

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PARK & RECREATION BOARD  
MINUTES – NOVEMBER 9, 2021

The regular meeting of the Park & Recreation Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on November 9, 2021. Mr. Krauss called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and called the Roll.

Those present:

Park & Recreation Board: Douglas Krauss, Chair  
Robert LaBar, Member  
Mike Blundi, Member  
Dennis Wysocki, Member

Others: Monica Tierney, Park & Recreation Director  
James McCartney, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Michael Brody, Park & Recreation Board Vice Chair  
Kim Rock, Park & Recreation Board Secretary  
David Malinowski, Park & Recreation Board Member

#### TABLING OF MINUTES

Due to lack of a quorum of members who were present on October 12, 2021 to vote on the Minutes, the Minutes were tabled.

#### FEE SCHEDULE DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL

Ms. Tierney stated a millage increase is not proposed for Park & Recreation for 2022. She stated she is proposing the hiring of a full-time, year-round Pool Manager who would be salaried and have benefits. She stated this is due to the fact that there was trouble keeping a Pool Manager, and having someone year-round who would also be in charge of the hiring would be much more helpful. Ms. Tierney stated they are also proposing to hire an Administrative Secretary for the office who would answer phones, respond to e-mails, and do check requests, etc. She stated this will not raise the millage, and it is supported by Fees.

Mr. Krauss asked if this will bring the Park & Rec staff to three, full-time Administrative employees. Ms. Tierney stated there are five full-time laborers, three full-time Administrative employees, and a portion of two other employees who are part Pool so there would be a total of ten employees. Mr. Krauss asked Ms. Tierney if she is included as one of the three Administrative employees, and Ms. Tierney agreed. Mr. Krauss asked if that also includes the Pool Manager. Ms. Tierney stated the staff includes herself as the Director and Lynn who is the Operations Manager who does everything related to the maintenance, inspections, and well-being of the Department including all of the work orders. Ms. Tierney stated there is also a membership coordinator and a program manager already on staff which totals four. She stated they are looking to hire a secretary and a full-time, year-round Pool Manager. She stated she and the Pool Manager's salaries are supplemented by the Pool Funds because of the time they spend on the Pool. Ms. Tierney stated there are five employees now, and they will hire two more full-time employees, and they have the five full-time laborers. Ms. Tierney stated there was a part-time membership coordinator who assisted only during the summer with memberships, but now they are going to have a full-time administrative assistant who will assist with membership when it gets heavy.

Mr. Blundi asked if there is a job description for the year round Pool Manager, and Ms. Tierney stated in the Budget documents she provided a link to all of the job descriptions. She stated she could also send them out separately, and Mr. Blundi asked that Ms. Tierney do that. Ms. Tierney stated they are also posted publicly in the Budget document.

Ms. Tierney showed a slide of the Pool Budget 2021 projected Budget versus 2022. She stated an increase is shown because she is recommending raising the wages of the staff to meet current wages that are being offered by others. She showed a slide of pay rate information that shows that what were paying was not competitive with others. She stated currently we pay \$8.25 an hour to \$11.25 an hour, and she is proposing for 2022 to raise that to \$9.50 an hour to \$14.50 an hour based on different levels of non-management staff. She again noted what other area employers are paying. Ms. Tierney noted \$9.50 an hour would be for a maintenance position, and lifeguard salaries would be higher. Ms. Tierney stated she hopes that this will help us attract more employees. She stated starting in January, they will also offer potential hires to get their Certifications in advance so that there will be more Certified staff on board.

Ms. Tierney showed slides of the Fees that other pools in the area were charging. She stated what she is showing are 2021 Fees, and most pools are going to have to increase their Fees the same way she is proposing. She stated we are in a Pool Consortium with pools in Bucks and Montgomery County; and everyone is discussing the same thing, but everyone did not have their fees in place for 2022 to share ahead of time. She stated they are all looking to go to around the same rate of pay. A slide was shown of the fees charged by Fanny Chapman Pool in Doylestown, and they do have an Endowment Fund that helps with their Fees. A slide was shown of the Oxford Valley Pool. Ms. Tierney noted they have fewer amenities than Lower Makefield, and their fees and memberships are lower than Lower Makefield. A slide was shown of the Hatfield Aquatic Center showing that they base their memberships on family size, with the highest fee charged of \$1,300 a year.

Ms. Tierney stated by raising the pay of the staff a proposed, they would have had to raise the membership fees 21% across the board. She noted that two individual memberships at our Pool would cost more than a family membership which she did not feel was equitable so she wanted to look further into how the fees could be structured.

Ms. Tierney stated our Pool has some of the nicest facilities in the area and the best-trained life guards. Ms. Tierney stated in 2021, we were able to offer a lot that other pools were not able to offer. She stated we very rarely had to close in 2021 compared to some of the other area pools.

Ms. Tierney showed a slide of current rates. She stated they received a lot of phone calls from single parents with one child wanting to join Pool but they did not join because they would have been required to have a family membership.

Ms. Tierney showed a slide of what she is proposing for 2022 which would be based on family size. She stated those who are fourteen and older can use the facility without an adult. She stated the first two adults, fourteen and older, would be \$175 each for a resident at the discount period, \$230 for a non-resident at the discount period, \$190 for a resident at full price, and \$250 for a non-resident at full price. All rates noted are per person. She showed the fees for every additional adult after the first two adults.

Ms. Tierney showed a slide of 2021 family size data. She stated about 48% of the families were four-person families.

Ms. Tierney noted there will be some additional rate-related rules created. She stated the age cut-off will be the Friday before the first day of the Pool opens. She stated if you turn fourteen after May 27, you would pay the thirteen-year-old fee even though you would get some of the fourteen-year-old perks once you turn fourteen.

Ms. Tierney stated there is a discounted rate for Seniors. She stated previously there was a Senior limited membership, but a number of Seniors who bought that expanded their membership because they did not have access to water aerobics, etc. She stated with the limited Senior membership the Pool could only be used after 4:00 p.m. She stated there was also not a Discount period for Seniors, but one is now proposed.

Ms. Tierney stated another rule is that different households cannot be on the same account. She stated if there is a split household, two separate accounts would have to be created. Ms. Tierney stated Guest passes are for guests of members only. She stated in order to receive any type of swim lesson, you must be a member, and all Swim Team members must have a membership. Only Pool members can reserve the pavilion. There are no refunds after the start of the season. Ms. Tierney stated if you are registering a child fourteen or under, an adult over the age of eighteen from the same household will also be required to have a membership. Mr. Wysocki asked if the person over eighteen who is required to register with the child fourteen or under would have to be present at the Pool when that child is there. Ms. Tierney stated that child could go to the Pool with a friend's parent or sibling who is a member, but they wanted to make sure that there was someone in that household who was registered with them from the same household.

Mr. Wysocki noted the comment about guest passes that indicated that the passes are for guests of members only, and that the guest must always remain with the member; and he asked for an explanation. Ms. Tierney stated that is an existing rule, and the members must stay at the Pool with their guests. Mr. Krauss stated this means that a member could not leave the Pool and leave their guest there, and Ms. Tierney agreed. She stated they do not want people just dropping guests off.

Mr. Blundi asked about the requirement related to separate households, and stated if there were children, they would be registered under one parent's account, and the other parent could have an individual membership; and Ms. Tierney agreed.

Mr. Krauss asked Ms. Tierney how she came up with the Discount Rates because the percent discounts are very different, and it is not consistent. He stated for those under 1 to 5/Seniors it is a 23% discount, and the next one is a 16.6% discount. Ms. Tierney stated it was not a percentage discount - it was a number amount. Ms. Tierney stated it is just a \$15 discount across the board which made it easier to administer. Mr. Wysocki stated there is a value to having people register early.

Ms. Tierney showed slides as to how the changes in rates will impact families of various sizes. For a family of two, the rates will actually be less than was being charged previously, and for a family of three it would be approximately the same. She stated for families of four and above, the fees will increase from what was charged previously. Mr. Blundi stated he understands that families of four and five make up approximately 70% of the Pool membership, and Ms. Tierney agreed.

Mr. Wysocki asked the cost of a family membership in 2021, and Ms. Tierney stated it was \$450, and now it would be \$560 for a family of four.

Mr. Blundi asked the breakdown of residents versus non-residents. Ms. Tierney stated she can provide that information at a later time. Mr. Blundi stated he felt that about half of the Pool members were non-residents. He stated it will be a big jump for non-residents going from \$570 to \$750 for a family of four.

Mr. Blundi stated it appears that the Budget is increasing by about \$150,000, and Ms. Tierney agreed. Mr. Blundi asked if that will be made up by membership fees, and Ms. Tierney agreed. Ms. Tierney stated she took every member and broke them up by age and how old they would be in 2022, and plugged them into a formula to come up with the numbers needed in order to get where we need to be.

Mr. Blundi stated he is concerned whether the non-residents will decide that it is too much money and look for other options. He stated there may be families that have a family membership with four to five people on the membership but they are not all using it. Ms. Tierney stated there were also a lot of people who did not join because they could not afford the fees previously because of their family situation, and she feels they may be able to get those people with two to three people in their family to register.

Mr. LaBar stated it is possible that someone could decide not to get a family membership; but would get an individual membership and then use guest passes for people in their family who may want to attend.

Ms. Tierney stated they are also looking into payment plans to make the Pool more affordable by not having to pay the fee all at once.

Mr. LaBar stated the fees proposed are so that we can pay the proposed hourly rates for staff. Ms. Tierney stated the idea would be not to have to close the Pool since they would have adequate staff. She added that there were many pools in Bucks County which did not open for months, closed early, or were not open certain days of the week. Ms. Tierney stated we were able to “struggle through that” even though we were twenty lifeguards short this year. She stated we need to attract employees, and the only way to do that is by raising the fees to pay the higher salary rates.

Mr. Wysocki asked Ms. Tierney if the math was based on the registration numbers from last year. He stated he feels if it was, there is a risk that higher fees may impact the registration and the numbers may not hold going into 2022. He stated he feels there may be some drop offs because of the price increase. Ms. Tierney stated she feels that there will actually be an increase in registration numbers and increased usage of the Pool. She again showed the slide of the Hatfield rates, and what is proposed for LMT is similar. She stated the Hatfield pool is heavily used, and they completely offset their costs through membership. She stated while they have some amenities that Lower Makefield does not have, they only have two pools. Mr. Wysocki stated for a family of four Hatfield charges less than what LMT is proposing.

Mr. Krauss stated he feels it is important to know the percentage of resident and non-resident members, since the non-residents will be seeing a 53% increase for a family of five over current rates. He added that there could be increases in other categories as noted by Ms. Tierney, and they should see if there will be an offset.

Mr. LaBar noted that Hatfield has an option for a Twilight membership after 3 p.m., and he asked Ms. Tierney if she knows how popular that is. Ms. Tierney stated she would prefer to get away from that adding that they did that for the Seniors and it was very hard to manage. She stated she does not know how popular it is at Hatfield.

Mr. Blundi asked Ms. Tierney if the registration numbers projected are more or less than next year, and Ms. Tierney stated her anticipation is that they will be equal. She stated she feels they may see the sale of more guest passes.

Mr. Blundi asked Ms. Tierney if she is projecting the same number of members paying more or more members. Ms. Tierney stated she feels there will be a mixture of both. She stated she has a number of spreadsheets she could review with Mr. Blundi.

Mr. Blundi stated he is concerned about the non-residents which he believe make up 50% of the membership. Ms. Tierney stated she does not feel it is that high.

Mr. Wysocki asked Mr. McCartney if the Pool registration did not support the cost of operation of the Pool, how would the difference be covered. Mr. McCartney stated while he is not sure, he assumes that it would come out of the General Fund. He stated both the Golf Course and the Pool are meant to be self-sustaining; but if there are any shortages, he believes the General Fund covers those shortfalls. Mr. McCartney stated based on the projections it appears that the Pool will be self-sufficient for 2022, and Ms. Tierney agreed. Mr. McCartney asked if the \$150,000 increase includes the cost of the Pool Manager, and Ms. Tierney agreed and it would be coming from the increase in the Pool fees.

Mr. McCartney stated this past year, Lower Makefield has seen more Pool permits for construction of pools at personal residences than in the history of Lower Makefield. He stated he feels increases in memberships will probably be coming from non-residents based on what they have seen as far as new pools being built within the Township.

Ms. Tierney stated they could lower the non-resident rate and increase the resident rate. Mr. McCartney stated they would then have to consider if it is truly a Lower Makefield community pool or just a pool that happens to be in the community, and that we are trying to get to a break-even point by bringing in Revenue from non-residents. Mr. LaBar stated a good portion of the Pool is already non-residents. He added that they need to consider how to cost effectively keep the Pool operational for our constituents and also make it a facility that can operate on its own without going to the General Budget by doing something with the Pool membership fees.

Mr. Krauss stated if we are trying to get to the Budget by leveraging non-residents to help keep the rates down for residents, and we miss that amount, the residents will end up paying for it anyway in tax dollars.

Mr. McCartney stated it would be helpful to know the percentage of non-residents versus residents; and Ms. Tierney stated while she does not have that number available at this point, the percentage of residents is greater than non-residents. Mr. McCartney stated the challenge is how to balance whether the sense is that this is still a Township community pool recognizing that a large number of residents have decided to build private pools.

Mr. McCartney asked Ms. Tierney if she does exit surveys from members to find out what their plans are for the following year; and Ms. Tierney stated while they intended to do that this year, she does not believe they actually did that. She stated they did do surveys heading into the season and surveys regarding possible Pool changes in the future, but they did not do an exit survey this year. Mr. McCartney stated doing that would provide a guideline, recognizing that there would be 5% to 10% room for error, which would help project memberships.

Mr. Blundi asked if our POS system gives usage information as to how many use the Pool once a week, etc. Ms. Tierney stated they can currently go into individual households and pull who is the user, but it would take days of work to be able to do that. She stated she could look into whether something custom could be created to do that.

Mr. Krauss stated at this point he feels there should be follow-up to see what is the percentage of residents and non-residents.

Mr. Wysocki asked Ms. Tierney if this still needs to go before the Board of Supervisors for approval; and Ms. Tierney stated once the Park Board makes a recommendation on this, it would then go to the Board of Supervisors for approval. Ms. Tierney stated the Budget is contingent on these Fees, which is why this is so important.

Mr. Krauss asked that they review the other proposed Pool fees so that there is a complete snapshot.

Mr. LaBar stated he understands that this is not based on an increase in membership, and it is based on the membership numbers from last season; and Ms. Tierney agreed. Mr. Krauss stated the concern was raised that with the increase of the fees for non-residents, there could be a potential shortfall. Mr. Wysocki stated he feels the concern is for both residents and non-residents. He stated fees for a family of four residents will go up 25%, and it is unknown what will happen at the time of registration.



Mr. Wysocki asked the timing for approval, and Ms. Tierney stated the next Board of Supervisors meeting is Wednesday, November 17. She stated the fees would be approved when the Final Budget is approved by the Board of Supervisors which she understands will be in December. Ms. Tierney stated this was presented to the Board of Supervisors at their last meeting, and there was minimal discussion about it.

Ms. Tierney stated she feels the only way to lower the non-resident rate would be to increase resident rates. She stated she was under the impression that the idea for the Pool was to have primarily resident members given that it is a community pool, and it took a while to bring in non-residents. She stated she was under the impression that we were “resident-centric,” which was why she presented these numbers.

Mr. Blundi noted the fee for a family of five residents which will be \$575 at the discount period, and it was \$450 this past season. He stated the non-resident fee would be \$775 compared to \$570 last season. Ms. Tierney agreed. Ms. Tierney added non-residents did not have a discount period previously, but now they do. Mr. LaBar stated the fees proposed makes it more equitable for different sized families, and Ms. Tierney agreed. She added previously individual members were supporting the larger families. Mr. Wysocki asked if the \$450 charged last year was for the discount period; and Ms. Tierney stated a resident family was \$475 if paid after the discount period, and \$430 if paid at the discount period.

Ms. Tierney stated the choice for new rates was either a 21% increase across the board or to make it more equitable by decreasing Individual rates and having a charge per person for a family membership.

Mr. Kraus stated as a follow-up they would like to know the percentage of non-residents and residents; and if there was to be a reduction in non-resident members, what would need to be made to offset this in other memberships to get to the same Budget number. Ms. Tierney stated while she can do the various scenarios, it is all guessing.

There was discussion about other proposed Fee changes. Ms. Tierney stated with regard to the Swim Team there was some discussion at the last meeting about the potential of charging League Fees to the Swim Team. She stated she feels the Swim Team is a little different since they have to pay for the Swim Team membership as well as their Pool membership, so she feels we should consider charging them differently than the other Leagues. She showed a slide of what she is proposing. Ms. Tierney stated that we now charge a

blended non-uniform rate for staff based on who is working. She stated if we need maintenance staff to cover an event, we charge their blended rate to the participant to support them for whatever their event or program is. She stated they would do the same thing for the lifeguard staff they would have to have outside of normal hours. She stated they would track who was scheduled; and every extra hour outside of the regular Pool season that they are here, which would vary based on the swim meets, would be charged to the Swim Team at the end of the year, as it would be hard to predict this pre-season. Ms. Tierney stated for regular home meets that would run beyond closing time, they would be charged for the extra time. She stated if it were a Tournament/Championship, they would charge what is charged for an athletic field. She stated she feels charging those rates would offset the costs rather than the standard per-person fee since their members are all paying membership fees.

Mr. Krauss asked the number of regular home meets, and Ms. Tierney stated there are about six to seven. Mr. Krauss stated there would be no fee for those, and Ms. Tierney agreed unless they ran overtime. She stated they would charge a \$250 fee for the Championship meets when there are extended hours. Mr. Krauss stated he assumes that for a regular meet there would still be extra clean-up, etc. after the meet. Ms. Tierney stated they would be charged the rate for whoever has to stay late.

Mr. LaBar asked if the \$250 proposed to be charged for a Championship is enough to recover the additional costs, and Ms. Tierney stated they would also be charged the amount the staff has to be there after hours.

Ms. Tierney showed a slide of some other proposed Fee changes. She stated they are looking to increase the rate of all guest passes. She stated they have proposed a guest pass for after 4 p.m. She stated the proposal is \$20 in 2022 for a full day versus \$10 which was the amount charged in 2021. She stated they are encouraging memberships. Ms. Tierney stated they are looking to increase the charge for swim lessons to \$50 for the first child and each additional child would be \$40. She stated they are proposing to increase the pavilion rental to \$15 an hour in line with the other pavilions in the Township.

Mr. Krauss stated he feels \$20 a day is steep for a guest pass. Ms. Tierney stated she does not feel \$20 for a full day at the Pool is that expensive.

Mr. Wysocki stated he feels a day at a water park would cost more than \$20, and Ms. Tierney agreed a water park would charge \$65 a day. Mr. Krauss stated he does not feel that is an apples-to-apples comparison.

Mr. Blundi asked the revenue generated in 2021 from guest passes. Ms. Tierney stated we sold \$5,760 worth of guest books, and we made \$27,063 in guest passes. Mr. Blundi stated Ms. Tierney is budgeting to double this, and Ms. Tierney agreed and that she is anticipating that the guest passes will help supplement the revenue. She added that for 2021, they started guest passes late. She stated in 2019, we made \$51,706 in guest passes.

Mr. LaBar stated there may be an increase in individual memberships and some people may decide not to get a family membership and then purchase guest passes to bring their older children who do not come to the Pool often.

Mr. LaBar asked if all the money for the swim lessons comes back to the Pool Budget, and Ms. Tierney agreed. She added that the person giving the swim lessons is paid an hourly rate.

Ms. Tierney showed a slide outlining a new proposal for 2022 offering semi-private lessons for those of like ability. She stated it has been difficult to get to all the people requesting private swim lesson; and if we were to offer semi-private lessons, we could reach more. She stated these would be half-hour, semi-private lessons for \$15 each up to three individuals. Mr. Wysocki asked how long the regular group swim lessons are for; and Ms. Tierney that they are slightly less than an hour, and it is for six or eight lessons.

Ms. Tierney stated she is also looking to make changes to Summer Camp. She stated they previously had eight and four-week sessions; and the format proposed is to officially have four, six, and eight week sessions. She showed a slide outlining the rates for residents, non-resident Pool members, and a rate for non-residents. Mr. LaBar asked if the resident rate includes a Pool membership, and Ms. Tierney stated it does not. Ms. Tierney stated they propose to increase the pay for Summer Camp staff. She stated the fee includes all of the trip fees, and they have gone to the zoo, the aquarium, Five Mile Woods, etc. She stated those attending Camp bring their own lunch.

Mr. Wysocki asked if there is a rate for residents who have a Pool membership, and Ms. Tierney stated there is not. She stated the rate for the residents is the lowest rate whether they are Pool members or not. She stated non-resident Pool members get a lower rate than other non-residents. Mr. Wysocki noted the proposed 2022 eight-week, resident rate of \$1,256, and he asked how that compares to the 2021 rate; and Ms. Tierney stated it was \$1,255 if they registered early, and the proposed is \$1,256. Mr. Wysocki asked if the

Camp is usually filled up, and Ms. Tierney stated they have had to reach out to other locations in the Township to try to get additional space to be able to expand the Camp. She stated last year there was a forty-person waiting list each week even during the high-COVID concern time. She stated there is a big demand in the Township for Summer Camp which is mostly Township residents. She stated she would like to be able to expand to an additional site if possible in 2022. Mr. Wysocki asked if what is proposed will generate more revenue. Ms. Tierney stated she is trying to expand the program. She stated they are raising the rates slightly to cover the increases in staff pay.

Mr. Krauss asked the Board if they want to make a Motion to approve the Fees tonight or wait until we have additional information and vote on this at the next meeting. Mr. LaBar asked when this needs to be recommended to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. McCartney stated the Board of Supervisors will be discussing the Budget at their next meeting on November 17 with that meeting starting at 6:30 p.m. so they will have an additional hour for Budget-specific discussion. Mr. Krauss stated he understands the formal approval by the Board of Supervisors will be in December, and Mr. McCartney agreed. After discussion, it was realized that the Park & Recreation Board would not be meeting until after the Board of Supervisors December 1 meeting. Mr. McCartney stated he feels the Board of Supervisors will therefore need a recommendation from the Park & Recreation Board tonight.

Mr. LaBar moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to approve the numbers that Ms. Tierney has proposed for 2022.

Mr. Wysocki stated he feels what Ms. Tierney has presented is a reasonable proposal for a fee structure. He stated they could manipulate the numbers to push the cost from one membership base to another, but they would not be able to project which way would be the most successful combination of fees. He stated he feels what has been presented is as good a fee proposal structure as they can go with at this point; and unless someone has a better idea to consider, he would be in favor of the Motion.

Mr. Blundi asked Ms. Tierney if there were other things that she considered which she rejected, and Ms. Tierney stated there were many. Ms. Tierney stated she completely rejected raising fees across the board. She stated she realized that reducing the Individual rate was the only way to make it more equitable. She stated she tried a number of different options before coming to this proposal which she feels is much more equitable than what we had in the past.

Mr. Wysocki stated he does feel that a family of two should probably be less than a single times two. Mr. LaBar stated the point was that if there was a family of two, they were paying more than a family. He stated he feels what is proposed gives an equitable reason for what we are doing to keep the facilities at the level that we want and also seek good, qualified lifeguards and support staff to be able to keep it at the level we do. Mr. LaBar stated it is possible that they will lose a family of five but they may also get couples coming in because it is more equitable. He stated he feels comfortable recommending this to the Board of Supervisors and then let them review the numbers themselves.

Ms. Tierney stated for the 2021 season there were 1,026 resident families and 447 non-resident families. Mr. McCartney asked Ms. Tierney if the proposed fee structure is in order to keep the non-resident families at 30%, and Ms. Tierney agreed that if the numbers were the same, that is how we would cover our costs.

Mr. Wysocki asked Mr. McCartney whether there were concerns expressed when this was presented at the Board of Supervisors meeting. Mr. McCartney stated the Budget encompasses so much, it was a lot for the Board to digest at that meeting. He stated over the last week Supervisors have spent some time with Mr. Ferguson going over more specific expenses of the Budget. He stated he assumes that there will be more discussion of specific line items at the November 17 meeting. Mr. Wysocki asked Mr. McCartney if he would be comfortable defending the fee schedule proposed, and Mr. McCartney stated he would be. He added if this Budget makes the Pool whole so that it does not have to be subsidized by taxpayer dollars out of the General Fund, he feels it is a success. He stated while he would like there to be a surplus to cover renovations and infrastructure issues at the Pool, he feels if we were to break even that would be good for the taxpayers. Mr. Wysocki asked Mr. McCartney how he would respond to a Pool member expressing concern about the increased fees, and Mr. McCartney stated he understands that there will be some people who are not pleased with it. He stated there are probably some Pool members who are not pleased that 30% of the Pool members are non-residents, but their fees would then have to be tripled if we did not allow for non-residents to join the Pool.

Mr. Wysocki seconded the Motion, and the Motion carried unanimously.

POOL AGREEMENT WITH YARDLEY DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL

Ms. Tierney stated she provided to the Board in their packet the Pool Agreement with Yardley from 2001. She stated the Agreement is very outdated, and it was created before we allowed non-residents into the Pool. She stated the Agreement allowed Lower Makefield to use their recreation room if we allowed fifty Yardley residents to get all of the same benefits as Township residents at the Pool. Ms. Tierney stated at a minimum seventy-five families from Yardley Borough were paying resident rates at the Pool.

Ms. Tierney stated the Township does not use the Yardley Borough recreation room; and the only reason she feels the Township could use it would be if it were large enough to accommodate Summer Camp. Mr. Krauss described the room in Yardley Borough; however, Ms. Tierney stated because we have the Community Center, she does not feel we would need to go into Yardley Borough to offer programs. She stated the Agreement automatically renews, so we would have to give notice on any change before January.

Mr. Krauss stated without this Agreement, Yardley Borough residents would just be considered non-residents and would have to pay the non-resident fee as opposed to be paying the resident fee as they do now.

Ms. Tierney stated that while the Agreement indicated that this would just be applicable to fifty families from Yardley Borough, currently every Yardley Borough resident Pool member is paying resident rates. Mr. Wysocki asked if Yardley Borough residents coming in to register for the Pool know that if they are the first fifty to come in that they are entitled to the Lower Makefield Township resident rate. Ms. Tierney stated since she has been with the Township, this has never been limited to the first fifty, and she did not know that was part of the Agreement. Mr. Wysocki asked, regardless of the fifty limit, do Yardley Borough residents come in expecting to pay resident rates; and Ms. Tierney stated while a new Yardley Borough resident may not, the old residents do expect that.

Mr. Krauss stated when this Agreement was written, you had to be a Lower Makefield resident to be a Pool member so there was only one rate. He stated this Agreement gave Yardley Borough residents the ability to belong to the Pool. Mr. LaBar stated the Agreement also gave them the ability to pay the same fees as Lower Makefield residents. He stated if this were to remain in effect, Yardley Borough residents would pay Lower Makefield resident rates. Mr. Wysocki stated technically that would only be for the first fifty if we were to monitor it.

Mr. Wysocki asked Ms. Tierney if she feels there is something else that we may want from Yardley Borough that Lower Makefield would be interested in if we still wanted to provide the Lower Makefield resident rates to Yardley Borough residents, and then we would just amend the Agreement and get something that would be more equitable in return since at this point, Lower Makefield is getting something that we are not using. Ms. Tierney stated she does not know that at this point, as she is not that familiar with Yardley facilities and infrastructure.

Mr. LaBar stated according to the Agreement, we would have to notify Yardley prior to January 1 if we wanted to get out of the Agreement; and he asked who would make that notification to Yardley Borough. Mr. McCartney stated he assumes it would be the Township solicitor based on the direction of the Board of Supervisors. Mr. LaBar stated he feels it would be in our best interest to reach out to Yardley Borough to discuss what Yardley Borough could offer and come to an agreement that would be in everyone's interest.

Mr. Wysocki stated under the current Agreement it has been asymmetrical in terms of value and we could show how many Yardley Borough residents have taken advantage of the Pool at Lower Makefield Township resident rates. He stated circumstances have changed since the Agreement was written, and there is now a non-resident rate so a value could be set showing what Yardley residents are getting by paying Lower Makefield Township resident rates. Mr. Wysocki stated while the Township itself may not use the Yardley Borough recreation room, Lower Makefield residents may have used it, and Yardley Borough may have a record of that; and they could compare and look at the equity. Mr. Wysocki stated he feels that if it is found that it is not equitable, there should be a discussion with Yardley Borough on something else of value that Yardley Borough has that could be offered to Lower Makefield Township, and we could then amend the Agreement.

Mr. Blundi stated at a point in time, he feels there was a reason for this Agreement which allowed the Yardley residents to join as it was noted that the children from Yardley and Lower Makefield go to school, play, and are on the same sports teams; and it was not right to separate them with regard to the Pool. He stated now however, there is an avenue for non-residents to join the Pool; and he feels they should pay the non-resident rate. He stated he feels the Agreement has run its course. He stated he would be willing to listen if Yardley Borough wanted to negotiate something different; however, he feels the time for this Agreement is over, and they should pay the non-resident rate. He added that the other surrounding Municipalities pay the non-resident rate, and he feels Yardley should do the same.

Mr. Krauss stated when the Agreement was written, Yardley had a recreation center; but Lower Makefield now has its own Community Center.

Mr. Wysocki suggested that they advise Yardley Borough that they are going to end the Agreement since it has run its course as there is no longer the need for the Yardley Borough facility and we now offer non-resident rates; and that unless Yardley Borough has a different proposal, we will be ending this Agreement. Mr. Wysocki stated this would give Yardley Borough the opportunity to decide if they want to provide some other benefit to the Township.

Mr. Blundi moved and Mr. LaBar seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to terminate and/or negotiate a new Agreement with Yardley Borough as it stands with regard to Yardley Board residents' Pool membership.

Mr. Wysocki asked if it would help the Supervisors if Ms. Tierney were to provide the data as to how many Yardley Borough residents were Pool members, and Mr. McCartney stated that would help. He added the recommendation would give the Township solicitor the opportunity to review both options to see what would be the best course of action whether it would be to terminate or re-negotiate the Agreement.

Motion carried unanimously.

## POLICY APPROVALS

### League Sanctioning Policy

Ms. Tierney stated she would like to discuss this in the future so that she can go over it more closely with the Leagues, and this was acceptable to Mr. Krauss.

### Fields and Facilities Policy

Ms. Tierney stated a problem with the Fields and Facilities Policy was brought to her attention, and she is recommending under Field Policy No. 2 taking out the first sentence which states, "a maximum weekly usage of ten hours," since that is not physically possible at this time with the fields and the number of Leagues that we have.



Mr. LaBar moved, Mr. Wysocki seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Fields and Facilities Policy with the one correction.

#### Programs and Events Policy

Ms. Tierney stated this covers tournaments, performances, meetings, etc. She stated this has been discussed previously by the Park & Recreation Board.

Mr. Krauss asked if the staff hired for classes have to go through background checks, and Ms. Tierney stated they do if they are working with children. Mr. Krauss asked if that was included in the Policy. Ms. Tierney stated this Policy is about events and not our internal classes. Mr. Krauss noted the second paragraph. Ms. Tierney stated she does not know if that was identified, but they do require that by Contract. She stated she could add that to the Policy. Mr. Krauss stated he wants to make sure that if someone was teaching classes for children, they would have the proper background check as any other organization would require; and Mr. Blundi agreed. Ms. Tierney stated by Contract they are required to have background checks if they are working with youth; and if the Board would like her to include that wording in the Policy she would make that change.

Mr. Wysocki moved and Mr. LaBar seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approving the Programs and Events Policy with the change incorporated.

Ms. Noelle Codispoti, 1908 S. Crescent Boulevard, representing PAA, stated she previously suggested that the special events not include their regularly-sanctioned Babe Ruth or Cal Ripken Tournaments where they would have two or more non-resident teams come in. Ms. Tierney stated that was included as “friendlies.” Ms. Codispoti stated these would be different from Softball. She stated last year PAA hosted the 8-U State Tournament for the Girls Softball as part of the Babe Ruth trail; and it is the continuation of the in-house season. Ms. Tierney asked how many teams that was, and Ms. Codispoti stated it was six teams for Softball. Ms. Codispoti stated they also hosted an 8-U Baseball State Tournament, and there were a total of eight non-resident teams in that Tournament. Ms. Tierney stated she had accounted for up to four with four teams “friendly non-resident,” in the Policy, but they could address this further. Ms. Codispoti it puts them at a disadvantage when they are being called upon by Cal Ripken or Babe Ruth

to be a tournament host for those tournament trails if they have to “re-up their Permits for those specifics.” Ms. Codispoti stated in the Policy it specifically lists four teams for “softball travel-style friendlies.” Ms. Codispoti stated she is speaking about when it is sanctioned by their governing body of Cal Ripken or Babe Ruth. Ms. Codispoti stated she would not be considering this if a 10-U team wanted to host a tournament outside of the norm.

Ms. Codispoti stated the Tournaments she is discussing are not meant to be a League fundraiser type of event. She stated she felt the clause in this Policy related to the fundraiser-type tournaments so that the Township would also benefit from those types of events. Ms. Tierney stated she felt she was addressing Ms. Codispoti’s concern by “adding the friendlies.” She stated provided the Park & Recreation Board agrees, she would amend the Policy to include sanctioned-type events.

Mr. Wysocki asked what would we be giving up if we provide this waiver, and Ms. Tierney stated we charge a per-field usage fee for Tournaments because it is non-resident usage coming in as well as a lot of extra work for the staff. She stated they also charge light fees for Tournaments. She stated she understands what Ms. Codispoti is requesting which she feels is fair, and it is the larger Tournaments that are more taxing to the system. Ms. Codispoti stated the larger Tournament are the ones that bring in additional funds so they would have the money to support the additional Township Permit required.

Mr. Wysocki stated he assumes that for the other events, there is still clean-up required, and he understands that they considering a waiver for those events because they are not fundraiser-type events. Mr. Krauss stated they are kind of an extension of the regular season. Mr. Wysocki stated if this is something they are going to do for PAA, it should also be afforded to the other Leagues as well for this same kind of waiver. Ms. Tierney stated that is what is generally done, and we only charge YMS for the big soccer tournaments and not extended playing season. Mr. Wysocki stated he would like to make sure that it is fair for all of the Leagues.

Mr. LaBar asked if it is included in the Policy that if there is a State Tournament the Township will be supplied with their insurances, and Ms. Tierney stated PAA supplies the Township with their insurance at the beginning of the year because they are a sanctioned League. Mr. LaBar asked if the other teams from the State have to provide that as well, and Ms. Tierney stated that is not required of the other teams coming in at this time. Mr. LaBar asked if they should include that

in this Policy or look into it. Ms. Tierney stated this would require a legal opinion. She asked Mr. LaBar if he is suggesting that they require insurance information from all opposing teams. Mr. LaBar stated the onus could be on PAA as part of the Agreement that they would make sure that the other teams coming in have insurance.

There was discussion whether the Motion would be approved with the changes that have been discussed. Mr. Wysocki stated he feels that they should see a revised document before voting on this, and it was agreed to table this until the December Park & Recreation Board meeting.

#### Security and Access Policy

Ms. Tierney stated this discusses how they will keep track of keys, key duplication, etc. for the different facilities.

Mr. LaBar moved, Mr. Wysocki seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Security and Access Policy.

#### Update Community Center Policy

Ms. Tierney stated over time we recognized that the initial Policies we had in place needed some modifications. She stated we recognized that we do not have enough space or time for private parties although initially they were anticipating that we would be able to host private parties; however, once we had all of the programming they found we could not make that work at this time. She stated the biggest change was defining the different types of user groups and what the facility would be used for.

Mr. Krauss asked if they are now saying that there will be no private parties at the Community Center, and Ms. Tierney agreed. She stated they have not been doing any private parties, and they have all been community events as well as religious/cultural events. She stated they have not been hosting personal/private events such as birthday parties, etc. Ms. Tierney stated people do call after seeing this Policy on the Website which indicates they offer the Community Center for private events, but we are not offering the Center for those private events.

Mr. Wysocki asked if the restriction for private parties is a capacity issue; and if capacity was not an issue, would they consider private parties. Ms. Tierney stated it is capacity and the ability to turn the facility over as there is not enough staff to change over a room if they had those types of events. She noted there would also be a requirement to pay staff overtime. Mr. Wysocki stated people can rent a Township pavilion for a private party, and Ms. Tierney agreed.

Mr. Wysocki moved, Mr. LaBar seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approving the update to the Community Center Policy.

#### Update Dog Park Policy

Ms. Tierney stated there are minor changes to the Dog Park Policy. She stated she took the Fees out of the document and made reference to the Website to get the Fees so that if the Fees were to change, we would not have to re-write the Policy. She stated changes were also made to the “reporting structure.” She stated issues will be addressed according to a “strike system” depending on the situation.

Mr. Wysocki moved, Mr. Blundi seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approving the update to the Dog Park Policy.

#### LIAISON REPORTS

Mr. Mike Hansen, 13 Houston Road, representing YMS Soccer was present. He stated they are finishing up the fall season. He stated with regard to the rec/in-house program from fall of 2019 to fall 2021, they increased from 800 to 900 and had 30 people on the waiting list this year who they were not able to accommodate.

Mr. Wysocki stated he has YMS Columbus Day Soccer Tournament books from 1999 to 2012, and he asked if they would be interested in having those; and Mr. Hansen stated he would be interested in those to keep at their indoor facility as they are considering a museum at some point.

Ms. Noelle Codispoti, Pennsbury Athletic Association, stated their season is finished. She stated at the Caiola Complex this weekend, they took down the batting cage nets and winterized the fields. She stated that same process will happen this weekend at the Fred Allen fields and the Pool fields. She stated they have had their try-outs for the Gems teams and travel baseball. She stated there are two teams at every age group – at Gems starting at 10-U and a newly formed 8-U softball team which will help as they go into the 8-U State Tournament for Babe Ruth. She stated there are also two teams at every age for 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12s on the baseball side, and three teams at 13, 14, and 15 for the travel season coming up in the spring. She stated they are getting ready to open up spring Registration. She stated this Thursday at Makefield Highlands at 7:00 p.m., they will be honoring their three State Champions – the 10-U softball team, the 10-U baseball team, and 8-U baseball team; and she invited the Board members to attend.

#### RECREATION DIRECTOR REPORT

##### Memorial Park Project Update

Ms. Tierney stated the courts are being painted, and in the next few weeks we will be able to open the courts. She stated the benches have not yet been received, and hopefully they will be available soon. She stated they are looking into some alternatives that might be in stock. Ms. Tierney stated there had been some concerns about ponding; and the drainage is not yet all in place so until that is completed, there may be some ponding.

##### Community Center Doors Update

Ms. Tierney stated there are supply chain issues with the doors. She stated there were some issues with the lock access to the facility, and they have come up with a temporary solution until the new doors are received.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Wysocki stated he is very happy that we have courts at Memorial Park that are close to being ready to be used. He stated, while he may have missed it, when we went into the design and lay-out he does not know that the Park Board ever saw a finished lay-out. He stated he did have some comments,

but apparently he was too late to effect the way the courts were going to be lined for pickleball versus tennis. He stated he understands that there will be two dedicated tennis courts, one dedicated tennis court area for pickleball, and one that will be combined. Mr. Krauss stated there will three tennis courts and four pickleball courts.

Mr. Wysocki stated he knows that Ms. Tierney had the engineers check it out and was told that there was not a problem, but when he walked the site, the north end pickleball and tennis court end of the court looks like it is pitched beyond what would be normal. He stated with respect to pickleball, he feels they will be playing up or down hill a little bit; and while in actuality it might not be an issue, it appears that it is inordinately pitched on that end. Mr. Wysocki also noted the way the fencing was laid out. He stated he feels one of the best models are the tennis courts at Core Creek Park where there is not a hard right-angle corner which makes balls more retrievable and looks better. He stated at Memorial Park, the dividing fences between the pickleball courts do not give access diagonally; and you have to go all the way around. He stated he wishes the Park Board had seen the specific Plans before it was put into the Grant Application process since once that happened, they could not change it. He stated while he is very happy that we have courts, he wishes that they were “A-level courts,” since in the end we will probably have something a little less than that. He stated if the process did not allow the Park Board to see this detail and comment on it, he feels that process should be fixed in the future.

Mr. Krauss stated he does not believe that the Park & Recreation Board had a formal final presentation from the engineer as to what was being submitted. He stated he knows that Plans were talked about, but he does not know if the previous engineer ever came to the Park & Recreation Board to show what the final submission was going to be although they may have done that with the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Tierney stated we amended the Plan since there were no pickleball courts initially. Mr. Krauss stated he believes that Mr. Wysocki is referring to the final detailed engineering drawing. Ms. Tierney stated she believes that she did share those Plans, but she will double check. Mr. Krauss stated they should consider this going forward to make sure that the Park & Recreation Board gets final presentations from the engineer, and Ms. Tierney stated she will look into the process.

November 9, 2021

Park & Recreation Board – page 23 of 23

There being no further business, Mr. Wysocki moved, Mr. Blundi seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Douglas Krauss, Chair