

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
AD HOC PROPERTY COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FEBRUARY 9, 2023

The regular meeting of the Ad Hoc Property Committee of the Township of Lower Makefield was held remotely on February 9, 2023. Mr. Steadman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

Ad Hoc Property Committee: Dennis Steadman, Chair
Joe Camaratta, Member
John Mohan, Member
Ron Schmid, Member

Others: James Majewski, Community Development Director
Monica Tierney, Park & Recreation Director
Jennifer Stark, Avison-Young
Candace Ly, Avison-Yung
Suzanne Blundi, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Fred Childs, Ad Hoc Property Committee Vice Chair
Bette Sovinee, Ad Hoc Property Committee Secretary
Jim Scott, Ad Hoc Property Committee Member

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 2023 AND JANUARY 12, 2023

Mr. Schmid moved, Mr. Mohan seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of January 5, 2023 as written.

Mr. Schmid moved, Mr. Mohan seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of January 12, 2023 as written.

DECISION-MAKING PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES APPROVAL

Mr. Steadman stated this was discussed at the last meeting and a Draft Policy was circulated to the Committee. There are eight elements to the decision-making process. Mr. Steadman stated he feels the fifth item is the most important that as a group, they strive to reach consensus before making an important decision.

He stated it means that all opinions have been heard, understood, and considered. While 100% agreement is not always achievable, we can achieve 100% listening, 100% understanding, 100% consideration, and 100% acceptance. Once a decision is made, Members will strive to fully support that decision; and that is how effective teams and Committees work together. He stated he is pleased that this Committee wants to adopt this kind of behavior.

Mr. Schmid moved and Mr. Mohan seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Decision-Making Principles and Practices.

Mr. Steadman stated these will be finalized and attached to the Minutes of this meeting, and he will circulate them asking for signatures from the Committee members.

MASTER PLAN CONTRACTOR SELECTION: Ms. Stark

4ward Planning Inc. Market Potential & Revenue Evaluation Proposal

During the discussion with Seiler-Drury, they mentioned the merits of having a market analysis done for the sake of learning about the best and highest uses for the site based on what the area could bear, what the area could use, and what the interests are of local potential partners – profit or non-profit. This information would help inform the architectural team as to potential uses and help them evaluate the site based on the potential uses. Different uses would require different physical characteristics to the structures. Having a better idea of what could be appropriate and what would be the highest and best effect for the Township, would help to determine how to evaluate.

Ms. Stark stated we took this recommendation and reached out to 4ward Planning to prepare a proposal to do the market analysis. Seiler-Drury advised that they could manage this effort or the Township could consider managing it separately. The Committee feels that having 4ward Planning being managed by the architects who are leading the team will give us better results.

Mr. Steadman stated he would like to know if there is consensus on that point that the market analysis would be coordinated by our architectural projects lead, and this was the consensus of the Committee.

Ms. Stark reminded the Committee that 4ward Planning had been an alternate service that Seiler-Drury had included in their original proposal, and that is folded into the Seiler-Drury cost so there is a full package of consultants who will be working with the architect as the lead. She stated their efforts will be concurrent and complement each other so that the architects get the information that they need in a timely manner so that everything is moving forward appropriately.

Timing & Integration with Seiler-Drury Project

Ms. Stark stated Seiler-Drury will start their initial work which is the survey.

Mr. Camaratta asked about the scope of what they are looking at in terms of market. He stated he felt it seemed it be geared toward Retail, and he feels we should think about what the potential uses could be. Mr. Camaratta stated he feels education should be included. He stated AOY already has an educational mandate, and Patterson Farm Preservation has put together a number of different ideas in their plan for education around agricultural purposes. Mr. Camaratta asked how do we set the scope for things they could potentially look at. He stated they mentioned spas and things like that, and he asked if we see that as an appropriate use for Patterson Farm. Mr. Mohan stated he feels we should leave it as wide open as possible so that we get the full breadth of the possibilities, and we can always whittle it down at a later point. He stated he feels we should get the most options to make this as good of an asset as we can for the Township.

Ms. Stark stated the Kick-Off with the consultants is the time to reinforce the three-pronged mission, and that helps inform them as to where our interests are. She stated she agrees that looking at a full breadth is very informative for us, but we also have to stick to the core mission. She stated you guide your consultants a little bit so that they have some direction and not pursue something that does not work for what our ultimate goal is.

Mr. Camaratta stated the appropriate time for him to bring up what he feels they should be looking at would be during the Kick-Off meeting, and Ms. Stark agreed that is where you lay the groundwork.

Mr. Steadman stated he feels that we should be very broad to get new ideas, although that does not mean that they have to be accepted or that they fit; however, given the priorities that have been defined for the properties, he feels that will limit it a bit.

Mr. Steadman stated with regard to the timing of the market assessment that is needed, before we can determine what some of the uses of the buildings will be, we need to know the condition of the buildings to understand what some of the potential uses could be; and there is an argument on both sides of that timing debate, and this is the time to have that discussion to decide how this is folded together.

Mr. Camaratta stated with regard to the timing, he believes that 4ward Planning had mentioned two public meetings. He stated there had been a discussion with Seiler-Drury about three public meetings, and he asked if the public meetings are now being combined or will there be five total public meetings. Ms. Stark stated she is leaving Mr. Seiler in charge of how we get these meetings pulled together and whether they participate in all of them or 4ward Planning does some on their own. She stated that is why it is good that Seiler-Drury is in charge of their consultant, 4ward Planning, because they are now a team.

Mr. Schmid stated he feels we need to be flexible and not lock ourselves into a specific amount of public hearings, and as we move along we will see if we need additional public hearings. Mr. Steadman agreed adding he feels it will be a dynamic process. He stated he feels the architectural engineering and the market assessment are simultaneous equations. He stated that integration under the Seiler-Drury umbrella will give us the highest probability of success.

Mr. Steadman stated Mr. Schmid has raised a good point in terms of contingencies. He stated we have the Budget for this project as defined; however, as we get into it, we may find that there are contingencies including additional meetings or some other unforeseen situation where we could enrich the results with another element. He stated in our recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, he feels it would make sense to put in some contingency buffer to that estimate. He asked Mr. Majewski if that is unusual, and he asked how the Township typically approaches contingencies. Mr. Majewski stated in this case, the proposal was pretty well defined, and anything that is extra is something that would probably have to be approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Final Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors

Ms. Stark shared the leveling sheet which is a breakdown of the final proposal from Mr. Seiler. She stated the Base Fee is \$75,400 and there is a selection of

Alternates. She stated we struck the National Register Nomination, as we will not be accepting that from Seiler-Drury. She stated the additional Fee for documentation of the other buildings besides the three primary ones that were identified in the Base scope is \$3,800. She stated there are also three Public Meetings and the Market Analysis with 4ward Planning, and a Management Fee for Seiler-Drury to manage 4ward Planning's effort. The total Fee is therefore \$113,900.

Ms. Stark stated she believes there was going to be discussion about the additional architectural documentation.

Mr. Steadman asked Ms. Ly to discuss how the Base Fee of \$75,400 compared to the competitive Bid on a like basis. Mr. Steadman noted it was not just the scope of the proposal that led the Committee to narrow to this contractor, but also the price differential which was significant. He added that we also thought the quality was better. Ms. Ly stated Connolly Hickey's Base Fee for what Seiler-Drury offered was \$134,700.

Mr. Steadman stated Ms. Stark had indicated that we had struck the \$10,000 cost associated with the Application for the National Registry listing; but added that we are moving ahead with that and the Township and the Historical Commission will do that themselves so we do not need to spend those monies with this consulting firm.

Mr. Schmid asked if the Board of Supervisors has been briefed somewhat that we are potentially coming in with these kinds of numbers. Ms. Blundi stated the Board has already allocated money to the process, and these numbers are within it. Mr. Schmid asked if we are considering putting a plus 10%/minus 10% when this goes to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Majewski stated the cost proposal was a not-to-exceed, although if we start adding scope of services, we should have the Board of Supervisors authorize the expanded scope. Ms. Blundi stated there are specific rules about how the Board can expend money; and given the totality of this, if this is the proposal we are going with, this is what will be approved, and if more is needed, a separate action will be taken by the Board which she is confident will be supported.

Mr. Steadman noted his earlier e-mail asking about the \$3,800 item for additional architectural documentation of the rest of the buildings.

Mr. Steadman asked Mr. Camaratta to discuss the opportunity we have with Bucks County Community College and how that might impact the fee. Mr. Camaratta stated as part of their Historic Preservation Program, Bucks County Community College has a course called Documentation. He stated the objective of that course is to teach students how to document historic buildings either for rehabilitation/restoration or even just documenting them should they be demolished so that there is a record. He stated part of the documentation is photographic and part of it is drawing. He stated there was a request made by the College to the Township if they could use Patterson Farm for their field study, and they would conduct three sessions on Saturday mornings, and they have been coordinating with Mr. Steadman and Mr. Majewski in terms of getting them access to do that. He stated he believes the Seiler-Drury Base Proposal called for elevation drawings and for the others there were just going to be sketches. He asked Ms. Stark to describe what the additional fee is for. Ms. Stark stated the three base buildings will have exterior elevations and floor plans prepared. She stated we asked for additional buildings to have the same thing, and Seiler-Drury indicated that they could do the rest of the buildings for \$3,800. She stated they will do the surveys the same days that they are doing the three primary structures.

Mr. Steadman asked if that work would be duplicative with what Bucks County Community College students would be doing. Mr. Camaratta stated he would be surprised if they could do all of those structures based on the size of that class or that they would have the tools necessary as a lot of the drawings the class will be doing would be hand drawings. He stated he will work with the College on producing the information that we need for the National Register submission.

Ms. Stark stated she has taught Historic Preservation students, and this is a wonderful opportunity for them, and she believes we could ask Mr. Seiler if his team would be willing to participate in the classes presentation of their work so that they have a real-life judging; and the students could hear from the people who surveyed the same structures as to how they approached it and hear feedback. Mr. Camaratta stated he will speak to the instructor about that.

Mr. Camaratta stated he feels that there is some overlap between the Market Analysis Study and Task 3. He stated it was not clear that Seiler-Drury may have been doing that, anticipating that we were not going to have a Market Analysis;

and now we are having it. He stated he is not sure it is possible to break that out in terms of actual cost. He stated since Seiler-Drury is managing the whole project, he assumes they will work on the deliverables being correct. Mr. Steadman stated his impression was that the Market Analysis would enrich Option 3.

Mr. Steadman stated according to the timeline a comprehensive Master Plan would be provided by September, 2023. He stated there seems to be a good working dialogue with Seiler-Drury and Ms. Stark's professional relationship with them. He stated it will still be the Committee's work to make the judgment calls with community input to finalize the Master Plan.

Mr. Steadman moved, Mr. Mohan seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve going forward to the Board of Supervisors' meeting scheduled for February 15 with a formal recommendation that we contract with Seiler-Drury and their various sub-contractors as specified in their proposal and as has been revised for a total of \$113,900. Mr. Steadman and Ms. Stark will make the presentation to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Steadman stated while Ms. Sovinee and Mr. Childs are not present this evening, they both advised him individually through e-mails that they support that recommendation. He stated he did not hear from Mr. Scott, although he believes he is in favor of it.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT: Mr. Schmid

Mr. Schmid stated the Sub-Committee on Community Outreach & Engagement had two meetings since the last Ad Hoc Property Committee meeting. He stated the members of the Sub-Committee are himself, Ms. Sovinee, Mr. Childs, and Mr. Majewski. He stated they had an organizational meeting by Zoom on February 1 and again on February 8 at AOY with Ms. Tierney as well.

Mr. Schmid stated the objective of the Sub-Committee is to inform and educate residents of Lower Makefield Township on the recommendations and processes adopted by the Ad Hoc Property Committee. He stated the processes are as important as the recommendations, and how we arrive at all of our recommendations in a very transparent way to the entire community is an important part of what we want to do as we go along. He stated our strategy is to develop an

on-going messaging platform targeted to key audiences in order to advance the short and long-term recommendations for these properties. He stated we want to continue to emphasize in all of our communications the three goals of the Committee which are preserving agriculture and historic structures, bring community utility, value, and support, and be fiscally responsible with taxpayer money. He stated we will send out news releases to local media, populate the Patterson Farm page on the Lower Makefield Website, and provide on-going communication from the Committee to the Patterson Farm Webpage. He stated we see the audiences to be the Lower Makefield Township residents, neighbors residing near the properties, the Board of Supervisors, existing and potential candidates who will be running for election this year, and the Lower Makefield Township business community since at some point they will have to weigh in and fund some of the activities.

Mr. Steadman stated one of the objectives was disseminating information from the Ad Hoc Property Committee; and while that is accurate, he asked if it could be refined to information regarding the Patterson Farm Master Plan. Mr. Schmid agreed to this.

Mr. Schmid stated the second meeting was held at AOY, and they focused on the processes that Park & Recreation used to create a Master Plan and successfully achieve Board of Supervisors' approval on 6/1/22. He stated there was a discussion about the Play For All Master Plan, the public opinion survey that was done by Ms. Tierney and Mr. Majewski, and the Needs Assessment Marketing Report. Mr. Schmid stated the Sub-Committee learned a lot during that discussion and at some point will make recommendations to the full Ad Hoc Property Committee to see if these various tools are applicable to our effort. He stated at this point they are still analyzing that.

Mr. Schmid stated that in the mean time they have come up with a tentative plan in conjunction with Mr. Majewski and Ms. Tierney and decided on a Patterson Farm Web page in the Community section of the Lower Makefield Township Website as our landing page for all communications from the Ad Hoc Committee relative to Patterson Farm. He thanked Ms. Tierney and Mr. Majewski for all the assistance they have given so far and wanting to continue to help us publish all of our documents and public information on the Website.

Ms. Tierney stated she is excited about the project. She stated it needs to be remembered that the information cannot come directly from the Ad Hoc

Property Committee, and the Board of Supervisors have to approve what is put out, and she and Mr. Majewski will review whatever they are provided. Ms. Tierney stated we have put on some historic information and some of the RFPs on the Website already adding that she and Mr. Majewski have been discussing some of the content that the Ad Hoc Committee wants to include.

Ms. Tierney stated one of the more valuable pieces of information that can be used from the Play For All Master Plan is the marketing report that we have on the Website which shows what was successful and what had the most hits from our mass e-mail, to our social media posts, signage that was put in the parks, press releases, and letters that we sent out to user groups. Ms. Tierney stated the Parks & Recreation Department does a lot of community outreach and has a good formula for success.

Mr. Steadman thanked Ms. Tierney for making her resources available adding that community input is important and central to this project. He stated we want not only input on the Plan but also community engagement to engage the Plan and support the initiatives that the Plan may call for whether that be spending tax dollars or asking the community for support via fundraising.

Mr. Majewski stated it is exciting to put up some information that the residents can go to find information on what is going on, alert them to public meetings when we get to that point, and point them to documents they will hopefully read.

Ms. Tierney stated one thing that would be good to share directly from the Committee would be meetings where there is a focus group with feedback or slides that were shared that the community could see. She stated it is important to be as transparent as possible along the way.

Mr. Schmid stated in the short term he will be working with Mr. Majewski and Ms. Tierney to populate the Patterson Farm Website.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Steadman stated there has been reference to the three priorities which were recommended to the Board of Supervisors in March, 2022; and it was based on those recommendations that the Supervisors earmarked the funds

necessary to go forward and develop the Master Plan which we are engaged in doing right now. He stated the March report indicated that the number one recommendation from the Committee is that Patterson Farm is to remain in agriculture as the top priority use and any other uses should be designed to accommodate this priority use. He stated another priority is that there have to be productive uses of the buildings by the community or otherwise in order to provide utility that will generate revenue to support them. He stated as we see on the Farm now the buildings that do not have a use are deteriorating rapidly, and the couple of buildings that are actively used are being maintained. He stated we are trying to balance preserving agriculture, preserving historical structures, creating community value and support, and being fiscally responsible with taxpayer money. He stated these are the guiding principles for this Master Plan.

Ms. Lora Tarantino, 185 Durham Road, Newtown, stated with regard to the LMT Website and Ms. Tierney's efforts to post information, she reiterated her earlier suggestion about signage on the actual Farm so that passersby could see it. She stated she feels that directing people to the Website would make the connection between the Master Plan and development at Patterson Farm. She stated she would also suggest any kind of radio public announcements to be done as many people are inundated with information on-line. Mr. Steadman stated Mr. Schmid and Ms. Tierney will take that into consideration. Mr. Schmid stated we are looking into using any and all media and will look into how we could allocate time to news releases, radio, and other forms of getting the word out.

ACTION ITEMS, ASSIGNMENTS & MEETING SCHEDULE

1. Mr. Steadman and Ms. Stark – Attend the February 15 Board of Supervisors meeting with a recommendation with a draft of the recommendation being circulated by Mr. Steadman over the weekend for the Committee to review. Ms. Blundi stated it could be as late as Monday to get the materials to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Majewski stated we already have the proposal from Seiler-Drury with the addition of 4ward Planning, and he will put together a memo summarizing the action tonight recommending moving forward with the proposal as submitted, striking out the \$10,000 for the National Registry portion. Mr. Steadman asked him to draft that and circulate it to the Committee, and he will incorporate that into a short presentation to the Board of Supervisors

February 9, 2023

Ad Hoc Property Committee

2. Mr. Steadman – Remove “Draft” from the Decision-Making Policies and Practices and send it to the Committee to secure their signatures and make it part of our Record
3. Mr. Steadman - While the March public meeting is not yet on the calendar, it is proposed to be March 9
4. Ms. Stark – Following the Supervisors meeting assuming there is approval, reach out to Mr. Seiler to start populating calendars with their activities that involve the Committee. Ms. Stark stated she assumes evening meetings are best, and she will get some preliminary dates and coordinate Zoom availability with Mr. Majewski

There being no further business, Mr. Steadman moved, Mr. Schmid seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dennis Steadman, Chair

