

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MINUTES – FEBRUARY 7, 2005

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on February 7, 2005. Mr. Stainthorpe called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. noting that the Board had been meeting in Executive Session since 6:30 p.m. to discuss legal, real estate, and personnel issues.

Those present:

Board of Supervisors: Pete Stainthorpe, Chairman
 Frank Fazzalore, Supervisor
 Steve Santarsiero, Supervisor

Others: Terry Fedorchak, Township Manager
 Jeffrey Garton, Township Solicitor
 James Majewski, Township Engineer
 Kenneth Coluzzi, Chief of Police

Absent: Scott Fegley, Vice Chairman
 Grace Godshalk, Secretary/Treasurer

I-95/SCUDDER FALLS BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. Michael Kane of the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission and Mr. Bijan Pashanamaei, DMJM+Harris, were present. Mr. Michael Kane stated the Commission has been working on this project for some time and has been present previously to provide updates. They are working in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration, PennDOT, and NJDOT to implement improvements to the Scudders Falls Bridge and the approach roadways on either side of the Bridge in Pennsylvania and New Jersey beginning from the Interchange at 332 North to the Interchange at Bear Tavern Road in New Jersey.

Mr. Bijan Pashanamaei, DMJM+Harris, was present and stated an Open House will be held in the spring to present the alternatives. He stated they are conducting an environmental assessment for the project. The Commission has budgeted \$142 million for the program. The current estimate is \$195 million because of more detailed information they now have available. This will include construction of the bridge and the portion of I-95 from 332 to Bear Tavern Road. He stated a Level of Service D is being determined appropriate for this facility. He showed pictures of the existing conditions. He reviewed the ways they communicate with the public including a Website and press releases. They also have informational signs on the roadways.

Mr. Pashanamaei stated they have completed the evaluation criteria, traffic projections, and conducted an evaluation of the existing bridge to determine the feasibility of repairing it versus replacement. The traffic analysis conducted resulted in the following: on the Bridge, they have determined they will require five lanes in the northbound direction and four in the southbound direction. For I-95 in Pennsylvania, three lanes will be required in both directions; and in New Jersey, they will require five lanes going north and three going south. The evaluation of the existing bridge was conducted to determine the feasibility of replacement versus rehabilitation. The conclusion was that it would be less expensive to replace the Bridge than to repair it. He stated they considered two parallel bridges, a two-level bridge, and a bridge which would permit shifting lane direction in morning and afternoon depending on the direction of peak traffic. They are also looking at the feasibility of installing a bicycle/pedestrian facility on the Bridge. Mr. Pashanamaei stated they are also looking at alternative improvements to the interchanges including Taylorsville Road and Route 29. He stated in New Jersey they are looking predominantly to work on the outside to add the lanes; and on the Pennsylvania side, they are looking either to add the lanes on the inside, on the grass median, or on the outside. He showed pictures of these alternatives. In the next few months, they hope to complete their alternatives, get input from the communities, evaluate the alternatives, hold formal Agency meetings, and hold an Open House in the spring.

Mr. Joseph Marthowler, 49 Upper Hilltop Road, asked if they will condemn any homes on Upper Hilltop, and Mr. Pashanamaei stated they do not yet know the final impact. By spring when they have their Open House, they will be able to see exactly what properties could be impacted. Mr. Marthowler asked if there will be a sound barrier wall by the weigh station. Mr. Pashanamaei stated they are doing a noise evaluation of existing and projected noise. Mr. Marthowler stated once they took the trees away from the weigh station, it made it much louder. Mr. Pashanamaei stated their base line noise level was done after those trees were removed. He stated they may not have the noise level information completed by the Open House in the spring.

Ms. Katherine Koglia asked if the noise study is being done now, and Mr. Pashanamaei stated they have completed this work and did it last year. They did monitor certain locations, and they will model the rest to get the base lines. Mr. Koglia asked about Level of Service, and Mr. Pashanamaei stated Level of Service is a grading of operational performance. Level of Service A is the best. Level of Service D has been determined as appropriate for an urban area. DVRPC has indicated this is an urban area. They are designing the project for a Level of Service D by the year 2030. When they open the road in 2010, it will be a better Level of Service. Currently it is Level of Service F.

Mr. John Boyle, representing the Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia, asked when the bicycle/pedestrian study will take place, and what criteria is used. Mr. Pashanamaei stated they are starting the study in the next few months. They will use the Statewide Bicycle Planning for both States. They will also consider cost.

Mr. Doug Sherwood, 1330 Heller Drive, asked about construction and how traffic will be impacted during construction. Mr. Pashanamaei stated under all alternatives, they will maintain the same number of lanes as they have currently. Some ramps will have temporary roadways, but they will maintain all movements.

Ms. Edna Dilliplane, 1870 Newtown Road, asked why the noise evaluations were not done during rush hours, and Mr. Pashanamaei stated they had twenty-four hour monitors. Ms. Dilliplane stated they did not do this at her property. She stated they only came to her property for about ten minutes. Mr. Pashanamaei stated those were a different type of monitor.

Mr. Bob Serilla asked if the plans are on the Website for the public to view, and Mr. Pashanamaei stated they are not at this time because they are still developing the plans. He stated this is a work in progress. He stated when they look at the alternatives and see property impact, they will look to see what they can do to minimize the impact. When they have the Open House, they will show the result of their work and see what the impact will be under the different alternatives. They are looking for the most balanced plan.

Mr. Ron Maisano, 44 Upper Hilltop Road, asked how long those impacted will have to get their affairs in order. Mr. Pashanamaei stated they will not complete final design and start construction until 2008. He stated they will advise of the impact under the different alternatives in the spring. They will make a final decision on the properties to be impacted by the summer of 2005. He stated right-of-way impact is only one of the ways they are considering to determine the final alternative. He stated they are looking for a balanced solution.

One gentleman asked how they determine fair market value if a property is condemned. Mr. Pashanamaei stated there are appraisers who do this type of work. He stated this is not his expertise. The gentleman stated he feels this is the main thing the homeowners are thinking about. Mr. Pashanamaei stated at this point it is premature to talk about right-of-way impact. The gentleman asked who makes the decision on value of property, and Mr. Pashanamaei stated the appraisers who are hired by the Commission make this determination. The gentleman asked if the Board of Supervisors will protect the homeowners in Lower Makefield. Mr. Stainthorpe stated the Township has no legal authority in this matter except to hold meetings open to the public. Mr. Garton stated under Pennsylvania Law, the Commission would have to file a Declaration of Taking in Doylestown and give an estimated just compensation they believe the property is worth. If it is a total take, it would be the value of the entire property based on market value. If it is less than a total take, it would be the value before the take and the value after. If the homeowner does not like what they are offering, the homeowner has the right to petition for a Board of View consisting of a lawyer, an engineer, and a real estate appraiser appointed by the Court. If the homeowner is still not satisfied with the Board of View's

decision, they can Appeal and have a jury decide in Doylestown. He added the Township has no jurisdiction and cannot affect the Bridge Commission's efforts other than to provide a forum for the community to express their opinions.

Ms. Virginia Torbert asked since the Bridge Commission is made up of members of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, would Federal law apply, and Mr. Garton stated it is where the take is being effectuated. It is not a Federal take, it is a State take. Ms. Torbert stated PennDOT is taking some of her land now, and PennDOT comes in and tells what they feel it is worth. She stated she can get her own appraisal and there is some leeway to try to convince them to go higher. She stated it would be up to the individual to go to the Board of View. She stated the appraisers base the price on the sales in the area in the previous five years of comparable properties.

Mr. Santarsiero stated the issue about whether or not these neighborhoods are going to be effected is really a function of whether they decide if the new lanes for I-95 are going to go on the inside or the outside. He stated while the Board of Supervisors has no authority over that decision, they could try to influence them on which way they will proceed if there is a reasonable alternative. He stated the Board of Supervisors could send a letter to the Commission and make their feelings known that they would prefer to have the least amount of impact in the Township and that would include having the lane in the center and not on the outside.

One woman stated she has concerns with the Interchanges. Mr. Pashanamaei stated the Interchange footprint, for the most part, will stay the same. They are not looking to go out significantly at the Interchanges. The woman asked how this can be if they are widening the Bridge. Mr. Pashanamaei stated there is sufficient room to stay within the existing right-of-way. He stated they will be able to show this much more clearly at the Open House.

One woman asked about the use of certain type of road surfaces to minimize noise. Mr. Pashanamaei stated they must follow State standards. He stated they will look for ways to reduce noise levels with the road surface. The woman asked who they have used in the past to evaluate properties, and Mr. Pashanamaei stated he does not personally know and suggested that they contact the Bridge Commission.

A gentleman asked about the comment made regarding building the lanes on the inside and the outside and asked when they would consider using an outside lane. Mr. Pashanamaei stated they do consider property impact, but they also consider stormwater management and other criteria. The gentleman asked what happens with the I-95 easements they have on their properties, and if these would be pushed back. Mr. Pashanamaei stated he cannot comment on specific areas at the present time and asked that they wait until the Open House in the spring. He stated in Pennsylvania if they

add to the inside, they will not impact anything on the outside. They could add one lane and one shoulder in each direction, and this would be sufficient.

Mr. Stainthorpe thanked the Bridge Commission for providing the public with this opportunity and being open in the process. He asked that they come back in June when they have the Open House.

A five minute recess was taken at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Kurt Shambaugh stated at the last meeting they discussed the Verizon situation where cable boxes were put on the front lawns and asked if this situation has been resolved. Mr. Stainthorpe stated the Township Manager has been meeting with Verizon weekly and they have been trying to address all the concerns. Mr. Fedorchak stated Verizon sub-contractors had located some of their boxes, without the consent of the property owners, on private property rather than within the Township rights-of-way which was what they were required to do and what the Township had permitted them for. The Township's permission to Verizon extends only to the Township's rights-of-way. He added it is Verizon's responsibility to first advise the property owner that it may be necessary for them to locate a box on their property, and secondly it is Verizon's responsibility to negotiate with the property owner the location and other circumstances. Mr. Fedorchak stated shortly after the residents appeared at the Supervisors' meeting, the Township instructed Verizon to go to each property owner and take care of the matter to the property owner's satisfaction. Verizon advised that they are in the process of doing that. At this point, the Township is waiting to hear from the property owners as to whether they are happy with the outcome. If they are not happy with the outcome, the Township will continue to pressure Verizon until there is an amicable solution. He asked that the property owners contact his office if they are dissatisfied with the progress. Mr. Shambaugh stated a number of the property owners had their Comcast cable cut and asked if they are entitled to compensation. Mr. Fedorchak stated that they are for the value of that loss and it would go back on Verizon to compensate the homeowners. He asked that the property owners include the Township in this process. Mr. Shambaugh stated he has been contacted by Verizon who seems intent on resolving the matter, although they are still in the process of working out some solution.

Ms. Beth Peal, 1362 Apple Blossom Drive, stated she has not yet been contacted. Mr. Fedorchak noted Mr. Todd Day, who is in the audience, is the engineer from PCS who is the Township's project manager for this and he will contact them tomorrow on this.

Mr. Henzik, Hidden Oaks, asked why the boxes cannot be underground. Mr. Garton stated the PUC regulates telephone service and has permitted them to install boxes in a place other than underground.

Mr. Stephen Heinz noted the house in Edgewood Village which has been partially demolished and no remedial action has taken place. He stated information has been sent from HARB and the Historic Commission on this matter. He stated he feels this is demolition by neglect and if allowed to proceed, other property owners in the area might decide to do this as well. He stated the property owner should be required to provide some kind of covering over the existing structure to protect what is left of the existing façade. He is concerned with the impact on the status of the Village on the National register. Mr. Garton stated the owner filed a request to demolish the building, and HARB made a recommendation to deny. This was to come before the Board of Supervisors this evening, but was continued as Mrs. Godshalk, who is knowledgeable in this area, was unable to attend this evening's meeting. It was noted that Mr. Messick was also not able to attend tonight's meeting. The matter has been scheduled for the March meeting. Mr. Fedorchak stated this process was started because the Township started enforcement action against the property owner. This led them to the HARB with the demolition idea and now they will go before the Board of Supervisors for a resolution. Mr. Heinz stated the longer they wait, the more weather damage can impact the condition of the building. He stated they requested in September or October that some action be taken on this matter. He stated the longer they wait, the more credence the property owner will give to state that they cannot save it. He stated by delaying it, this will give him more room to make this appeal. He asked that some consideration be given to using the right of eminent domain to take a building that someone is not taking care of and either restore it or sell it to someone who will restore it. He asked that the Board of Supervisors commission an appraisal of the property and then proceed to condemnation if necessary. Mr. Stainthorpe stated this has been scheduled for the first meeting in March, and it would be appropriate to address these ideas at that time. He stated the property owner does have rights, and they need to have him included in a public discussion. Mr. Fazzalore stated they are assuming that they are not going to have another public meeting in February, and he does not feel that they will get the third vote tonight to cancel the second meeting in February.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of December 20, 2004 as corrected.

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of January 3, 2005 as corrected.

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of January 25, 2005 as corrected.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 5 AND 17 WARRANT LISTS AND DECEMBER, 2004 PAYROLL

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the January 5 and January 17 Warrant Lists and December, 2004 Payroll as attached to the Minutes

AWARD CONTRACT TO PROVIDE MASTER PLAN FOR THE BARN AT ELM LOWNE

Ms. Karen Friedman and Ms. Jo Norum stated one year ago they submitted for a Grant and have received Grant approval to start a phase of a feasibility study for the barn at Elm Lowne. They advertised and asked architectural firms to submit requests for proposals for the project and received seven proposals. After careful review, they have recommended the contract be awarded to Susan Maxman & Partners, Architects. They feel this firm most closely adhered to the needs and constraints that are part of this project. Ms. Maxman is very qualified in all areas relating to the scope of the project and has qualified in-house employees. Her cost factors were very moderate and worked well with the monies allotted to them in the Grant. They received \$25,000 in the Grant. She is also going to work with the Bucks County Community College to have them do the documentation of the building which should save over \$2,000 which can then be used for other areas of the project. Ms. Friedman reviewed the work to be done under the Contract.

Mr. Fazzalore stated initially they indicated that the Township would not be involved in renovating the barn and funds would be raised in some other way. Ms. Friedman stated this is correct, and they are doing the entire project without Township funds. She stated this is why the feasibility study is critical.

Mr. Fazzalore moved and Mr. Santarsiero seconded to move toward a Contract with Susan Maxman & Partners, Architects to provide a Master Plan for the Barn at Elm Lowne at a cost of \$22,500 through the Delaware and Lehigh Navigational Grant and authorize its execution by the appropriate Officers of the Board.

Mr. Santarsiero stated there was discussion about the possibility of using the property as some kind of performing arts facility and it was mentioned that there were a number of area theater groups which had expressed interest. He asked for more information on this.

Ms. Friedman stated Actor's Net was one as was a Philadelphia group. She stated they would like to start with small theater which would start generating funds after which they could move into another phase of construction and build upon this until they reach their final goal. She stated a number of people have indicated they would like to be involved including caterers, performing arts, educational groups, and Bucks County Community College which is interested in using the landscaped grounds for conducting different kinds of educational services. She stated they hope this will be a multi-generational facility and provide a full range of recreational, educational, and performing activities.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated one of the reasons they indicated that it would be good for performing arts is that it could generate income, but this does not mean that it could only be used for performing arts. He stated he is in favor of taking things slowly and then building on this.

Ms. Norum stated they have been advised that you do not generate the most money from the performing arts, but rather from the educational aspects.

Mr. Santarsiero stated he does agree that they should try to use the building in some way and does not want to preclude any uses. Ms. Friedman stated they are open to this and the feasibility study will help them realize where they can go.

Mr. Fazzalore stated he feels when they do the feasibility study they should consider additional parking, and Ms. Friedman stated this will be included. Mr. Fazzalore stated they are also considering bringing in sewers to this property. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he understands to get to the next level of Grant funding, the property must have public sewer and water.

Motion carried unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE NO. 347 AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 335 BY
ADDING ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE INSTALLATION OF FIRE
HYDRANTS**

Mr. Garton stated this follows the request of Mr. Yates regarding fire hydrants. Mr. Garton stated he advertised the Ordinance as required, and the staff would recommend approval following a public hearing.

Mr. Santarsiero moved and Mr. Fazzalore seconded to Approve Ordinance No. 347. There was no public comment, and the Motion carried unanimously.

AUTHORIZE ADVERTISING OF DEP STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE

Mr. Garton noted the study undertaken regarding stormwater issues. He stated the Board has been provided a copy of the two draft Ordinances. The staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors authorize advertisement noting that a few items will be worked out prior to the Hearing.

Mr. Fazzalore stated the Planning Commission did express some concern about this as it relates to old properties. Mr. Garton stated they are not required to make any new improvements, and this is designed to require improvements going forward.

Mr. Santarsiero moved, Mr. Fazzalore seconded and it was unanimously carried to authorize advertising of DEP Stormwater Management Ordinance.

APPROVE INSTALLATION OF AN AUDIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL

Mr. Majewski stated this signal was requested by a blind resident of the development across the street from the Oxford Oaks Shopping Center. They did obtain three written quotes, and the low bid was from Precision Electric Signal. Mr. Majewski reviewed how the system works and the inclusion of indicator signs to notify cars that it is a blind-person's crossing. Mr. Fedorchak stated the Disabled Persons Advisory Board initiated this on behalf of the resident who did contact them and they discussed it at their meeting.

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to hire Precision Electric Signal to install an audible pedestrian signal on Big Oak Road at the Oxford Oaks Shopping Center at a cost of \$6,812.

DISCUSSION AND MOTION REGARDING PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL AT WASHINGTON CROSSING AND LINDENHURST ROAD

Mr. Majewski stated his office, on behalf of Lower Makefield Township, has prepared a plan to install a pedestrian crossing within the Upper Makefield portion of Lindenhurst Road at the intersection of Route 532. He reviewed what would be included in the project. Since the signal is in Upper Makefield, his office forwarded the Plan to them and at their January meeting, they questioned the benefit of this to their own residents. They voted to approve it subject to Lower Makefield assuming all costs associated with the signal especially long-term maintenance. He stated the signal is being paid for by Toll Brothers through an Agreement with the Dolington Estates Development. Upper Makefield's concern was with ongoing costs.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated he does feel the Township has an obligation for the safety of the residents and feels they should move forward. Mr. Santarsiero asked the long-range costs. Mr. Majewski stated he feels they are fairly minimal, although fifty years from now they may have to redo the ramps leading into the roadway.

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to authorize Mr. Garton to prepare the Agreements to maintain the pedestrian signal at Washington Crossing and Lindenhurst Roads.

Ms. Herman thanked the Board of Supervisors for proceeding on this.

APPROVAL OF EXTENSIONS FOR WICK, GOLDBERG & SICHEL, PRIME PROPERTIES SUBDIVISION, AND MINEHART

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant an Extension of time to Wick, Goldberg & Sichel, Preliminary/Final Minor Subdivision Plan, Washington Crossing Road, to April 21, 2005.

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant an Extension of time to Prime Properties Subdivision, Big Oak Road, to May 3, 2005.

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant an Extension of time to Minehart Preliminary Plan to May 18, 2005.

ZONING HEARING BOARD MATTERS

It was agreed to leave to the Zoning Hearing Board the Benjamin and Michelle Wiegand, 55 Rickert Drive, Variance request to construct additions, patio, and walkways resulting in greater than permitted impervious surface.

APPROVE RESOLUTION WITH REGARD TO EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Chief Coluzzi stated the Emergency Management Plan needs to be updated. He has prepared the Resolution for the Board's signature pending approval.

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Resolution prepared by the Chief with regard to the Emergency Management Plan.

SUPERVISORS' REPORTS

Mr. Santarsiero stated the Zoning Hearing Board has closed testimony on the Sunrise Application and has asked the two sides to submit briefs. A decision will be made in March. He stated the EAC did discuss whether or not there would be some kind of Earth Day Celebration, and it was decided that it made more sense to have an environmental recognition at a public event such as Canal Days where they have a better chance of a good turn-out to make issues of the environment clear to the public rather than at a specific Earth Day event. He advised that the Southeastern Bucks League of Municipalities met last week and had some discussion on what Townships can do to further protect historic properties and also the Verizon matter.

DISCUSSION OF PENNSBURY ARTS FOUNDATION REQUEST TO RAFFLE OFF A FOURSOME OF GOLF AT MAKEFIELD HIGHLANDS

Mr. Fazzalore stated he presumes they wanted the foursome for free, and Mr. Santarsiero stated this is his understanding. He stated this request came to him and he asked that it be put on the Agenda. Mr. Stainthorpe stated that they support the work of the Arts Foundation, but they have made a policy that there is no free golf. He would be in favor of giving them the resident's rate. He noted they have received considerable other requests and it would be best to keep the policy that there is no free golf. Mr. Santarsiero asked if the other requests were from non-profits as well, and it was noted that they were. Mr. Santarsiero asked if Kemper has made a **recommendation** to the Township as to how the Township should deal with these requests. Mr. Fazzalore stated the Township indicated even before the Course opened that at least for the first few years there should be no free golf. Mr. Fedorchak stated rates are based on the tee-time. Mr. Fazzalore noted he was the Treasurer of the McCaffrey health insurance fundraiser, and they did pay the golf course for the foursome they offered at the silent auction. Mr. Santarsiero stated the issue is whether they should consider giving non-profits that exist in the Township some break, and Mr. Fazzalore stated he feels the break would be that they would get the Township rate even if there are not Township residents playing. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he feels this is a bad precedent to agree to free golf, and Mr. Fazzalore agreed at least until they have the Golf Course stabilized.

DISCUSSION OF GOLF RESIDENT IDENTIFICATION CARDS

Mr. Fedorchak stated the Golf Committee is recommending to the Board of Supervisors that they have picture identification cards for Township residents. This will allow those at the Golf Course who are handling tee times to quickly and accurately determine whether or not the golfer is a resident so that they can get the discount rate.

Mr. Fedorchak stated he would suggest that to maximize control, the cards be issued at the Township Building. He stated they would need to purchase a camera, a printer, and a computer to support the system. One of the Township employees would, after a form is filled out by the resident which would later be keyed into a data base, take a picture at the Township and the card would be issued. They feel this would cost approximately \$4500 for the equipment plus shipping costs. They would propose that at least for this year, that they begin to issue the cards effective July. If the Board approves this tonight, it should take approximately five to six weeks to get the equipment and have the staff trained. He stated this is also the time of year when they start to collect Pool Memberships so his staff was concerned with fitting in the golfers with those coming in for Pool memberships which is why they decided to have the July 1 date at least for this year. Next year, they could do something in February if this is what they want to do. Mr. Fedorchak stated he does have a part-time employee and he could increase her hours during certain times so it will not require additional staff although it will require additional hours for an already-hired employee.

Mr. Fazzalore stated this should be part of the Golf Course costs. Mr. Fedorchak stated if they wanted to charge a fee for the card, he could handle it through the General Fund and have the fee cover the cost.

Mr. Santarsiero stated the issue is determining, based on someone's having a license, whether or not they are a resident of Lower Makefield Township. Mr. Stainthorpe stated the Kemper people do not feel that they need to do this, but the Golf Course Committee feels that right now they are matching a driver's license against a print out from the tax office. The Golf Committee feels the enforcement of this is lax. In order to take the uncertainty out of this, they felt that they should issue cards to Lower Makefield residents so that they are not losing revenue. Mr. Santarsiero asked if the problem is getting the Kemper employees to follow the procedure already in place.

Mr. Fedorchak stated they asked Kemper how many Lower Makefield residents were golfing, and they indicated it was 1500 to 2000 so that would mean that number of people would have to come to the Township Building to get processed. He noted this would be an extra step for those golfers and an inconvenience besides the potential fee.

Mr. Matt Maloney stated he is a frequent golfer and stated they do not pay attention to this at the Course. He feels this is Kemper's responsibility and they should not be adding this burden to the Township office staff. He stated the Golf office is not that busy, and they should be checking the licenses and the data base.

Ms. Ellen Bosley stated she feels the idea of coming to the Township and getting an ID card is a great idea. She suggested that they get a software program and a bar code so that they could require Kemper to swipe it.

Mr. Joe Sundee stated if you play a few times in the summer and are a resident, then the penalty may not be high, but he feels they are making it more difficult for residents by requiring them to get a card. He feels it is up to Kemper to check, and they should not add to the bureaucracy.

Ms. Torbert stated the first time they check someone, there should be some kind of sticker that they could put on something so that the next time you go, they would not have to keep checking that same person. Mr. Sundee stated a number of courses have a policy such as this where you register the first time and get a card and then subsequently you just show this card.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated at Mercer County they do require you to get an ID card and there is a nominal fee. Mr. Sundee stated this is because they have multiple courses. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he still likes the idea of having a card as it takes the guess work out of it. He stated many times there is a high school student working at the Golf Course desk.

Ms. Cynthia Harrison asked what the difference would be between having a card and having a driver's license. Mr. Stainthorpe stated because of the post office situation in the area there are people in Yardley Borough and Morrisville who also have the 19067 zip code as well as Lower Makefield residents who have a Newtown address. Ms. Harrison asked if they have ever tried to apply for a separate post office for Lower Makefield.

Mr. Fazzalore stated he is concerned that a resident will go to the Golf Course to golf and then be told he has to go to the Township Building to get a card before they can get the discount rate and may not return. He would not want to discourage golfers from using the Course.

Mr. Sundee asked if they could not get something right at the Golf Course on a CD on a computer. Ms. Harrison stated this would also offer a system of checks and balances as to how many golfers were there on each day and where they were from. Mr. Stainthorpe stated they do this currently and can tell residents from non-residents assuming they are checking.

Ms. Torbert asked what Kemper does at their other Courses, and Mr. Stainthorpe stated at some Courses they have cards and at some they do not.

Mr. Sam Spera stated if they have an ID card it may be better to have it issued at the Golf Course rather than requiring people to come to the Township. He also asked what would happen if someone lost their card. Mr. Fazzalore stated he is concerned with the potential loss of golfers with this policy.

Mr. Santarsiero stated he would recommend that they go back to Kemper and tell them that this is their responsibility and they must check for residency. He stated he feels the tax information is on a disc and it could easily be put into a computer and it would be easy for someone to type in a name and find out if they are a Lower Makefield resident. Mr. Fazzalore agreed.

DISCUSSION OF CANCELING FEBRUARY 21 MEETING IN HONOR OF PRESIDENTS' DAY

Mr. Stainthorpe stated there was a discussion last year about changing the regular meeting date of the Board of Supervisors because of the number of holidays which fall on a Monday. He stated in the past they had not canceled meetings for holidays, but they did cancel for Martin Luther King Day and he remembered very clearly that last year someone asked why they do not honor the Presidents when they honor Martin Luther King. He stated they looked at a list of possible holidays and decided they would vote on them as to whether or not they would hold the meeting.

Mr. Fazzalore stated Presidents' Day is basically now a shopping day in this Country and does not really honor the Presidents. He stated if the meeting date were Washington's Birthday, he would feel differently. Mr. Fazzalore stated he is not in favor of canceling the meeting. Mr. Santarsiero stated if they do not have the votes tonight to cancel the meeting, he would suggest as a compromise that they find another day to hold the meeting. He stated he would have preferred to do this with Martin Luther King Day as well. He suggested Wednesday or another day that week so that they do not lose another day. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he feels that they schedule the meetings for Mondays and they should have them or not. He stated there are other Boards that meet on other nights of the week; and when they try to move the date, it is very difficult to get a night when everyone is available. If they do not have the votes tonight to cancel, he would assume that the meeting stands for February 21. Mr. Santarsiero stated they could also consider the proposal he made last year which was to move the meetings to Wednesday nights. Mr. Stainthorpe stated this did not work. Mr. Santarsiero stated they may have the votes to do that this evening.

Ms. Harrison stated Presidents' Day was made one day to honor Lincoln and Washington. She stated she does not feel Martin Luther King was more important than George Washington or Abraham Lincoln; and if they are taking one off, they should also take the other to honor them all. She suggested that they cancel the meeting on the 21st.

Mr. Santarsiero stated he does feel that they should have the day off. He stated so many of the holidays are celebrated on a Monday and this is why he feels the Board of Supervisors' regular meeting should be moved to Wednesday if not this year, then next year provided they give plenty of notice. He stated for various reasons, they decided not

to do this, but he still feels they should do this as it would avoid all of these problems. He stated there are many holidays which fall on a Monday.

Mr. Sam Spera stated the only holiday that still stays on the National Day is July 4 and every other Holiday has been changed for the convenience of the consumers. He stated he feels they should have the meeting. Mr. Santarsiero stated that while this is true, you set aside a day for remembering someone and someone's contribution, and it does not really matter whether it is the actual date or not. He stated it makes sense as a Country to recognize these individuals who have been important to our history and society.

Mr. Santarsiero moved that they cancel the meeting on President's Day. There was no second to the Motion and the Motion died.

APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to appoint Karen Iungerman to the Historic Commission.

Mr. Stainthorpe moved, Mr. Fazzalore seconded and it was unanimously carried to re-appoint Mark Adami to the Golf Committee.

Mr. Stainthorpe moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to appoint Tim Katsiff to the Environmental Advisory Council.

There being no further business, Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Stainthorpe seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Pete Stainthorpe, Chairman



Township of Lower Makefield

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Pete Stainthorpe, Chairman
Scott I. Fegley, Vice-Chairman
Grace M. Godshalk, Secretary/Treasurer
Frank J. Fazzalore, Supervisor
Steven J. Santarsiero, Supervisor

**JANUARY 2005 WARRANT LISTS AND
DECEMBER 2004 PAYROLL COSTS FOR APPROVAL
FEBRUARY 7, 2005 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING**

01/06/05 Warrant List	\$ 273,713.13	
01/05 Manual Checks	1,658,618.88	
01/17/05 Warrant List	669,868.67	
Total Warrants & Prepays		2,602,200.68
<u>PAYROLL COSTS:</u>		
December 2004 Payroll	519,966.18	
12/04 Payroll Taxes, etc.	38,810.01	
Total Payroll Costs		<u>558,776.19</u>
TOTAL TO BE APPROVED		\$ <u><u>3,160,976.87</u></u>

