will be coming from, and then returning, to Mirror Lake Road and Yardley-Newtown Road.** Both Left and Right turns for Creamery Road traffic turning onto Yardley-Newtown Road are already at a Level of Service D during weekday pm peak hours. How much worse will this congestion get? We don't know. How is it that according to the Township's traffic study, the current LOS C during midday Saturday peak hours will improve to LOS B by 2019?

We do know there is an existing problem during weekday am peak hours at Creamery and Quarry Roads, with cars heading toward the elementary schools waiting in long queues to make a left toward the schools. (In the morning this unsignalized intersection operates at Level of Service F). Although not directly related to Snipes tract perhaps an **eastbound dedicated right turn lane** should be considered for Quarry Road traffic making a right onto Creamery to reduce congestion during weekday am peak. How much will the new park exacerbate this situation during the weekday pm peak, now operating at a LOS C?

Another issue not addressed by the traffic study is increased traffic due to **tournaments or other post-season type events.** Potential conflicts with nighttime and weekend special events at the elementary schools is another area also not addressed by the traffic study.

Finally, we would encourage you to emphasize **walkability** to the new park so that residents from

Remarks to BOS re Snipes Athletic Fields May 30, 2017

surrounding neighborhoods can safely walk, bicycle and jog to and from the park. In December 2016 the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation issued a new directive called "PennDOT Connects". Every transportation improvement project must consider all modes of transportation, including pedestrians and bicycles. Snipes Park includes improvements being proposed for Dolington Road, which is a state road. Is there any requirement to comply with "PennDOT Connects"? Currently the network of sidewalks in the vicinity of the proposed Snipes Park is incomplete. For this reason, children in the nearby neighborhoods such as Makefield Chase and Quarry Commons have to be bused to Quarry Hill School because it is not safe to walk.

I would further note here that the "school zone" in front of Quarry Hill and Afton schools is rather ineffectual, with little signage and no traffic calming measures in place. Adding a park entrance across the street from these schools makes it even more important that Dolington Road and Quarry Road traffic be slowed down during both school and park hours. Please consider working with the Pennsbury School District to enhance the safety of that school zone with increased signage, raised crosswalks, additional striping and other traffic calming measures.

I would only add that should you decide not to have a revised traffic study prepared, please at least follow up with post construction traffic monitoring. Conducting traffic counts after the park is built and in use will provide accurate data to verify the capacity and safety of the affected roadways.

Thank you, we'll be happy to answer any questions you may have.

