TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MINUTES – OCTOBER 15, 2025

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on October 15, 2025. Mr. Grenier called the meeting to order and called the Roll.

Those present:

Board of Supervisors:	Daniel Grenier, Chair John B. Lewis, Vice Chair James McCartney, Secretary Matt Ross, Treasurer Suzanne Blundi, Supervisor
Others:	David W. Kratzer, Jr., Township Manager Maureen Burke-Carlton, Township Solicitor

COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Grenier stated during this portion of the Agenda, residents and youth organizations may call in to make a special announcement or may contact the Township at admin@lmt.org to request a special announcement be added to the Agenda. There was no one wishing to make a special announcement at this time.

Mr. Grenier stated the 2025-2026 Deer Hunting season has started. All areas being hunted are properly posted. If you have any questions or concerns, you can reach out to the Township at admin@lmt.org.

Mr. Grenier stated the Environmental Advisory Council is hosting their Styrofoam Collection event on Saturday, November 1, 2025 from 10:00 a.m. to Noon at the Township Building. Along with your clean white Styrofoam you can also bring natural corks, cleaned pill bottles with tops, and batteries. If you have any questions, you can check out the calendar on our Website at lmt.org or reach out to the Township at admin@lmt.org.

Mr. Grenier stated Lower Makefield Township will be hosting an American Red Cross Blood Drive on Friday, November 7, 2025 from 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the Lower Makefield Township Building.

Mr. Grenier stated lower Makefield Township along with Yardley Borough will be hosting an e-Waste Recycling Event offering Township and Borough residents the opportunity to responsibly recycle obsolete electronics. This event will take place at the Pool at LMT parking lot, 1050 Edgewood Road, Yardley on Saturday, November 8, 2025 from 9:00 a.m. to Noon. For more information please visit our Website calendar.

Mr. Grenier stated the Environmental Advisory Council along with PennEnvironment's Zero Waste Program will present on single-use plastic bags on Saturday, November 8 from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. at the Lower Makefield Township Building.

Mr. Grenier stated Lower Makefield Township in partnership with the Veterans Square Foundation is hosting the 19th Annual Veterans Parade and Commemorative Ceremony on Saturday, November 8 at 1:00 p.m. (rain or shine). The parade will begin near the intersection of Edgewood Road and Long Acre Lane and proceed to Veterans Square Monument at the corner of Edgewood Road and Heacock Road.

Mr. Grenier stated that while there are currently issues with YouTube, there is access for viewing this meeting via the cable channels; and once the meeting is completed, it will be posted on YouTube for viewing later.

Mr. Kratzer stated leaf collection will begin on Monday, November 3 and information is posted on the Township Website regarding the respective cycles and dates associated with that. Mr. Grenier stated leaves should not be piled put onto the road since large piles of leaves create a safety hazard by narrowing the roads, and leaves in the road get washed into the stormwater infrastructure and do significant damage including flooding. He stated he believes the Code Enforcement Officer will be making rounds to make sure that is not happening. He stated hopefully the leaf collection will be able to be done in a timely manner so that is less of an issue.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no one wishing to make public comment at this time.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Lewis moved, Mr. McCartney seconded and it was unanimously carried to remove Item 6.g from the Consent Agenda and discuss it under the Manger's Report.

Mr. Lewis moved, Mr. Ross seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the following Consent Agenda items:

Approved the Minutes for the October 1, 2025 Meeting
Approved the Warrant List dated October 15, 2025 in the amount of $479,725.04 (as attached to the Minutes)
Approved the September, 2025 Interfund Transfers (as attached to the Minutes)
Approved to accept the resignation of Victor Fiori from the Lower Makefield Township Historical Commission
Approved to authorize Financial Security Release #12 (partial release) in the amount of $141,003.50 for Prickett Preserve
Approved to authorize Financial Security Release #1 (partial release) in the amount of $258,643.40 for the 1101 Big Oak Road Subdivision

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Acceptance of the Bid from Parkyn Landscape and Hardscape, LLC. in the Amount of $62,991.12 for the Fall, 2025 Tree Planting Project

Mr. Majewski showed a slide presentation of where Township-wide tree planting will take place this year with 169 trees being planted as part of the Long-Range Tree Planting Plan that was adopted by the Board of Supervisors last year funded by contributions from developers for trees that were removed during construction projects.

Mr. Majewski reviewed the number and type of trees to be planted at Memorial Park. Mr. Grenier stated under the Manager's Report there will be discussion about Memorial Park, and we need to make sure that there is no conflict between proposed upgrades at Memorial Park versus where the trees are going. Ms. Blundi expressed concern with the proposed planting location of trees near the basketball courts, and Mr. Majewski stated there is sufficient room for the trees to be planted and grow to full maturity. Mr. Majewski stated residents living adjacent to the east side of Memorial Park where the tennis and pickleball courts are located have requested additional buffering, and additional trees will be planted in that area. Mr. Grenier stated there is a large open field that is frequently mowed, and in time there may be consideration to doing something in that area. Mr. Majewski stated as part of the Long-Range Tree Planting Plan, the consultant was asked to look at that area; and they recommended a meadow area, planting trees or a combination of both. He stated on the Long-Range Plan it is shown as a meadow that may have walking trails, but that is still to be determined.

Mr. McCartney asked if the trees should be extended further to help dampen more of the sound from the tennis/pickleball courts. Mr. Majewski stated it will be shifted to the south from where it is shown on the plan.

Mr. Majewski stated there will also be trees planted at the Fred Allan Softball Complex on Oxford Valley Road, Veteran's Square, Woodside Road/Upper Hilltop where there is Township open space, Prospect Drive open space, and the Dog Park. Mr. Majewski stated some trees have died at a number of the detention basins; and as part of this planting, trees will be planted at the basin on Emerald Drive and the Hyde Park Place/Big Oak Road basin along with additional trees on Big Oak Road and the Guzikowski Farm. Mr. Majewski stated trees will also be added at the Heritage Oaks detention basin.

Ms. Blundi expressed concern with planting sweet gum trees; however, Mr. Grenier stated they will be fine at the locations proposed. Mr. Majewski stated sweet gum trees were taken down at the Pool since they were not suitable for that location, and different trees will be planted there.

Mr. Majewski noted the trees proposed to be planted at the Patterson Farm/ Janney Brown House where trees were taken down last year. Trees which were taken down along Edgewood Road next to the Library and Township Building will also be replaced. Trees to be planted at the open space at Regency were added as an Alternate Bid to replace trees that were planted a few years ago which have since died. He added they will work with some of the residents on the exact locations where these will be planted.
Mr. Majewski stated the 2025 Arbor Day tree which was planted at the Caiola Baseball Complex has died, and a replacement tree will be planted at that location.

Mr. Grenier asked about the warranty on the trees. Mr. Majewski stated he believes that it is one year or eighteen months. Mr. Grenier asked about watering in the first year; and Mr. Majewski stated while the Township does this, it is probably not done enough. Mr. Grenier stated Public Works and Park & Rec should find a way to keep an eye on the trees and get water to them. Ms. Blundi stated the gator bags not only help collect water but also protect the trees from weedwhackers.

Ms. Blundi asked if we are moving forward in a timely fashion with whatever replacement trees we are owed. Mr. Majewski stated that is a different contractor, and they will probably not be planted until the spring. Mr. Grenier asked if those are covered under the last contractor's warranty, and Mr. Majewski stated they are. Mr. Kratzer stated a report was done by the EAC after they went out and did a post-planting evaluation, and Mr. Majewski has that report. He added the EAC is looking into trying to establish more Committee-involvement to help with some of the post-planting obligations and observations. He stated there has been discussion about a tree-tender group to assist the internal staff given the volume of trees that we are planting.

Mr. Lewis moved, Ms. Blundi seconded and it was unanimously carried to accept the bid from Parkyn Landscape and Hardscape LLC in the amount of $62,991.12 for the Fall, 2025 Tree Planting Project.

ENGINEER'S REPORT

Project Update Re: Stormwater Utility Fee Implementation

Mr. Kratzer stated this has been discussed previously, and the Board entered into a Professional Services Agreement with HRG. Mr. Tyler Erb, Project Manager from HRG, which has implemented these fees throughout various Municipalities in the Commonwealth, was present.

Mr. Erb stated Lower Makefield Township is an MS4 community, and there is a requirement to implement a Pollutant Reduction Plan (PRP), which is a series of stormwater projects to reduce sediment entering local waterways. He stated the Township was given five years to complete that PRP, and we received notice earlier this year about the future round of MS4 which will be shifting to a volume management. Mr. Erb stated they are taking into account both the current regulations and future regulations when considering this project.

Mr. Erb stated there is a section within the MS4 permit that states adequate legal authorities and funding shall be made in order to implement the Permit. He stated the challenges Municipalities, including Lower Makefield, are facing are polluted streams, increased regulation requirements and the PRP and projects associated with that, aging infrastructure, development over the course of many years which creates more stormwater run-off and more infrastructure that is required to be maintained, and funding to meet all of those requirements. Mr. Erb stated the benefit of a Stormwater Utility Fee is that it gives dedicated stormwater revenue, and the revenue generated can only be used for stormwater-related projects. It also frees up General Fund revenue, He stated it is also a more equitable way to distribute the cost of the program, and it positions the Township better for grants and loans. He stated it also allows the Township to have a framework of projects ready to go for Grants so that when Grants are announced, it is easy to apply.

Mr. Erb stated the first step is to develop an impervious area data base. He stated the Township worked with Nearmap to develop that using AI, and HRG is going through that and improving it. He stated they need to develop the rate structure for the program and the credit program, which are options for residents and business owners to reduce the amount billed to their property through storm-water control devices. Mr. Erb stated there will be public outreach, and then billing implementation. Mr. Erb showed an example of the impervious area data they received from Nearmap, adding it is aerial imagery with all of the impervious surfaces mapped out so that they can get a square footage for each parcel. He stated HRG's portion of that should be finalized by the end of the month.

Mr. Erb stated they have also been working on developing a budget with the Township staff. He stated the draft budget is an average revenue requirement of $2.1 million per year taking into account the activities that the stormwater program will be taking on as far as maintaining the system, the PRP projects, and future volume-management projects.

Mr. Erb stated there are two different options for the rate structure – the ERU option or Equivalent Residential Unit or a tiered structure. He stated for both of these options, they are assuming properties below 300 square feet are not going to be assessed a fee as they do not have enough impervious on them to warrant sending a bill. Mr. Erb stated with the ERU approach all single-family Residential properties would pay the same rate, and they determine that based on the Land Use Codes. He stated apartments, etc. would not fall into that category. He stated any other property that is not considered a Residential bill that is not considered a Residential property would pay multiples of the ERU.

Mr. Erb stated the tiered approach breaks into impervious area groups where each property is assessed a fee based on the amount of impervious on that property and where it falls within that grouping range. He stated there could be ranges for impervious area where 300 square feet to 2,000 square feet would pay a rate, 2,000 to 4,000 would pay a rate, 4,000 to 6,000 would pay a rate, and above that would be a separate rate.

Mr. Grenier stated he feels how this will be assessed and if it is justifiable will be the biggest questions by the residents as well as how they get credit if they are doing something at their property that is beneficial. Mr. Grenier stated he would be in favor of the tiered approach since it seems to be the most equitable as you would pay based on what impact you have. He asked what has been the experience in other Municipalities. Mr. Kratzer asked Mr. Erb to speak on the single-family designation and the percentage of parcels that fall within that realm versus the non-single family designation. Mr. Grenier stated there are also a lot of multi-family and Commercial properties in the Township that are not single-family, and he asked how those types of properties are addressed in each approach. Mr. Kratzer stated he understand that condos would fall under single-family based on Land Use Codes.

Mr. Erb showed a slide with black lines representing parcel boundaries; and he stated typically condos are mapped where each condo is its own parcel, and they can assign a fee to it that way, and that would be considered a single-family Residential property. He stated other communities have used both rate structure options depending on the community, and his recommendation is dependent on the community. He stated a significant portion of the Township is single-family Residential, higher than he has seen in any other community he has worked in. Mr. Kratzer stated 92% of our parcels are single-family Residential, and Mr. Erb stated they re-ran this and it came out to 95%. He stated given that, the aspect of sending different bills out and appeals, etc. does get significantly more-simplified with the ERU approach versus the tiered approach. He stated with the tiered approach, there is the potential for a property to add impervious or remove impervious that would adjust them so there would be a constant ebb and flow of maintaining the billing data and making sure properties are in the correct tier that they should be assigned to.

Mr. Lewis stated there are multi-floor condos in the Township, and he asked if each unit would be billed an ERU in that environment; and Mr. Erb agreed. Mr. Lewis stated that is a trade-off in fairness between someone who might have a three-acre property with a huge amount of impervious. Mr. Erb stated when you do the ERU approach it does simplify the program and makes it more manageable from an administrative perspective; but there is the situation where you are lumping all single-family Residential properties together, and there can be a variance between them.

Ms. Blundi asked about a hybrid approach where it is an ERU for a certain amount and tiered for others, and Mr. Erb stated he has not seen that. He added that he has seen an approach where they classified the tiers based on multiples of ERUs. Ms. Blundi stated she was looking to see if condos or smaller homes could have a tier. Mr. Grenier stated they are looking for something equitable because there are a lot of different home types in the Township.

Mr. Grenier asked Mr. Erb if he has run an analysis for either approach to see what the cost would be per household. Mr. Erb stated while they have run the numbers, they are still working on cleaning up the AI data set. He stated with the ERU approach with the current Budget, they are seeing about $12.50 per month. He stated with the tiered approach, it depends on how many tiers you would implement; but if you would do a two-tiered approach and have a cut-off of about 5,000, it does drop it to about $9 or $10. He stated the more tiers you add, the more variance you would have between the lowest and the mid-point.

Mr. Grenier stated in terms of tracking, they would use the AI tools through Nearmap with someone reviewing it. Mr. Erb stated they noticed issues with tennis courts, basketball courts, etc., and the Ai was confused as to what was green pavement versus grass.

Mr. Grenier stated there will be Budget meetings in the next few weeks, and the Board needs to vote on a Budget over the next two months; and they need to get this addressed for the Budget. Mr. Grenier stated it was indicated that the average revenue needed is $2.1 million. Mr. Kratzer stated the model currently contemplates the assessment of a rate and rate stabilization for a period of time before there is a need for a rate adjustment. Mr. Erb stated they are looking at a steady rate for five years at minimum. Mr. Grenier stated we would have the ability to adjust that based on projects that could fall under this program either up or down. Mr. Grenier stated the concept behind this is that the Stormwater Fee will be based on actual planned projects, and we have to come up with that plan. Mr. Kratzer stated there is a known obligation and there are assumptions that are built into the model that would permit some adjustment from year to year if needed.

Mr. Lewis stated given that we are about 95% single-family homes, he asked for the 5% that is Commercial/Retail, what percent of the impervious surface is coming from that category of property. He stated many of those properties are largely impervious such as parking lots with shopping centers which is a significant issue. He stated those 5% may represent 15% of the impervious surface of the total in the Township so they should probably pay 15% of the fee; and he feels that should be analyzed to make sure that we are being fair. Mr. Erb stated once they finalize the data set, he can provide that. He stated the way they build the rate structure they create a rate per thousand square feet of impervious area and utilize that throughout all of the rate-setting process. He stated they would be looking at a per-thousand square feet assessment. Mr. Lewis stated he understands that there will be a data set that will have each parcel number, the Zoning of that parcel number, and the amount of impervious and total size; and Mr. Erb agreed.

Mr. Grenier stated Commercial properties also tend to be more concentrated; and when you have concentrated impervious, you have more impacts to water features. Mr. Erb stated that is also the most beneficial place to put a project to improve water quality which would offset that impact.

Mr. Lewis asked Ms. Carlton if there are any rules on rate-setting that would stop the Township from putting more of the burden on Commercial versus Residential; and he asked if we could do it based on type of property/Zoning of the property. Ms. Carlton stated while she is not certain, she believes the answer would be they could not differentiate. Mr. Lewis stated it would have to be based on an assessment of what the percentage of impervious is. Mr. Erb stated they have seen it done where if your property is below a certain percentage of impervious, you get a reduced rate called a low-impact parcel credit.

Mr. Grenier stated the more-modern parcels/developments have some level of stormwater management designed into them because the regulations require that. He stated there are also a lot of Commercial properties and older homes that have no stormwater management because they pre-dated the rules. He asked if those are considered differently. Mr. Erb stated they strongly recommend including at minimum a stormwater peak rate and volume control credit, and that credit would take into account the properties that have stormwater detention basins or some sort of stormwater management on-site which offsets the development of that parcel. He stated that is then tied to the Budget to see what portion is fixed and what portion is variable due to the regulation, and then provide a percent credit based on the Budget, the property, and how much impervious they are treating on the property. He stated if they are treating 50% of their impervious, they would get 50% of that max credit assuming they meet all of the other criteria.

Mr. Grenier stated there are property owners in the Township who want swimming pools; and when they go to the Zoning Hearing Board for a Variance because they are going over the impervious threshold, the Board requires them to put in some type of BMP to treat some delta in the impervious above the threshold. He asked if that would be included in the credit, and Mr. Erb stated the parcel owner would need to apply to receive a credit for that. He stated anything on an individual property either Commercial or single-family Residential would be eligible to the extent that their BMP is managing stormwater. Mr. Grenier stated we would need to come up with an approach to verify that the BMP is working and being maintained. He stated the Zoning Hearing Board has started to require O & M Agreements, and Mr. Kratzer stated we would have to consider how those would be enforced. Mr. Lewis stated it could give the Township the opportunity to mandate an O & M for those who request a credit.

Mr. Kratzer stated another benefit has to do with meeting our regulatory obligations, and reduction requirements are established based on modeling; but we have not captured those structural BMPs that are on individual properties that have been required to be installed as part of the Zoning Hearing Board process. He stated there could be some value from a community standpoint requiring that affirmative action by the property owner to submit the information to document and substantiate its function. Mr. Erb stated based on the draft Permit, they are anticipating the need to have a BMP inventory more substantial than has previously been required to reduce the amount of impervious area required to be treated. He stated if the Township has all of these small BMPs in the community, that is meaningful. He stated by requiring documentation of this through this program, the Township would have that information. He stated there are a lot of communities who utilize this as getting O & Ms in place, and part of the Permit continuing to be viable is submitting inspection reports for that as well. Mr. Kratzer stated a condition of the Application for the granting of the credit could be a requirement to have an O & M Agreement in place for a facility that has been installed prior to the requirement for an O & M. Mr. Erb stated for the more simple BMPs engineering drawings are not needed.

Ms. Blundi stated there is at least one development in the Township that has an HOA which has responsibility for their stormwater management, and she asked if they would get the same ERU as everyone else if that was the option chosen versus tiered. Mr. Grenier stated the Township maintains approximately 150 basins although there are a few that have stayed private. Ms. Blundi stated there is a development in the north part of the Township where there is a Homeowners Association; and the only reason they have it is because when that development was approved, they took on the responsibility of their storm-water management. She stated those homeowners are already contributing to that, and they would also have to pay an ERU. Mr. Erb stated in situations where it is a Township-owned basin being maintained by the Township they would not provide a credit for that; but in the situation where an HOA is paying for basin maintenance and upkeep, the HOA would apply on behalf of all of the residents within that development that should be eligible for the credit. He stated they would do an assessment for the overall development rather than an individual parcel and provide that amount of credit to the parcels in that community.

Ms. Blundi asked about the properties below 300 square feet, and asked if that would be for a property with just a shed on it. Mr. Erb stated if the shed is below 300 square feet, they would not be assessed a fee. Ms. Blundi asked if we have that situation in the Township. Mr. Erb stated it would be considered an undeveloped parcel, and they would not receive a bill. Ms. Blundi stated if someone owns a property that is not developed, they would not receive a bill; and Mr. Erb agreed. Mr. Erb stated they will have to do an analysis to see how the condos are mapped, and the 300 square feet may have to shift; but the intent of the 300 feet is for undeveloped parcels so that both large open spaces and small open spaces are not getting assessed a fee. He stated he will work on clarifying that language.

Mr. Kratzer stated with regard to the decision point of tier versus ERU and the ability to transition, he understands that we are still at a point in time where the transition could be easily made at some point but at some point that becomes a little more difficult; and Mr. Erb agreed. Mr. Erb stated there is a tight timeframe, and they have to develop a lot of other materials. He stated once they decide on a path for the billing structure, changing things is difficult. He stated once that decision is made, they can then solidify other things such as the credit policy, FAQ documents, and general outreach materials. Mr. Erb stated they will finalize the AI data set and the Budget, and have the Budget and Credit Policy to the Board at the second November meeting, although he could have it by the first November meeting if needed.

Mr. Grenier stated he wants to have the Board come to a consensus and then give Mr. Erb and the staff enough time to create the data bases and proceed so this can get implemented. Mr. Erb stated he feels he can have the Budget ready for the first meeting in November. He stated he would like to have the rates ready for the first meeting as well; however, it is dependent on when the GIS team gets the data back to him. Mr. Grenier stated they need to see real-life examples of the two rate structures and the numbers so that the Board can provide better direction. Mr. Grenier stated the Board needs to vote on a Budget, and this is part of it.

Ms. Larissa Lozeckyj stated she is a Lower Makefield resident. She asked if it was indicated that they have a number of planned projects in mind for the revenue generated from the Stormwater Fee. Mr. Grenier stated there are some projects that we have to do as part of the Pollution Reduction Plan as part of the MS4 Permit to clean up the streams. He stated there are other types of projects that the Public Works Director has in mind which may be presented during the Budget process. He stated he thinks that this Fee can be applied to some of the administrative costs. He stated there are other projects that come up that may or may not be emergencies but are projects that are identified along the way.

Mr. Kratzer stated in terms of Capital Projects, there are existing regulatory obligations to implement projects that are contained within the Department of Environmental Protection approved Pollution Reduction Plan as part of this Permit cycle which is about \$4 million to \$4.5 million of Capital Projects that have already been identified in the Pollution Reduction Plan. He stated a lot of them are basin retrofits taking existing basins, re-constructing channels, and retrofitting them to implement green infrastructure components; and all of that is already established as an obligation and are in the Plan that need to be done within a certain period of time. He stated we are behind in terms of implementation from a Permitting cycle. He added that if we are making good faith efforts to meet our obligations, generally there is some degree of flexibility.

Mr. Erb stated they have seen DEP be a little bit lenient on the schedule for implementation as long as there is a plan to implement and you can point to progress being made, although the Township would not want to put things off. He stated one of the main things the program is anticipating is a rapid infrastructure assessment of the system so that they can see where the problem areas are and determine where to best allocate funds to make sure that the problem areas are addressed in a systematic way.

He stated Public Works does have a running list of the "worst offenders;" and based on the evidence they find from that, they would make a schedule and determine where to allocate the funds.

Ms. Lozeckyj stated while a lot of work was done, there is additional work needed in her area of Maplevale; and she asked if they fit into this. Mr. Grenier stated a lot of the Township has gone too long without improvements to the infrastructure, and this is part of the plan to address it. He stated this will be a tool to start funding those projects more quickly which is why we want to implement it. He stated the Fee collected will focus specifically on these types of infrastructure projects. Mr. Kratzer stated having re-occurring revenue enables the Township to proactively assess, address, and implement projects; and we have not had that re-occurring revenue dedicated to this specific purpose. He stated the Board has done a good job trying to identify dedicated revenue sources to address things in a way that is not reactive, is more strategic, and is driven by data to make those decisions.

Mr. Lewis stated Ms. Lozeckyj may see some projects to the north and the west of her neighborhood which will have a positive impact. Ms. Lozeckyj stated they understand that any work done around them will help improve their situation.

Ms. Laurie Grey, stated she is a Lower Makefield resident. She asked if this presentation will be on the Township Website, and Mr. Kratzer stated it will. She also asked if Mr. Majewski's prior presentation will be on the Township Website as well, and Mr. Kratzer stated it will as well. Ms. Grey stated with regard to the "single use rate structure," there could be two properties of the same size, but one property may have a pool, shed, large swing set, etc. and the other has nothing but they would both pay the same amount; and Mr. Grenier agreed. Ms. Grey asked how they will deal with Township properties, and Mr. Kratzer stated they would also be assessed a fee, and the taxpayers would be paying for that. Ms. Grey stated individual taxpayers would know what they have to pay for their individual property, but she asked if they would also know what they would have to pay for what the Township is paying as their fee for Township properties. Mr. Kratzer stated it would probably just be a line in the Budget. Mr. Erb stated he does not feel it would be a listing that someone could go on-line and look at, but the Township could pull that number and share it publicly.

Mr. Grenier stated if the Township is assessed a fee based on impervious area, that may encourage the Board to look at options to get our own credit such as doing stormwater projects on Township property which would bring the fee down for taxpayers.

Ms. Grey asked what fund would the Township's fee get paid from, and Mr. Kratzer stated the Township's fee would be paid from the General Fund.

Mr. Erb stated they are not planning to assess a fee for roadway surfaces so the State and Township-owned roads would not be included in that, and it would just be the parcels themselves. He stated there are Fees assessed for areas where PennDOT has salt sheds, State-owned and Federal-owned properties other than the road surfaces. Mr. Kratzer stated the Fee would be charged to the Joint Toll Bridge Commission. Ms. Blundi asked if this would be charged to Schools and houses of worship, and Mr. Kratzer agreed.

Mr. Grenier asked if there are any private roads; and Mr. Erb stated there are some private roads that are located on parcels, and those would be assessed for the road surface.

FINANCE

2026 Budget Workshops – November 6, 2025 and November 10, 2025 at 7:00 p.m.

Ms. Mega Bhandary stated the Budget Workshops will be different from what the Board has been used to. She stated she will make a presentation at the first Budget Workshop highlighting the Budget draft on the financial side, and it will focus on where the Township is at currently along with any normal year-over-year increases that we have such as wages and inflation-related items. She stated Department Heads will also present if they have any changes such as changes to head count, etc. The draft Budget will be provided to the Board prior to the Workshop.

Mr. Grenier asked what format will the Budget be presented in. Ms. Bhandary stated it will be a printed PDF, but she can provide it however the Board likes it. Mr. Grenier stated he would prefer Excel.

Ms. Bhandary stated the second Workshop will focus mostly on Capital. She stated the first draft of the Budget will have projections for Capital for this year based on where we are at, but it will not have future planned projects unless they have been planned and moved over from this year; and they will discuss all of that at the second Workshop. Mr. Kratzer stated the intent is to focus on where we are at from an operational perspective before we start discussing the insertion of Capital projects. He stated as noted, there are some things that have already been started that will have residuals that we will have to plan for; but in terms of new Capital spend, the intent is to try to show where we are operationally, and then there are choices to be made on the Operational and Capital side.

Ms. Blundi asked the status of the outside audit. Ms. Bhandary stated 2024 is delayed compared to what she was hoping for. She stated the auditors have had everything since June, and we are waiting on them since there were issues with their schedules based on who they already "had in the pipeline," and our 2023 Audit being late. She stated the auditors are hoping to provide the draft very soon. Mr. Grenier asked if they are contractually obligated to meet any deadlines, and Mr. Kratzer stated they are not. He added that some of this is a function of the availability of Governmental auditors since people continue to leave that space adding that when the Township went through the RFP, we were broadly reaching out to firms, but they did not have the capacity since fewer people are going into that field. He noted that some of the delays with the prior year also pushed the Township back from a scheduling standpoint. Mr. Kratzer recognized Ms. Bhandary for the work she is doing in terms of clean-up. He stated on the Budget and the Audit side it will be seen how much work has been done. Ms. Bhandary stated she is hopeful that we will be on time with 2025.

It was noted that the two Budget workshops will be public meetings. Mr. Grenier stated the Board will not vote on the Budget at those meetings, and they will vote on the Budget following those meetings at a regularly-scheduled Board meeting. He stated the Budget needs to be fully adopted by the second meeting in December.

2025 3rd Quarter Report

Ms. Bhandary stated the Board was provided the 2025 3rd Quarter Report, and Mr. Kratzer stated that will be posted on-line.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Project Update and Motion – Memorial Park Phase 3 Improvements

Mr. Kratzer stated this project is funded through a State-wide Local Share Grant Award in the amount of $900,000 to make improvements to Memorial Park Phase 3. He stated as was discussed previously the deadline to spend these funds is relatively tight, and the funds must be spent by the end of June, 2026. He stated Mr. Will Daggett from Carroll Engineering is present, and he will outline a tentative schedule that meets that deadline. Mr. Kratzer stated there was a question about the possibility of an extension; and while they have reached out to DCED to see about that, they have not responded. Mr. Kratzer stated he will follow up on that issue. Mr. Kratzer stated the Board needs to give direction on a concept so the project can keep moving. Mr. Kratzer stated there was discussion at the Park & Rec Board about equipment choices, etc., and there is still flexibility with some of those aspects.

Mr. Daggett stated the Grant was awarded on March 31, 2023, and it has a completion and reimbursement deadline of June 30, 2026. He stated he was provided the initial Concept Plan from Boucher and James and then RVE, and it went though some iterations. He stated there is an east and west side, and the west side includes the 2 to 5 year-old playground, and the east side includes pickleball, tennis courts, an open area, and parking lot to the north. He stated the original RFP asked that all of the improvements be on the east side; but through further evaluation it was realized that the parking on the east side would not accommodate a playground and a pavilion along with the existing pickleball and tennis courts which are used a lot already. He stated they have had several site visits where they have seen the parking half way full at times already in that area. He stated they therefore shifted the 5 to 12 year-old playground to the west side to work together with the 2 to 5 year-old playground so that a family can be in that area and have visual sight of their full family.

Mr. Grenier stated the Board has been provided with three options. He stated Option 1 looks similar to the original lay-out, and Mr. Daggett agreed. Mr. Grenier stated since that time they have come up with Options 2 and 3. Mr. Daggett stated originally they had Options 1 and 2, but they had discussions with the Township staff, and that is when they shifted to the playground area being moved. He stated Option 3 would add a bathroom pad that would be ADA-accessible as well as a regular portable bathroom that would need to be maintained in the future.

He stated it would be screened, and there is a depiction on the plans for each option showing how it would be buffered. Mr. Daggett stated the west side will also include a portable bathroom pad with ADA-access and a regular portable bathroom as well.

Mr. Daggett stated with Option 2 the difference is that they would be including a bocce pavilion which will be covered and need a lot less maintenance in the future. Examples were shown of one of these that are existing in other Municipalities.

Slides were shown of the existing park. Option 1 was shown with the full playground area that has roughly a 10,500 square feet footprint with 5 features on it including swing sets, a large fitness challenge which was recommended by the Parks & Rec Department, a free-standing structure with several options shown, a zip line, and a shaded bench area. He stated that would be on the west side. He stated on the east side, they would have the horseshoe pit, and the two bocce courts that are 12 by 60 which would be open to the elements and would need maintenance in the future. He stated in Option 1 there would be a group exercise station area that would have similar surfacing to the playground and would include 5 exercise stations, and there would be a pavilion with several options provided that would fit within the budget and would fit 8 to 10 picnic tables.

Mr. Daggett stated the Township does rent out the pavilion areas, and currently on the west side the capacity exceeds the current size according to the Parks & Rec Department; and that is where they got the size of the proposed pavilion.

Mr. Daggett noted the location of the proposed ADA-accessible bathrooms one located near the northwest corner of the pickleball area and the other at the entrance to the Secret Garden playground.

Mr. Daggett stated Options 2 and 3 for the west side are similar. He showed Option 2, and stated there will be more on the east side than there is proposed for that side in Option 3. He stated a swing set was requested by Parks & Rec as the current swing set within the Secret Garden accommodate both 2 to 5 year-olds and 5 to 12 year-olds and it does not really have enough seats for children aged 5 to 12. He stated they would remove the existing swings for the 5 to 12 year-olds in the Secret Garden and replace them with swings for the younger children.

Mr. Daggett stated a reason for some of the features they have chosen is that they are looking for more active and more group-oriented areas versus the existing Secret Garden which is more sensory-related and had more free-standing features versus group features that can be used by larger children. Examples of some of the equipment they are proposing for larger children were shown.

Ms. Blundi stated the Secret Garden was very specifically for children with special needs and they are now talking about bringing in more activity. She asked if the Disability Advisory Board has been able to weigh in on how that will impact the children the Secret Garden was built for. Mr. Lewis stated the Disability Advisory Board has discussed noise as it is loud, and he does not know if adding this new equipment would increase the noise. He stated there was a request for accessible changing tables, and he asked if the concrete pad would accommodate a structure so they would be able to change diapers for larger children to fit with what it currently there.

Mr. Lewis stated his understanding was that Mr. Daggett was speaking about replacing the size of the swings so that they would accommodate younger children and the older children would be out of the Secret Garden area on swings that would accommodate older children. He stated the Secret Garden does attract a wide variety of people because they like the padding and all of the amenities.

Ms. Blundi stated they have been asking for shade over the Secret Garden for a long time, and she would be in favor of that. She questioned why there is a need for twelve picnic tables. Mr. Grenier stated he questioned that as well. He stated there is an existing pavilion which has 4 picnic tables which is relatively small. He stated Option #1 had a large picnic table pavilion and that would require a large pad and a large cover which adds cost. He stated while he feels we could use some more picnic tables, he does not feel we need as many as are proposed. He stated they would be going from one playground to two playgrounds so there will be more people. He stated there are also a number of flag football teams and other activities going on at the fields, and the pavilions would provide space to sit in the shade.

Ms. Blundi asked if there is shade contemplated over the Secret Garden, and Mr. Daggett stated there is not. Mr. Grenier stated trees are contemplated in that area which could create shade at angles. Mr. Kratzer stated we need to be cognizant of the scope of the improvements that were contemplated in the initial Grant Application and the ability to modify that. He stated part of the delay in the project was the attempt to try to modify the scope to accommodate elements that were outside of the original Application. He stated we are trying to inject shade in a way that it is not the primary feature from a cost perspective because shade was not identified in the Application four to five years ago. He stated the Application was consistent with the Master Plan that was adopted previously.

Ms. Blundi stated she is generally frustrated since we are "sandwiched in by a Plan by an engineering firm that we sued," and she does not know how much we should bend to build something that does not fit the needs as we understand them. Mr. Grenier stated he agrees, and he feels Option 1 is the old approach. He stated Option 2 is some of that. He stated Option 3 is still in line with the goals of the Grant but has allowed them to change it enough that is meets the actual goals that we have for the area.

Mr. Kratzer stated in terms of shifting the improvements to the west side beyond the functional components and ability to have children in those age groups being observed by a single parent, it also creates future flexibility for a potential newly-envisioned project for the east side if the Board is so inclined in the future.

Mr. Lewis stated he strongly favors Option 3 in terms of re-assessing how the design works to provide additional amenities. He stated with regard to shade, the proposed trees will eventually provide some additional shade in that area. He stated he believes there is demand for additional picnic tables. He stated the existing bathroom is not in ideal shape, and we will have to look at that in the future. He stated there were a lot of trees planted in that area so it is heavily shaded, and he feels that is not an area we would want to have heavily shaded for safety reasons. He stated we should look at that in the future as well. He would also like to include a portable accessible changing table that is ADA-compliant or something semi-permanent to help address the concern which was raised as that will fit in with those who use the Secret Garden. Mr. Daggett stated they could look at that option or put a pad in for a portable restroom that would be solely a changing area.

Mr. Grenier suggested reducing the size of the 30 by 40 pavilion for the 8 to 10 picnic tables which he feels is excessive for what we need. He stated we could use that space for a pad for an area for a changing table and additional bathrooms.

Ms. Blundi asked if it necessary to put a concrete slab under the pavilion, and Mr. Ross stated it is better for maintenance to have a concrete slab underneath.

Mr. Daggett showed the Plan for Option 3. He stated the only improvement on the east side would be the bathroom pad for future use. He stated he can reduce the size of the pavilion as he has prices for smaller ones, although the price difference is not substantial.

Mr. Daggett stated "we are on the brink of potentially not being able to use the money if we do not start moving forward with the project." He stated tonight they were looking for a decision on one of the Options so they could move forward with design. He stated until they get bids and order the products they will not know the hard costs. Mr. Grenier stated he feels Option 3 gives more future flexibility when it comes to the east side of the Park for potential future needs and to improve existing features. Mr. Daggett stated they would next look at a 90% plan with the footprints set in stone and locking in the features, and they would need that at the November 19 meeting. He stated the final approval for Bid would be needed so they can get it Bid out and get contractors looking at it.

Mr. Lewis moved to give direction to the engineer to consider Option 3 as the preferred option and as they refine design to consider reducing picnic tables, increasing shade around there, and an ADA-accessible changing table for that pad area.

Mr. McCartney asked if they are also looking at installing a pad around some of the portable toilets, and Mr. Kratzer stated there is a screened area on the west side as well. Mr. McCartney asked if they will be doing this in both areas, and Mr. Kratzer agreed. Mr. Daggett stated they were advised that the bathrooms are overburdened during sporting events, and this was what could be done within the budget. He stated anything permanent such as another bathroom building would not be possible with the current timeframe and budget for this project. Mr. Lewis stated both the east and west side would get access to additional toilets since those on the east side did not have them before, and this will save tennis and pickleball players from the long walk to the restroom. Mr. McCartney stated he is fine with it on the east side since we are looking at a future redesign, but he is not sure about the west side. He stated he does not feel putting two porta-potties on a pad finishes that side. Mr. Lewis stated there are additional porta-potties there now that are on the ground/parking lot, and the pad would be a better place for them to be; and while it is not ideal, it would be more semi-permanent. Mr. Daggett stated it would be ADA-accessible as well.

Mr. Grenier asked if they could consider composting toilets, but Mr. Daggett stated that would not be feasible and they are difficult to maintain. Mr. Grenier asked if he could provide an estimate for a composting toilet in a plastic housing as he feels they are nicer than porta-johns and have an environmental benefit. Mr. Fuller stated there are pre-fabricated structures, and we would be responsible to get plumbing and electrical to it; and a single stall would cost $180,000 with a lead time of 12 to 18 months from today. He stated a double toilet would be $250,000.

Mr. McCartney stated there are some porta-potties that have plumbing into them and sewer out of them that are set up at festivals. Mr. Fuller stated some of them for festivals have holding tanks behind them, but there is maintenance with them and odor. He stated at festivals, they are pumping them out at least daily due to the demand. He stated the porta-potties we have are serviced at a cost of about $80 a month for one porta-potty. He stated there are problems with sewer and water in the winter, and the permanent restrooms are shut down and porta-potties are put in for winter use. Mr. Fuller noted that there is no water or sewer on the east side.

Ms. Blundi asked Mr. Fuller if they are able to get a porta-potty that will address the needs that Mr. Lewis brought up; and Mr. Fuller stated he does not know of a vendor that does it, but if the pad is made large enough there is a company that has a stall with an ADA changing table with no toilet. He stated he does not believe anyone rents that, and we would have to purchase it. Ms. Blundi stated it has been explained to the Board that this is needed for older children who are 50 to 70 pounds.

Mr. Ross seconded the Motion.

Mr. Fuller stated he read the Grant; and if we were to add shade to the Secret Garden, we would be in violation of the Grant. He stated he feels we could put shade over the new playground. Mr. Fuller stated you cannot make improvements to existing structures with the Grant funds. Mr. Ross asked if there is a cantilevered shade structure that hangs over the new playground, could it be installed so that a piece could be added as a separate item in the future that would hang over the existing playground, and Mr. Fuller stated he could look into that.

Mr. Rob LaBar stated he lives at 519 Heritage Oak Drive and is a member of the Park & Rec Board. He stated this matter was discussed at their meeting last night, but they were not provided the amounts that bathrooms would cost or what the Grant restrictions were. He stated they felt that shade and bathrooms should be the main focus if possible. He stated they were concerned about what the penalties would be if the project was not done by the deadline if the Board of Supervisors agreed to move forward. He stated their concern was that if something was started and not completed by the deadline, the taxpayers would have to fund the project.

Mr. Kratzer asked Mr. Daggett if he feels that if there is timely decision-making, could the project can be accomplished within the time period. Mr. Daggett stated if they are proceeding with Option 3, he feels they can get this done. Mr. Grenier stated the Board of Supervisors is focused on the same things that the Park Board has raised. He stated the reason they have it on the Agenda is to give direction because they are so concerned about the deadline, and they do not want to lose the Grant. Mr. Daggett stated the final approval to bid would be at the December 17 Board meeting, and they would advertise it on the 22nd which would give them 30 days to January 21 which is the required window to have the bid opened at a minimum. Mr. Grenier asked if the 30-day window for bid opening is a State requirement or a Township requirement, and Mr. Daggett stated it is a State requirement.

Mr. LaBar stated if we are going to put in an apparatus and it is found that it will take longer than the deadline, the Park & Rec Board would suggest not putting it in and instead focus on what can get done so that the Township is not having to pay for it.

Mr. Kratzer asked the date of the next Park & Rec Board meeting; and Mr. LaBar stated while they asked about that last night, the question was not answered. He stated while the regularly-scheduled meeting would be on Veterans Day, they were not sure if the Building would be available for their meeting. Mr. Kratzer stated they will work with Ms. Tierney on a date. He stated he wants the Park & Rec Board to have information on potential options related to apparatus so that they can weigh in.

Motion carried with Mr. McCartney opposed.

Accept Bid from Sargent Enterprises, Inc. in the Amount of $21,535.00 for the Patterson Farm Asbestos Abatement Project

Mr. Kratzer stated the Board was provided a memo with regard to this item, and the Township had solicited bids. He stated seven responses were received on October 8. He stated the Township staff has reviewed the submitted documentation and reviewed references for the contractor, and has deemed the contractor to be responsible.

Mr. Fuller stated he understands that all of the asbestos has been identified in previous reports, and this is for the complete removal and abatement of that asbestos. Mr. Grenier stated this is part of the larger plan relative to remediating various environmental concerns at the Farm including lead abatement that has been ongoing. He stated painting has also been done. He stated all of this is being done so that it is safe for workers moving forward as we seek to implement further fixes to the Farm and the various buildings relative to structural items and other things.

Mr. Kratzer stated the Township adopted a Master Plan for Patterson Farm in November of 2023, and many of the activities that have been undertaken in 2025 are in the interest of establishing a framework to be able to advance the project. He stated painting and light carpentry work has been done, and there is this environmental clean-up with the asbestos. He stated they have been working in cooperation with the Bucks County Redevelopment Authority to identify funding sources and additional study on some of the environmental remediation, all of which are consistent with the initial seven steps that were outlined in the Master Plan. He stated they have continued to move forward although some of what has been done may not be as visible to the general public. He stated all of these projects and the work done trying to establish partnerships and leverage resources is all in the interest of advancing the project and are foundational steps that have been taken in 2025. Mr. Kratzer stated they will be meeting tomorrow with the Bucks County Redevelopment Authority to discuss how to translate this vision into incremental and implementable steps.

Mr. Lewis moved, Mr. McCartney seconded and it was unanimously carried to accept the Bid from Sargent Enterprises, Inc. in the amount of $21,535.00 for the Patterson Farm Asbestos Abatement Project.

PUBLIC WORKS

Project Update – Highland Drive Drainage Improvement Project

Mr. Fuller stated the project is moving along well, and the culvert has been demolished. He stated the utility providers have mobilized with American Water on site this week doing their water line work at the stream. He stated PECO Gas has confirmed that they will be on site Monday starting their work. He stated once the utility providers are done, our contractor can then keep working.

Mr. Grenier stated the neighbors did get notice from PECO but nothing from American Water. He asked if neighbors will have interrupted service. Mr. Fuller stated with regard to American Water previous work that was done that would have interrupted service has all been completed, and all the work they are doing at the stream will not disrupt any customer service in terms of water which is probably why they did not provide notice. He stated PECO Gas sent a boilerplate flyer, and he was told that there will be no interruption of gas service.

Mr. Fuller stated the contractor did a lot of invasive vegetation removal downstream of the culvert.

Mr. Grenier asked when they will be doing the work at Upton and Highland which is where the bus stops are. Mr. Fuller stated he can provide details on where they are working and when.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT

Ms. Carlton stated the Board met in Executive Session on Monday, October 13 to discuss a Real Estate matter. She stated the Board also met this evening in Executive Session prior to the meeting to discuss Real Estate matters, a litigation matter, and employment matters.

Ms. Carlton stated the four Ordinances to be considered this evening have been properly advertised, noticed, and presented to the Bucks County Planning Commission where appropriate.

Enact an Ordinance Amending the Lower Makefield Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Relating to the Tree Bank

Mr. Lewis moved, Mr. McCartney seconded and it was unanimously carried to enact an Ordinance amending the Lower Makefield Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance relating to the Tree Bank.

Enact an Ordinance Amending the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Relating to Street Trees and Buffer Yards

Mr. Lewis moved, Mr. Ross seconded and it was unanimously carried to enact an Ordinance amending the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance relating to Street Trees and Buffer Yards.

Enact an Ordinance Amending the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Eliminating Inconsistent Provisions with the Recently-Adopted Stormwater Management Ordinance

Mr. Lewis moved and Ms. Blundi seconded to enact an Ordinance amending the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance eliminating inconsistent provisions with the recently-adopted Stormwater Management Ordinance. Motion carried with Mr. McCartney opposed.

Enact an Ordinance Amending the Lower Makefield Township Zoning Ordinance to Eliminate Floodplain Management Requirements, which were Recently Incorporated into a Standalone Floodplain Management Ordinance

Mr. Lewis moved and Mr. Ross seconded to enact an Ordinance amending the Lower Makefield Township Zoning Ordinance to eliminate Floodplain Mange-ment requirements which were recently incorporated into a standalone Floodplain Management Ordinance.

Ms. Carlton stated we received the Bucks County Planning Commission review letter and they had two minor changes which were included in the Board's packet, and are what the Board is voting on tonight.

Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Carlton stated based on the Zoning Hearing Board Applications scheduled for October 21, her office has been authorized by the Board to attend and oppose two of the Applications.

SUPERVISORS' REPORTS

Mr. Grenier stated the Planning Commission met and had a presentation from Pennoni on the Act 537 Plan.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Reorganization/Restructuring of Advisory Boards and Commissions

Mr. Grenier stated the volunteer Boards and Commissions are a huge benefit to the Township. He stated some of them which were set up years ago may not be as necessary today since they were formed for a very specific purpose that no longer exists and others could evolve into something else where there is currently a greater need. He stated while the Board of Supervisors have discussed this over the years, they never moved forward with making any changes. He stated the Board had asked the staff to provide recommendations for how we might be able to re-form some Committees, combine some Committees, and create new Committees; and the Township Manager has come up with preliminary recommendations which have been included in the Board's packet for discussion purposes. Mr. Grenier stated he feels that if any changes are going to be made, it will need to be determined if any Resolutions or establishing Charters are needed.

Mr. Kratzer stated the memo contemplated the potential for nine changes, one of which has already been completed. He stated when he originally drafted the memo, there was some question as to the status of the Lower Makefield Township Sewer Authority given the decision that was made to sell the asset. He stated while he had including abolishing the Sewer Authority and the need to review Articles of Incorporation, since that time, it has been confirmed that the termination of the Authority was filed with the Commonwealth.

Mr. Kratzer stated the other items that remain were largely motivated by a desire to streamline Township governance, increase efficiency, reduce any potential duplication, make sure that the advisory bodies align more with the current strategic priorities of the Township, and make sure that we have capacity from a staff perspective to adequately support the work of these citizen committees doing great work on behalf of the Township.

Mr. Grenier stated there are no changes proposed for the Auditors, the Board of Supervisors, Citizens Traffic, Disability Advisory Board, Emergency Management, EAC, Farmland Preservation Corporation, Human Relations Commission, Parks & Rec, Planning Commission, Zoning Hearing Board, Patterson Farm Master Plan Implementation Committee, and the Trenton Mercer Airport Review Panel.

Mr. Grenier stated the proposed changes are to consider expanding the role of the EAC to serve as a Shade Tree Commission consistent with Article 29 of the Second Class Township Code, sunset the current Ad Hoc Property Committee and consider re-establishment as needed going forward, explore transition of the Veteran's Committee to serve as a Friends of Veteran's Square Advisory group organized as a Sub-Committee of Parks & Rec, eliminate the Electric Reliability Committee and Electronic Media Advisory Committee and blend them into a Regulated Utilities Committee since all of our utilities are now privately owned, and eliminate the existing Special Events Committee and consider re-establishment as an Ad Hoc as needed. Mr. Grenier stated as an example of this, we are accepting applications and resumes from residents for the 25th Anniversary of the 9/11 ceremony.

Mr. Grenier stated another proposed change is to re-organize the Golf Committee into a Makefield Highlands Advisory Stakeholders Committee which would reflect the nature of Makefield Highlands as not just being a Golf Course. Mr. Kratzer stated it is to potentially broaden the audience and the input. He stated while the golf operations are important, there could be adjacent property owners who might be interested in serving because of their proximity to the Course.

Mr. Grenier stated another proposed change is to consider combining HARB and the Historical Commission into a single Historical and Architectural Review Commission. Mr. Kratzer stated that is something that some other Municipalities have done. He stated this would recognize the value that both of these Committees do and the potential strength of combining the two and leveraging the respective skills of both of those bodies. Mr. Grenier stated the last proposed change is to create a Friends of Slate Hill Cemetery Advisory group as a Sub-Committee of the newly-created Historical and Architectural Review Commission. Mr. Kratzer stated this has been a focus of the Historical Commission, and this change would create the opportunity to have that be more focused, broaden outreach, and provide more opportunities for residents to get involved.

Mr. Grenier stated the Patterson Farm Master Plan Implementation Committee may evolve depending on how the overall Plan progresses.

Mr. Kratzer stated with regard to staff support Police Chief Kelly has assigned Lieutenant Hilghman to serve as a liaison to the volunteer committees which is an example of how we are connecting staff members with technical information that is helpful to the decision making of the volunteer groups.

Ms. Blundi asked about the Shade Tree Commission since currently stewardship of the trees falls to Parks & Rec and Public Works. Mr. Kratzer stated it is not atypical that a Municipality would have a Shade Tree Commission that would regulate street trees which would be trees between a sidewalk and a public street. He stated if there was a desire to do something to one of those trees there would be a process to submit a Permit to be reviewed by a Commission which would consider options relative to that tree.

Mr. Grenier stated while he believes the EAC currently does this, it could be more formalized so that when there is a Land Development Application with a landscaping requirement that includes street trees, the Shade Tree Commission would have an official letter that they would write. He stated he feels some developers ignore the EAC comment letters and just focus on Planning and the engineers; but if we went with the Shade Tree Commission approach, the developers could not ignore it.

Ms. Blundi stated over the eight years she has been on the Board of Supervisors she has been approached by members of Commissions asking her what they can do, and she would like to see that the volunteers are given direct feedback and direction. Mr. Kratzer stated that is part of the intent as well. He stated the scope of the work done by the Historical Commission is well beyond the initial Charter that established that group, and the alignment of the expectations and roles would be part of this exercise of re-structuring and re-organization trying to clearly define what is the scope of their responsibility. Mr. Grenier stated he feels that some of the Committees that we might be sunsetting or combining are due to the fact that they did not have a role or direction anymore because what they did previously is not needed any more although they still wanted to help; and this is an effort to and this is an effort to address that.

Mr. Lewis stated with regard to the Regulated Utilities Commission he suggested they cover other infrastructure as well because of the relationship between our infrastructure and the regulated utilities infrastructure. He stated in the past we have created temporary Committees, and he feels that we should have a formal sun to setting process and renewal process for them. He stated when we had significant power outages having a Committee was helpful in pushing PECO; but over time PECO did fix a number of circuits, and the role changed. Mr. Lewis stated this is similar with the Electronic Media Advisory Council; and when we were regulating local cable operators, there was a need for that, but with the changes in the Tele-Communications Act that changed the dynamic. He stated with streaming the Township is not getting their money in the same way.

Mr. Grenier stated nothing would be required for those Committee where there are not going to be any changes. He stated if the Board is interesting in proceeding with the changes being recommended, further discussion would be needed with regard to how those Committees would be structured, the number of members, requirements for membership, terms, and developing Charters which would need to be established by Resolution. Mr. Kratzer they can start looking into those issues for the Board's review, and he will look to get information back to the Board in two meetings.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no one wishing to make public comment at this time.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

James McCartney, Secretary

LOWER MAKEFIELD TOWNSHIP
BOS MEETING - 10/15/2025
INTERFUND TRANSFERS

SEPTEMBER 2025 INTERFUND TRANSFERS		
Fund		
01-	GENERAL FUND TO DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PENSION PLAN ACCOUNT	10,185.17
	GENERAL FUND TO 9/11 MEMORIAL ACCOUNT	9,971.43
03-	GENERAL FUND TO DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PENSION PLAN ACCOUNT	516.92
05-	PARKS AND RECREATION FUND TO DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PENSION PLAN ACCOUNT	2,203.60
09-	POOL FUND TO DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PENSION PLAN ACCOUNT	689.84
		23,566.96

Daniel R. Grenier

James McCartney

John B. Lewis

Suzanne S. Blundi

Matt Ross