

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MINUTES – APRIL 20, 2022

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on April 20, 2022. Mr. McCartney called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and called the Roll.

Those present:

Board of Supervisors: James McCartney, Chair
 Fredric K. Weiss, Vice Chair
 Daniel Grenier, Secretary
 Suzanne Blundi, Treasurer
 John B. Lewis, Supervisor

Others: Kurt Ferguson, Township Manager
 David Truelove, Township Solicitor
 Andrew Pockl, Township Engineer
 Kenneth Coluzzi, Chief of Police
 James Majewski, Community Development Director

COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Ferguson stated during this portion of the Agenda residents and youth organizations may call in to make a special announcement or may contact the Township to request a special announcement be added to a future Agenda.

Mr. Ferguson stated Lower Makefield Township will be holding a Styrofoam and Recycling Event on Saturday, May 21, 2022 from 10:00 a.m. to noon outside of the Township Building. We are collecting clean, white Styrofoam, natural and synthetic corks, clean pill bottles with tops, and household batteries.

Mr. Ferguson stated Lower Makefield Township will be hosting a Blood Drive for the Red Cross on Thursday, May 26, 2022 from 1:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. in the main meeting room at the Township Building, 1100 Edgewood Road. You can schedule an appointment on the Township Website. Mr. Ferguson stated people have called in and staff members are excited about being able to participate. Mr. Ferguson thanked Ms. Blundi for coordinating this with the Red Cross, and he feels there will be a great response.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Grenier moved, Ms. Blundi seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of April 6, 2022 as written.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Ms. Blundi moved, Dr. Weiss seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Warrant Lists for March 21, 2022 in the amount of \$634,651.82 as attached to the Minutes.

Ms. Blundi moved, Dr. Weiss seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Warrant Lists for April 4, 2022 in the amount of \$388,818.28 as attached to the Minutes.

KYLE MELANDER FROM REPRESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK'S OFFICE – THE FAA'S FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI) DECISION ON THE TRENTON MERCER AIRPORT EXPANSION AND ELECTED OFFICIAL'S RESPONSE TO THE FAA

Mr. Kyle Melander from Representative Fitzpatrick's office was present. He stated the biggest concern was that the Trenton Mercer Airport was segmenting the project and they were breaking apart the Master Plan and making it look like there was a minimal impact to the environment. He stated one segment was clearing trees and land which they argued was for the flight path and the parking lot, another was the runway which they argued was for the convenience of planes taxiing, and the third, which was the most important, was the new terminal which would make it four gates at one centralized area instead of two gates indoors and two gates outdoors. He stated that was contentious because they would be building a new facility over existing wetlands which are believed to have high levels of PFAS, which are contaminants.

Mr. Melander stated during the Public Comment period, Congressman Fitzpatrick put together a report outlining a myriad of issues including flight projections and the concern that the numbers being used were 2020 figures for estimates which was a Covid virus year which distorted the number and it projected low growth if any growth at all. He stated another concern was the building of a new structure over a wetlands, and another was the gates. He stated they use two gates indoors

and two gates outdoors; however, the outdoor gates are only rarely ever used so realistically they only use two gates. He stated the concern was there will be a much larger centralized area which will lead to more flight growth.

Mr. Melander stated there were a number of conversations with the FAA about this. He stated they had a conference call that included Senator Toomey's office, the regional FAA team, and the Environmental Review team, and they outlined all of their concerns. He stated the FAA found that there would be No Significant Impact. He stated they still believe that the Airport did not do an adequate job addressing the PFAS, and the FAA advised that the agreement is that the Trenton Airport sponsors have to work with the New Jersey DEP to remediate the existing PFAS now. Mr. Melander stated his question to the FAA was how could they green light a project when you know that there are contaminants in the "water cells," and they advised that the agreement is that it has to be remediated first before any construction can be done. Mr. Melander stated because they went forward with an Environmental Review, they are now liable to remove it regardless if the FAA were to approve the improvements or not.

Mr. Melander stated there was an OPRA request with the DEP for PFAS and the Trenton Mercer Airport, and he was told that there was nothing found; however, when he spoke with the FAA they said that they had communications as early as January, 2021 specifically about this and there is a partnership to remediate the PFAS in the wetlands area. Mr. Melander stated he had put together in their Public Comment a chart showing flight projections if the Corona Virus had never happened based on the previous three years of growth, and this was presented to the FAA; however, they indicated that the formula that they used was an FAA-approved formula so they disregarded the Congressman's Public Comment about this. Mr. Melander stated they also stressed with the FAA at the Public Comment and discussions they had with them that logic says that if you put two new gates into this area, more than likely the Airport will use them; and if the runway is made more convenient for planes, it could potentially lead to more planes coming in. He stated the FAA indicated that their data did not say that, and that their data says that they have four gates so there is likely not going to be any growth.

Mr. Melander stated with regard to air quality and noise pollution because the FAA is looking at the formula and not seeing any projection of growth, they did not find any reason for the Airport sponsors to do any noise studies or air sample studies.

Mr. Melander stated in the FONSI it stated that all the items were being done out of “safety,” and they deemed that the existing terminal was too small, it was unsafe, and clearing the trees was done for safety. He stated they still object to everything the FAA has done.

Mr. Melander stated five days before the FONSI was issued there was a staff call with the FAA, and they brought up the Trenton Mercer Airport during that call, and the FAA did not indicate that there would be a FONSI coming. He stated the next day, Congressman Fitzpatrick asked an FAA Administrator specifically about the Trenton Mercer Airport, and it was not indicated that a FONSI would be coming four days later. Mr. Melander stated they found out at 4:59 p.m. four days later that a FONSI was issued, and he feels that the timing was suspect. Mr. Melander stated there was a conference call with his office, Senator Casey’s office, and Senator Toomey’s office, and it was pointed out to them that the way the offices were notified was poor.

Mr. Melander stated he is available if anyone wants to reach out to him directly to discuss this further.

Mr. McCartney and Mr. Lewis thanked Mr. Melander for his time. Mr. Grenier stated there has been a multi-level Government group across Party lines working on this. Mr. Melander thanked the Board for all they have been doing. He stated Mr. Grenier had been very helpful when he first started working on this.

LED STREET LIGHT REPLACEMENT AND SERVICES PRESENTATION

Mr. Jerry Balzer, NEXtera Energy, was present. Mr. Ferguson stated the Township gets a lot of companies talking about LED light conversion, but what Mr. Balzer will be discussing includes Service Agreements beyond just replacing lights.

Mr. Balzer stated NEXtera Energy is a Nationally-present utility company that is involved in energy including a large wind and solar producing presence throughout the Country. They also do a lot of wholesale power to various utilities and cooperatives and provide power to Municipalities in Pennsylvania that have their own utility companies. Mr. Balzer stated they also own their own regulated utility called Florida Power and Light.

Mr. Balzer stated he is proposing an LED street-light conversion which would convert the street lights in Lower Makefield to a more energy-efficient LED variant which is done in a way that is turn-key and financially-prudent.

Mr. Balzer stated they do a lot of large-scale utility construction projects around the Country and they have a large service territory in Florida with over 750,000 street and parking lot lights. He stated for the last few years they have been able to commercially package a turn-key conversion.

Mr. Balzer stated they structure their program as a ten-year Service Agreement; and they take every possible expense that could be thought of that would be needed for a full turn-key operation of a street light conversion which would include converting the light, maintaining the light, keeping stock of inventory, dealing with warranties, dealing with pole knock-downs, and all of the labor involved including lighting design, engineering, maintenance of wiring, etc. He stated they compile all of that data and come to a lump sum of that cost. He stated they break that out into 120 equal monthly installments. He stated they would convert all of the Township's street lights to energy-efficient LEDs; and if the cost were determined to be \$120,000, the program fee would be \$1,000 a month for ten years. He stated the cost would never fluctuate for the ten years; and if something were to happen in the future, the company would take the risk and absorb the cost and would be contractually obligated to follow through on.

Mr. Balzer stated it is structured as a Service Agreement which moves the debt obligation away from the Municipality and the Municipality would not have to float a bond or raise taxes to get the project complete; rather it is all put on the NEXtera balance sheet, and they fully fund the project. He stated that allows them to not charge any money up front. He stated this is a true zero-dollar initial investment, and there is no money needed from the Municipality up front to get the project started or for materials. He stated no payments of any kind are made by the Township until they are completely done with the conversion project and the Township signs off on it. He stated at that point it would be rolled into the agreed-upon monthly payment.

Mr. Balzer stated included in the set monthly price is the full retrofit with no up-front costs and they would handle all design, engineering, manage materials, keep stock of inventory, handle all labor involved in the initial conversion of fixtures and the on-going maintenance, remotely manage all on-going operations, and handle any maintenance for the full ten years of the Agreement. He stated they also handle any issues with regard to Warranties. He stated this also includes a network-connected node which allows them to remotely operate the infrastructure and communicate directly with the fixtures themselves and with the maintenance contractor they use to maintain the infrastructure.

Mr. Lewis asked if the Township owns the poles. Mr. Balzer stated it is his experience in this area that the Township owns the poles only if it is not a PECO distribution pole. Mr. Balzer stated he believes the Township owns the fixtures as well as the poles. He stated PECO does not own the fixtures even if they are attached to a PECO-owned distribution pole. Mr. Lewis asked how small 5G transponders are handled, and he asked if the Township would have to work with NEXtera to get approval for new ones. Mr. Balzer stated they have the ability to host them on the fixture, and if they were to go on a new pole, they could do that or the Township could do that with PECO. Mr. Balzer stated they offer that type of product that can plug into the same socket that exists on top of the fixture.

Mr. Lewis asked if we would have centralized control for auto-dimming during certain periods of time, and Mr. Balzer agreed that comes with the network-connected node. Mr. Balzer stated the monthly price includes the network-connected node, and he showed a picture of it. He stated there are photo cells that read the amount of sunlight and tell the fixture to turn off when there is light and tell the fixture to turn back on when it is dark. He stated it also provides NEXtera constant, real-time feedback for each fixture. He stated it is also monitored over dashboard. He stated this is part of their on-going operation and maintenance and the nodes provide real-time feedback and can even tell during the day if there is a problem with a light before anyone in the community sees it.

Mr. Lewis asked if we would be able to turn off or dim the lights during specific times of the year to handle the requirements for night skies, to help with bird migration, and those who might want to do astronomy; and Mr. Balzer stated they can control the dimming of the LEDs, and they could also provide dark-sky compliant lights so that it shines the light only down on the ground. He stated there is also a certain temperature light that could be installed so that the light is not overpowering. He stated a schedule for dimming the lights could be put on for certain times of the year.

Mr. Lewis asked what kind of bulbs would be used. Mr. Balzer stated they use various manufacturers. He stated they would not just be replacing the bulb itself, they would be replacing the full lighting fixture. He noted some of the major manufacturers they use, and they leverage their strong purchasing power and pass the savings onto the projects that they do. Mr. Lewis asked if they are 28 watt bulbs. Mr. Balzer stated it depends on the wattage of the fixture that is being replaced. He stated they would make sure that at minimum the same amount of light is hitting the streets and sidewalks as is currently there and

possibly more depending on where it is lacking. He stated there is a standard conversion depending on the current wattage of the light that is there. He stated it could be different for the location and the fixture that is currently there, and typically there are energy savings going from the older technology and there would be 50% to 60% energy reduction. Mr. Balzer stated they would be doing the street lights only which would have a positive effect on the energy bill so the Township would have a reduced energy bill; however, NEXTERa has nothing to do with the energy bill, and the Township would still pay it as they do today. He added that their goal is to allow the Township to pay for the lighting upgrade while using the savings that they are seeing in the energy reduction.

Mr. Grenier asked what will happen at the end of ten years. Mr. Balzer stated at the end of the ten years if it is structured as a Service Agreement, the Township could tell NEXTERa they are done and “they can take their equipment and go.” Mr. Balzer stated at that point they would come in at no expense to the Township and take “their things and leave.” He stated that would be well in advance so that the Township could decide where they are going with their lighting infrastructure after that. Mr. Balzer stated the Township could also decide to continue with NEXTERa; and since they had already done the fixtures, it would be a “little bit more of a reduced Maintenance Contract thereafter.” He stated there is also the option of transferring the ownership of the assets that they had put in to the Township; and the way that would work would be that a third party neutral engineering organization would come in and assess the current value of the assets, and the bill would be whatever the third party comes up with and the Township would purchase them from NEXTERa. He added he could not tell what that would be as that would become more of a Lease Agreement and changes the way the debt obligation is held within the Municipality, but after ten years of using a fixture the depreciation is significant.

Mr. Grenier asked if this is the same Contract they proposed in Saco, Maine, and Mr. Balzer stated it is the same exact Contract. Mr. Balzer added in Saco, Maine an RFP was developed beforehand. He stated typically when a lighting conversion is looked at it is done as a piecemeal construction project where you hire a contractor, buy the lights, pay the contractor a fee to put the lights up, pay for outside maintenance, and buy fixtures over the course of time as lights go out. Mr. Balzer stated what his firm does is eliminate all of that, and they do all of that for the Township. He stated Saco, Maine’s RFP was structured as a typical project, and their program tends not to fit that model. Mr. Balzer stated with regard to the financial side, they are not aware of anyone else doing it the

way they are and they are able to fund the full project through their own balance sheet and structure the deal with a Service Agreement. He stated they handle all aspects of illuminating the roadways in the Township in exchange for the Township paying a monthly fee.

Ms. Blundi asked if there is a reason why it is a ten-year Agreement, and Mr. Balzer stated that is what they developed their financial model around. Ms. Blundi asked about the life expectancy of LED lighting, and Mr. Balzer stated for a street light, it is felt to be ten to twenty-five years although this is still a guestimate. Ms. Blundi stated she understands that NEXtera would install new cost-efficient equipment; and in ten years if the Township decides to end the relationship, one option would be that NEXtera would take their equipment back and the Township would then have to replace the equipment. Mr. Balzer stated hopefully they will want to move forward with NEXtera or the Township may want to keep the assets.

Ms. Blundi noted some LED lights are very bright, and she asked if there is choice as to what is installed. Mr. Balzer stated for street lights there are dark-sky compliant lights or lights that are warmer but still are a higher quality light than the older technology. He stated LED lights can be placed so that light shines much more effectively.

Mr. Balzer showed a slide related to the installation. He stated they recognize that the Township would want to see the biggest benefit from an energy-efficiency standpoint and capture the savings as quickly as possible so they put a lot of resources into getting the conversion done as quickly as possible. He stated they have a lot of experience throughout the Country and are able to get a project like this done very quickly, and a two-hundred light project could take a couple of months. He stated there would be minimal disruption to the community, and the streets would be converted. He noted they did a five-hundred light conversion in Pennsylvania in less than six months.

Mr. Balzer stated there are sometimes issues with inconsistent lighting from street to street even though they are the same light because the lights were purchased in different years; and in order to avoid that, they purchase all the materials upfront to make sure everything is uniform.

Mr. Balzer stated there is a lot they can do with the node technology which is included in the pricing. He stated a decision would be made as to who the Township would want from the Municipality to view the lights with NEXtera or NEXtera could do everything without Township input. He stated their

equipment has real-time monitoring and real-time access to all of the fixtures. A picture of the node was shown and Mr. Balzer reviewed what the node can detect. He stated they are able to tell if a pole has been hit and come down so that they can get someone out immediately. He stated it also indicates if a light has gone out and can control scheduling of the lights if they want the lights to be dimmed as was previously noted by Mr. Lewis. He stated the node also has space for other applications if desired by the Township.

Dr. Weiss asked if there is a way that they could change the color of the lights so that lights could be red white and blue on July 4th; and Mr. Balzer stated while they do not have anything like that, it would be contingent on the fixture used, adding they typically do not use fixtures like that as they are trying to be as cost-effective as possible. He stated if they had a light that could change color, the node could control that.

An example of a dashboard was shown with the location of the nodes on top of the fixtures. He stated if the dashboard shows that a light is out, they have software that automatically sends out notifications and generates a ticket to the maintenance contractor to go out and fix the light.

Mr. Balzer stated he is available to answer any other questions in more detail in the future. He stated with regard to the financials, they would need to confirm the existing lights so that they can determine what the monthly payment would be.

Mr. McCartney asked about ownership of the light poles. Mr. Ferguson stated they had listed that there were 220 total lights in the Township owned by both the Township and PECO; however, during this process, they learned that there are 260 lights in the Township and over the years somehow lights were put in that were never picked up. He stated of those 260, the Township probably owns 60 to 70 of the poles. Mr. Ferguson stated we have not had an active pole-replacement plan. Mr. Ferguson stated there is a Street Light Fund which is an assessment paid by residents who live within a certain distance from a street light. Mr. Ferguson stated the amount of the bill that would be paid under this proposal for the monthly fee and the reduction of the electric bill that would be anticipated of 40% to 50% would lower the expenses every year. He stated there is a viable fund balance of approximately \$120,000 so the Township could undertake a plan to start replacing the light poles that we own. He stated they have found that some of them should be changed, and

this would be an opportune time to do that. He stated while others may not need to be replaced yet, they could rely on the Light Fund and savings to get on a plan for pole replacement.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Balzer what would be the projected monthly fee be for the Township. Mr. Balzer stated the estimate they did initially was between \$1,000 and \$1,500, but that was based off of the list that Mr. Ferguson provided and a quick run through of what they would expect the replacement to be. Mr. Ferguson stated he believes the amount they had given was about \$1,200 but during that process it was discovered that there were 40 more lights than had been listed on the PECO records. He stated he believes the amount for 220 lights was around \$1,200. He stated they then discovered that there were 40 more lights in the Township that we were not being billed for; and if we convert those lights, there would be an increase in the monthly cost. Mr. Lewis stated the rate would be guaranteed for ten years, and Mr. Balzer agreed.

Mr. Ferguson stated NEXtera would also be dealing with problems and monitoring the lights which would be a time cost saving for staff as NEXtera would be arranging with local contractors. Mr. Balzer stated this would also include dealing with the materials and handling warranties with the manufacturers.

Mr. McCartney asked Mr. Balzer if NEXtera is dealing with any other Municipalities in Lower Bucks, and Mr. Balzer stated they are not. He noted other areas in Pennsylvania where they are involved.

Mr. Grenier asked if Mr. Balzer would be able to provide a detailed proposal that breaks out costs per year for lights, Maintenance Agreement, etc. so there could be a side-by-side comparison against other providers. Mr. Balzer stated the way they do it, it is a total package, and they do not break out the cost because there are so many things included that typically other companies do not do. He stated if the Township went to an RFP, they would be happy to respond, but typically they do not break it down. Mr. Grenier stated other companies offer similar service packages with smart lights, and he is looking at total cost of doing the program over the lifetime. He stated he would like to be able to make a comparison year-by-year as opposed to ten or twenty years. Mr. Balzer stated they can talk about this further and see if there is something that they can provide.

Mr. James Mossholder, 1326 Knox Drive, asked how long NEXtera has been offering this program, and Mr. Balzer stated it has been about two years, but they have been doing it in their service territory in Florida for about five years.

Mr. McCartney thanked Mr. Balzer for the presentation and encouraged the Supervisors to contact Mr. Balzer if they have any other questions that would help in the decision-making process.

ENGINEER'S REPORT

Mr. Pockl stated the Board received his report in their packet. He stated the Pool painting project and tennis court/basketball court repair Notices to Proceed were issued recently, and they expect work to start shortly. He stated the 2022 bike path renovation project is available for Bidding, and Bids are scheduled to be opened on May 11 and will be before the Board the second meeting in May. Mr. Pockl stated the Contracts for the 2022 Road Program will be sent out, and they expect work to start within the next few weeks.

Mr. Grenier asked for an update on BrightFarms. Mr. Pockl stated they have removed the greenhouse and the pad. He stated they had reached out to his office about bringing in clean fill onto the site so that they could put topsoil down in the area of the greenhouse and stabilize that. He stated a number of days ago BrightFarms had sent over soil sampling and the DEP Clean Fill form, and he approved that topsoil; and he believes they will start bringing topsoil onto the site later this week. Mr. Grenier asked about the depth of topsoil that will be used and if it matches what is there from a farming perspective. Mr. Pockl stated he does not have that information with him at this time.

Mr. Grenier stated the NPDES Permit Application was sent to DEP about two months ago for the Woodside bike path, and asked if that is moving forward. Mr. Pockl stated he has not heard back from DEP and there are no initial comments from them. He stated he will reach out to them to get a status on that.

PROJECT UPDATES

Mr. Ferguson stated they will be working on an RFP for design services for the Regency project that was discussed at the last meeting.

Mr. Ferguson stated they cleared the area at Memorial Park that Mr. Grenier had previously discussed. Mr. Ferguson stated there were two mounds which were removed, and all the material that was taken from there is now in the Public Works yard. The area where the material was taken from has been saturated with a lot of rain. He stated there is a silt fence, and we will keep monitoring the area; and when it dries out, topsoil will be brought in, and they will do the final grading and seeding of the area. Mr. Ferguson stated from what staff has observed it does not seem that it was from the group that worked on the paths last year, and some of the material may have been put there by Township staff in past years and concrete that a contractor may have put there although no one specifically can be pinpointed. Mr. Grenier stated he did see the work that was done.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Approval of Limited Use of Meetup at Memorial Park

Ms. Tierney was present and stated they hope to open the courts soon at Memorial Park. She stated the Township runs most of the pickleball through Meetup which is an opportunity for residents to sign up and get to know their neighbors. She stated twenty people per hour can sign up for pickleball and rotate through games. She stated pickleball is a very social sport. She stated since we are getting close to opening the pickleball courts at Memorial Park which is a little more sensitive, she wanted to ask the Board for their approval to use Meetup at Memorial Park. She stated the Park Board asked that we start small and grow as necessary. She stated pickleball is played by levels and intermediate and beginners are the biggest groups. She stated when she started with the Township in 2017, there were about 60 people playing pickleball in the Township, and as of today there are 275 people signed up for pickleball for this year with 17 having signed up in the last day. Ms. Tierney stated as of late we have only been allowing residents to sign up because of the demand.

Ms. Tierney stated having this additional space will be great for the group, but they also understand that there are people who just want to play pick-up games. She stated the Park Board wanted to wait before they overloaded Memorial Park with the Meetup group.

Dr. Weiss moved and Ms. Blundi seconded to approve the limited use of Meetup at Memorial Park at the staff's discretion as recommended by the Park & Recreation Board.

Mr. Lewis asked if Meetup costs the residents anything; and Ms. Tierney stated right now it is \$24.50 for the year, and that covers the cost of Meetup for the Township and some of the administrative time. Mr. Lewis stated that allows people to get priority access to the courts for specific hours, and Ms. Tierney agreed. Mr. Lewis asked how much limited use she is thinking of at this time, and Ms. Tierney stated the Park Board leaned toward one session a day to start. She stated the staff is looking into having a people counter at the site to see on and off Meetup times who is using the courts. Mr. Lewis stated he feels that they would want to make sure there were a lot of hours available for those who want to be able to play a pick-up game of pickleball. Ms. Tierney stated they will publish a schedule which will be on site so that people will know what the schedule will be moving forward.

Mr. Grenier stated he is glad that they decided to change one of the tennis courts for pickleball courts so that they can attempt to accommodate the growing numbers for pickleball. Mr. Grenier stated he feels that Meetup is starting to sound like a League that use our fields although a "League-type fee" is not being charged. He stated he would like to know if they should start to treat it more like an organized League as they assess how the courts are being used. Ms. Tierney stated pickleball is run completely through the Township, and we manage Meetup. She stated it is not a League in the way that teams are formed. She stated anything that evolves will evolve through the Park & Recreation Department directly. She stated the Leagues are run by outside organizations with teams, referees, competitions, etc. Ms. Tierney stated while there is interest in some pickleball competition, her interest lies in accommodating the "recreation needs of the many."

Mr. Grenier asked how people would get more information about how to sign up on Meetup and meet other players. Ms. Tierney stated they do plan to stop using the "company Meetup," since it is not very user-friendly; and for next year they hope to transition to another App. She stated at this time Meetup is an App, and you sign up on Meetup.com and look for Lower Make-field Township pickleball, and you get a fourteen day trial and then can sign up for the year. Ms. Tierney stated we have great community volunteers who help facilitate the different times throughout the day so that there is someone there on site for every session. Ms. Tierney stated people generally start at

beginner and work their way up. Ms. Tierney stated those interested can also contact the Township and we can guide those interested. Ms. Tierney stated on the back end we have trouble helping residents if they have trouble with the Meetup App as they have to call Meetup; and the new App they are currently looking at will give the Township more leverage on the back end to be able to help residents.

Ms. Tierney stated we have a new pickleball instructor, and the Township will start running classes for beginnings and Township residents can sign up for classes.

Motion carried unanimously.

Sewer Bill Delinquent Collection Discussion

Mr. Ferguson stated the Township will still have delinquent Sewer accounts. He stated the last Township Sewer bill went out around the end of February, and there could be some longer-term delinquencies. He stated over the last few years, the Township has been liening properties as necessary for those that were substantially delinquent. He stated for the current bill, we are still not in a period that it would be technically delinquent. He stated in the interim, we have been reaching out to companies to see, when the time comes, when that would be considered delinquent; and he stated it would probably be the end of April/first two weeks in May that those accounts would be considered officially delinquent. He stated they have been reaching out to companies that do collections to see the level of service that they provide; and many times they ask how many delinquencies we have, and at this point we do not know that answer. The Board will be provided details about those companies including what they charge and the services they provide, and the Board can then discuss how they want to proceed. He stated we may need to pass an Ordinance as to the level of Fee for non-payment and issues with regard to liens.

Approve Financing a 6-Wheel Dump Truck

Mr. Ferguson stated a Request for Proposals was put out, and the low bidder was TD Bank at 3.45%. Mr. Ferguson stated while rates have risen, this is still under the anticipated interest rate of 3.5% that was in the Budget.

Dr. Weiss moved and Ms. Blundi seconded to approve financing for a 6-wheel dump truck totaling \$177,910 to TD Bank at 3.45%.

Mr. Grenier asked if the cost of the dump truck is at or below Budget, and Mr. Ferguson stated the Budgeted cost amount \$180,000.

Motion carried unanimously.

Questions for the Township Manager

Mr. Grenier stated at a prior meeting he had asked about the percent that was paid to PFM from the Sewer proceeds. He stated he recalls that we set a limit of up to a certain number, but he does not recall voting on what we were actually going to pay them. Mr. Ferguson stated they reviewed the Minutes from 2019 when this was discussed, and PFM had indicated that they were willing to put a provision in that said up to .85%; and if for some reason there was a quick turn-around with the sale or if the sale price came in substantially over the estimate that PFM would be willing to work with the Township. Mr. Ferguson stated those things did not happen, and PFM put in a bill as part of Closing of .85%, and that was paid out of the proceeds.

Mr. Grenier asked when we were talking about .85% were we still at the rough estimate of \$30 to \$35 million, and Mr. Ferguson stated that was not the number that was their estimate. Mr. Ferguson stated when they had engaged PFM, they were trying not to talk too publicly about that number because there were potential Bidders coming in. Mr. Ferguson stated it was put out to PFM that the goal of the sale would be at least to achieve the goals of Debt reduction and what was discussed was a sale of at least \$30 million that when the Request for Indicative Bid came in if that was going to show something half of that or not close to that number that it would make no sense to move forward. Mr. Ferguson stated people were pressing on what was the goal we were trying to meet with the sale, and the discussion was about Debt reduction and how much would be needed for Debt reduction. Mr. Ferguson stated it was three years ago so the Debt we had to pay off at that time was higher.

Mr. Grenier stated it was not put to a vote, and PFM gave us a bill which was paid. Mr. Grenier stated he personally feels that based on the Contract language since it said up to .85% on what he felt was going to be a much lower number than what the actual sale was, he feels PFM “made

out pretty well” at .85% on a \$35 million sale versus .85% on a \$50 million plus sale which is a significant difference. Mr. Grenier asked Mr. Truelove if that is something that we need to have an “after-the-fact vote on.” Mr. Grenier stated he is uncomfortable with paying PFM that much for the services rendered without a discussion. Mr. Truelove stated he recalls that the way the documents were structured it included the Agreement with PFM, but he could look into that further.

Mr. Grenier stated his other question is about paying off the Golf Debt. Mr. Ferguson stated a number of people called him about this, and the Golf Debt was paid off as part of the 2022 Budget which was passed by the Board. He stated because of the timing of when that had to be done, it was understood that the Budget had not just the Debt being paid off but also with the benefit of the Debt being paid off. He noted we are funding the Woodside bike path this year because we have extra Golf money because there is a surplus this year and not a deficit. He stated all of those other pieces that went along with the Budget were in place that would have provided the authority to pay that Debt off as part of the Sale.

Mr. Grenier stated when he contemplated that process, he would compare it to the approval they did tonight with the financing of the dump truck; and even though that was in the Budget, the Board had to vote on executing that specific Line Item in the Budget. Mr. Ferguson stated that is very different. He stated he put that dump truck on the Agenda because it leaves a clear trail for the Auditor. He stated that is a distinct difference between paying off the Debt which was part of the Budget and had spill-over effects on ten other items.

Mr. Grenier stated he is not arguing that it was bad to pay off the Golf Course Debt; however, he feels this is a major financial matter, and in the future when we are going to execute those items, it should be on the Agenda first so that they are all aware of what is going on. Mr. Ferguson noted that leading into the March 4 Sewer Closing date, he had provided repeated updates to the Board that the Sewer sale would be Closed on March 4, and the plan was to pay off the Golf Debt, consistent with the Budget, on the following Monday which was March 7. He stated he started reporting on this to the Board at least three or four weeks in advance.

Mr. McCartney stated the Board did get those communications, and he did not get any feedback from any Supervisors asking him to put it on an Agenda. He stated Mr. Ferguson had communicated to the Board exactly what the

plan was going to be once the proceeds came through, and he received no feedback from any Supervisor asking if this should be an approved item on the Agenda for the next meeting.

Dr. Weiss stated in 2019 the Board authorized the Township Manager to go through all phases including Closing, and they also passed the Budget for 2022 with the payment of the Golf Debt. Dr. Weiss stated with a truck there is an actual figure, but with the payoff of a loan, mortgage or a bond issue and recognizing that there were uncallable bonds as part of the Debt, each day the number would change. He stated by waiting for a vote, and then finding out what the next payment would be, it would be impossible to pin the dollar amount down and it would probably cost an extra few thousand dollars by waiting for a meeting to take a vote. He stated it would be difficult to have a mechanism to have that level of detail. He stated the Board delegated the process to the Township Manager and agreed in the Budget to pay off the Debt. He stated the Board also authorized the Township Manager to work with the “finance people” to set this up. Dr. Weiss stated while he understands the want for the extra piece of transparency, but there are some things that cannot be done smoothly, and this is one of them.

Mr. Ferguson stated PFM had always anticipated that whatever Debt we paid off, recognizing that all of the Debt was not immediately callable, funds would sit in an investment; and PFM had been examining different securities. PFM had indicated that to pay off the Golf Debt would be approximately \$14.5 million, and in the end, we paid about \$15.2 million. Mr. Ferguson stated we did not net the number out and collected back \$1,637,000 from the State and Local Government Securities (SLGS) based on that “pot of money and the pot of money from the Sewer Debt.” Mr. Ferguson stated if you cut that in half and consider that about \$800,000 was attributed to the Golf Debt, it goes from \$15.2 million which was the gross payment with the net of the \$800,000 out, back to about \$14.4 million which was the number PFM had been talking about leading into the Closing period for at least a year.

Mr. Lewis asked the interest rate on the Golf Course Debt that was paid off. Mr. Ferguson stated he would have to look since there were different rates, but he would estimate it to be 2.5% and 3.7%. Mr. Lewis stated for that which is non-callable, there is a fund to pay that down, and Mr. Ferguson agreed. Mr. Lewis stated that fund is earning interest, and Mr. Ferguson stated those were SLGS that we bought in the market on the day of the Golf Course Debt Closing which would have been March 7. Mr. Lewis stated those are fixed instruments going forward, and Mr. Ferguson stated that is all we are allowed

to do with those. He stated depending on the length of the Debt, there would be a different interest rate. He stated those interest rates on those securities ranged from a low of .34% which would be something that had a shorter call time, which would be both for the Golf Debt and the Sewer Debt, up to 1.76% which would have been the fixed rate for something that would have a longer term before it would be paid off. Mr. Ferguson stated because they could run those numbers, we got the interest credited back immediately rather than coming back over thirteen years, and we received that about a week later.

Mr. Lewis stated he feels the Board would have wanted to vote on that, not just for transparency purposes, but to discuss the strategy around that. He stated there may be a case to say that maybe we should not have paid off the Golf Course Debt and instead kept that money earning a higher rate of return on a going-forward basis; and that the Board could have made a decision about that. He stated there is a lot that the Board could have discussed in open session that would have been financially beneficial in the long run that the community would have benefitted from.

Dr. Weiss stated the decision to pay off the Debt for the Golf Course was made in 2021 so what Mr. Lewis is asking is moot. He stated the decision by the Board was to pay off the Golf Debt. He stated that brought a Tax cut, brought more employees in the Township, and we saved more than \$9 million in interest including the \$1.6 million that we got back by putting everything in SLGS. Dr. Weiss stated we have saved \$10.5 million by paying off the Golf Debt. Dr. Weiss stated he does not believe that we could have gotten a better return by not paying the Golf Course off. Dr. Weiss stated he is “amazed that this conversation is coming up today.” Dr. Weiss stated the Township Manager has done what he was supposed to do as the Board had agreed to pay off the Debt.

Dr. Weiss stated he is disturbed that so many months after a decision was made that we are revisiting this and questions why this continues to go on. He stated he does not understand the need to question the decisions of the Board over and over again. He stated we did not have to go back and re-vote the sale of the Sewer system. He stated the Contract stated that PFM was allowed up to .85%, and he feels they probably should have gotten more for all the extra work they had to do. He stated while someone may disagree with the amount they were paid, a vote would not change that since he feels a majority of the Board would be in favor of the .85%. He stated he does not see the point of having these discussions after the fact. Dr. Weiss stated he reviewed the Minutes for the last three years on this issue, and he found

nothing that was inappropriate. He stated the Township Manager is an Administrative Officer, not a decision maker, and to imply that he did something wrong against the wishes of the Board is an insult to the Township Manager and to the members of the Board. Dr. Weiss stated he believes that it is time to put this to an end. He stated the place to accuse someone is not in public especially when you do not have facts and is slanderous.

Ms. Blundi stated she agrees that the Board passed a Budget and said they were paying off the Debt. She stated the faster it was paid off, the more money would be saved; and if anyone felt that there should have been a different course of action, it could be discussed in advance the next time we pay off Debt. She stated she credited the idea of paying off the Debt to Mr. Lewis as she felt that he was the proponent of paying off the Golf Course Debt as it would help "re-shape our whole picture." Ms. Blundi stated Mr. Ferguson has had to endure attacks, and she is concerned about all of the Township staff because of the way discussions are held in public and the impact on the staff morale. She stated the Board needs to be more thoughtful as to how they communicate and to act cohesively for the betterment of the Township.

Mr. McCartney stated he feels it is clear that there was a consensus of the Board to pay off the Golf Course Debt, and he would like to move on. Mr. Lewis asked for the opportunity to speak further; however, Mr. McCartney stated they were moving on.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Truelove stated the Board met in Executive Session beginning at 6:30 p.m. and confidential matters, security matters, and litigation were discussed.

Approval to Enact the Road Paving Financing Ordinance #429

Mr. Grenier moved, Mr. Lewis seconded and it was unanimously carried to enact the Road Paving Financing Ordinance #429 as advertised.

Approval to Adopt the Road Paving Funding Resolution #22-10

Mr. Grenier moved, Ms. Blundi seconded and it was unanimously carried to adopt the Road Paving Funding Resolution #22-10.

ZONING HEARING BOARD MATTERS

With regard to Appeal #22-1959 Matt & Anne Moyer for the property located at 1428 Revere Road, Yardley, PA 19067, Tax Parcel #20-059-028 Variance request from Township Zoning Ordinance #200-69.A(14)(a) in order to place a shed behind the house and 5 feet from the property line where it is required that an accessory building be located only in the fourth of the lot farthest from the abutting streets and no less than 10 feet from any side lot line, it was agreed to leave the matter to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Appeal #22-1960 Jessica and Lukas Rams for the property located at 879 Sandy Run Road, Yardley, PA 19067, Tax Parcel #20-025-002. Applicant is requesting Variances from Township Zoning Ordinance #200-22 to permit a front yard of 20.13 feet where 30 feet is required and a rear yard of 34.43 feet where 45 feet is required; Township Zoning Ordinance #200-51.B(1) to permit a 77.1% disturbance within a floodplain; Township Zoning Ordinance #200-51.B(4)(c)(2)(b) to permit a 66.1% disturbance within the required 100 foot watercourse buffer; Township Zoning Ordinance #200-51.B(6)(b) to permit 61.1% disturbance of woodlands where 25% is otherwise allowed; and Township Zoning Ordinance #200-61.C to permit setbacks on resource protected lands to be measured from the lot lines whereas the setbacks would otherwise be measured from the limit of the resource protected lands in order to construct a single-family home, driveway, and a storm water management system.

Mr. Truelove stated coming off of Afton onto Sandy Run Road, this property is just north of the intersection with College Avenue to the west of the road and close to the creek. He stated a lot of relief has been requested, and at a minimum he would recommend Township participation.

Mr. Grenier moved and Mr. Lewis seconded to oppose.

Mr. Grenier stated in this case the percentages are very high, and there are floodplains, streams, floodway, wetlands, and woodlands and they are impacting all of them.

Mr. Lee Pedowicz, 247 Truman Way, stated he agreed with Mr. Grenier.

Motion to oppose carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Lee Pedowicz, 247 Truman Way, stated with regard to the Trenton Mercer Airport, it seems that they are not addressing the scope of the pollution like they should. He stated the Board should support Congressman Fitzpatrick in his effort to get something done properly regarding the environmental impact of this Airport expansion.

Mr. Pedowicz asked what the Board does if someone makes a presentation and the material they have is not accurate. Mr. McCartney asked Mr. Pedowicz if he is referring to a specific incident, and Mr. Pedowicz stated at the last meeting the traffic engineer had shown an aerial overview of the area on Big Oak Road with regard to the pedestrian crossings, and his aerial overview did not show about 50% of the residences that have been built since that photo was taken. Ms. Blundi stated that was brought up at the time of the presentation. Mr. McCartney stated Mr. Fiocco acknowledged that it was a dated aerial photo. Mr. Pedowicz stated he believes Dr. Weiss had indicated at that time that when they submit their “request for proposals” it will be corrected. Mr. Pedowicz stated if there was a correct aerial overview, that might have effected someone’s opinion as to what is going on in terms of the crosswalks. Mr. Pedowicz stated when Caddis was building their facility behind his house, they had an aerial overview that did not show the residences that were abutting that property, but they eventually “came across with proper photos.”

Mr. Pedowicz asked if there is anything that the Board can do to insure that they are presented accurate information. Mr. McCartney stated they are dealing with traffic professionals. Mr. Grenier stated he assumes that everyone is working in good faith and not trying to hide anything; and engineering firms use aerials from different sources. He noted the Bucks County parcel map, and that is often what they use. He stated Plans that are submitted have parcel information that have structures in black and white. He stated they have to submit Plans signed and sealed by an engineer that is the latest Plan to the best of their knowledge, and that oftentimes includes a boundary and topo survey. He stated the traffic engineer is not just looking at an aerial, and he has also physically gone to the site taking pictures and has an understanding of what is there. He stated if that is not done, then the Board would hold them accountable through the Township Manager, Township engineer, Public Works, and the Planner as a team.

Mr. Pedowicz stated he disagrees; and if he was making a presentation, he would make sure all the information that he presented would be accurate including “getting a helicopter out there to take a picture if he had to.”

Mr. Pedowicz stated he thought there could be a Contract where it could be written in that all information at the time of presentation to the Board will be accurate. Mr. Truelove stated a lawyer may argue as to what “accurate” means.

Mr. Pedowicz stated the gentleman who presented the Traffic Study indicated that they were out there monitoring the people crossing Big Oak Road, and he believes he stated he counted ten to fourteen people over eight hours; but if someone was afraid of crossing Big Oak Road, they would not cross it. Mr. Grenier stated he agrees it is an issue as to when pedestrian counts are done.

Mr. Pedowicz stated he understands Mr. Ferguson is leaving in July, and he wanted to thank him for everything he has done; however, he feels it is “exorbitant” to take six or seven months to replace him. He stated if there are procedures in place that have to be followed in order to get a replacement, those procedures should be looked at. He stated while it was noted that this is a Municipality and not a private business, he feels that Lower Makefield has grown to the point where the Board should look at it a little bit more as a business than strictly a Municipality.

Mr. Bryan McNamara, 1412 Heather Circle, noted the Zoning Hearing Board Appeal for the Cameron Troilo parcel across from DeLorenzo’s was postponed to work out issues with the Township; and he asked how many apartments he is asking for on that triangle parcel. Mr. Grenier stated Mr. C. T. Troilo presented to both the Historical Commission and HARB and there have been significant changes from what was presented previously. He stated both Boards gave a lot of feedback that hopefully Mr. Troilo will consider. He stated the most recent request was to have fourteen dwelling units and that would remove the request for off-site parking. He stated the Boards asked that the number of units be brought down. Mr. Grenier stated Mr. Troilo was asking to not have to put a sidewalk on Yardley-Langhorne Road, but both Boards indicated that they would want a sidewalk. Mr. Grenier stated there was also discussion about re-aligning the buildings to allow for small porches versus doorway coverings, and Mr. Troilo was looking into that. He stated there was also a request to use parts of one of the older homes. Mr. Grenier stated he was requested to consider breaking the six-unit building into a four and two-unit building. Mr. Grenier stated the adjacent landowner was concerned about

the number of dwelling units. Mr. Grenier stated he feels all discussions have been very productive, and he believes that Mr. Troilo will be working on some additional refinements based on the comments he received and then go back to HARB and the Historic Commission. Mr. Grenier encouraged Mr. McNamara to watch those meetings when it goes back to HARB and the Historic Commission as there are in-depth conversations at those meetings.

Mr. McNamara asked how many units he is allowed to build under current Zoning. He asked if the Zoning is the Village design or the new Overlay. Mr. Grenier stated it is the Overlay. Mr. McNamara asked if it is the Overlay that was voted on two years ago, and Mr. Grenier stated it is the Edgewood Village Overlay and has nothing to do with the area around Prickett Preserve. Mr. Grenier stated he believes the Zoning permits twelve dwelling units per acre, and the site is about three-quarters of an area. Mr. Grenier stated he believes that he is allowed nine units by right, and he is asking for fourteen at this time which is down from the eighteen that he had requested previously.

Mr. McNamara asked what would be the benefit to the Township if he were given potentially five extra units. Mr. McNamara stated he understands it would be more of a profit for Mr. Troilo although as it was noted previously that he has already made money buying and selling that property at least twice. Mr. Grenier stated the main goals are that we want to do whatever we can to save the two buildings that are there, increase the inter-connectiveness of the entire Village which is why they are interested in the sidewalk, and meet the goals of the TND which is historic in nature.

Dr. Weiss stated he is the Zoning Hearing Board Liaison, and they granted a Continuance because the Troilos want to work with the Township and the various Committees to get the best possible plan before it is presented to the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated the matter has been Continued to May 16, and it may be Continued again depending on when their next Plans are presented to the other Committees.

Mr. McNamara stated if we are going to give a developer over what the current Zoning allows for, the Township should get something in return versus just giving Mr. Troilo a profit since he has already made a profit buying and selling this land twice. Dr. Weiss stated the goal is to keep the two historic buildings, and Mr. McNamara agreed.

Ms. Lora Tarantino, 185 Durham Road, Newtown, stated she watched the last Board of Supervisors meeting when Ms. Donna Doan made comments about Patterson Farm Preservation efforts. Ms. Tarantino noted the idea of putting the Lease in the Township Farmland Preservation Corporation since at present Patterson Farm is the only one that is not included in that. She asked if that will be discussed by the Board of Supervisors and if the public will learn about that in future meetings. She stated the other idea was to expand the Conservation Easement to include the portion of the land that is where the Satterthwaite House and other buildings in that area are located that are not currently part of the Conservation Easement. She asked if the Farm as a whole were to be under a Conservation Easement/Agricultural Easement, would that not make it a better case in terms of trying to solicit State and Federal funds for preservation. She stated Bucks County has the opportunity “to combine all of these factors such as heritage, the agriculture, and the Quaker background.” She asked how these matters will be discussed in the future so that the public is educated about what the choices are and how the Board will come up with a decision.

Dr. Weiss stated the Board will be discussing the Sewer proceeds and part of those discussions will include the Farm.

Mr. Grenier stated Ms. Tarantino had asked what can and cannot be done within an Agricultural Easement at the State level, and the Township has looked into that. He stated when the Easement was initially put on the 200 plus acres it falls within what is considered active farmland under an Agricultural Easement. He stated putting the front portion including buildings falls outside of the typical scope of an Agricultural Easement per se so at the time the Township was advised to not include the buildings and the front portion of the property within the Agricultural Easement because it did not fit the definition of what an Agricultural Easement should be. Mr. Grenier stated those buildings in total are eligible for listing on the National Register and the Historic Commission is looking into updating the Application so they can be listed on the National Register. He stated that opens them up for a lot of funding in the future for various studies, restoration, etc. He stated not having an Agricultural Easement on the buildings does not prevent them from being included in any future funding of any type that we would go for, for the buildings.

Mr. Truelove stated he looked at the program under which the Easement was approved years ago, and the Deed of Easement refers to agricultural areas security law and it talks primarily about field crops, fruits, vegetables, horticultural specialties, livestock, timber and wood, and aquatic plants and they

are talking about the activity of agriculture. He stated he agrees that it does not mention structures, but under some other program like the National Historic Registry, etc. it provides other options and probably more flexibility for funding. Mr. Truelove stated he believes everyone wants to try to maximize whatever benefits we can get and the Committee that has been working on this may be able to provide some more guidance and recommendations to the Board the next time they make a presentation.

DISCUSSION ITEM – SEWER SALE PROCEEDS SPECIAL MEETING DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION

Mr. McCartney stated they will be scheduling a special meeting to discuss Sewer proceeds; and the preservation/restoration of Patterson Farm will be considered by the Board, and they will be working closely with the Committees and advisors on the best approach to that problem. He stated an Agenda will be sent out once the date is known, and the Board will be polled on available dates.

Mr. Grenier asked if it is felt that there will be just this one meeting or will the Special Meeting be held and ideas generated based on what Mr. Truelove has provided and other ideas including the recommendations of the Committee, and then direct the staff to look into issues more in detail. Mr. McCartney stated there will not just be one meeting on this, and this is the first of several meetings to consider different ideas.

Dr. Weiss stated there are many options particularly with regard to the buildings and other projects we may want to do. He stated the Board had Mr. Truelove look into options for protecting the money, and he feels we should move forward with the beginnings of forming a protective Trust for a portion of the money to help the General Fund through the years. He stated it will take some time to set up an Irrevocable Trust if that is what is decided. Dr. Weiss asked if there should be a Motion tonight in that regard, and Mr. Truelove stated he feels it would be more appropriate to wait for a Motion on that since the Sunshine Act requires that any Motions of that type are to be specified at least twenty-four hours before the meeting starts. He stated while it can be discussed conceptually, it would be best to have a specific Agenda item that would encompass that on the Agenda beforehand. Dr. Weiss asked that be on the Agenda of the Special Meeting or the next regular meeting so that the Board can consider setting up a Trust for a portion of the money so that the Board can then concentrate on the other issues and how to allocate the money.

Mr. Grenier stated the details of the establishment of organizing documents for that Trust would be important, and he would like to have Mr. Truelove or staff be prepared to discuss different funding levels of the Trust and what that might mean long term. Mr. Grenier stated Ms. Tierney had indicated that the Park & Rec Plan will most likely be on the Board of Supervisors May 4 Agenda, and he feels it would be useful to hear that Plan before the Special Meeting to see if that influences the discussion. Mr. McCartney stated the idea of that Plan was more of a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors as to the Needs Assessment and how the Board may want to move forward. Mr. Grenier stated that Plan and the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee will help the Board of Supervisors decide how they want to proceed.

SUPERVISORS REPORTS

Dr. Weiss stated the Ad Hoc Property Committee is awaiting the Board's input on the recommendations for a Phase 1 Study, and he feels it is essential to continue that conversation.


Mr. Grenier stated the Historic Commission is pushing forward the Application for historic listing, and they discussed looking at the recommendation for the dendrochronology work.

Mr. Lewis stated the Trenton Mercer Airport Review Panel met and he noted the discussion earlier by Mr. Melander from Representative Fitzpatrick's office.

Ms. Blundi stated as noted earlier the Township will hold a Red Cross Blood Drive in the Township Building and given the shortage of blood and the fact that it is not so easy to find a place to give blood, the Red Cross has asked if we would commit to this being a continuous thing. She stated there are still open slots and she would encourage people to sign up so we can get an idea if this is something that the community is interested in and keep it going forward.

There being no further business, Mr. Grenier moved, Ms. Blundi seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 10:21 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Daniel Grenier, Secretary