

Lower Makefield Township
Patterson Farm Master Plan Implementation Committee (PFMPIC)
Minutes – January 15, 2026

1. Call to Order and Introductory Remarks – Mr. Steadman, Chair, called the meeting to order.

- A. Attendees – Dennis Steadman, Chair, Peter Solor, Vice Chair, Fred Childs, Secretary, Ron Schmid, Member, Jennifer Stark, Member, Colin Coyle, Supervisor Liaison

Absent – Joe Camaratta, Member

- B. Introductory Remarks by the Chair – Mr. Steadman

Mr. Steadman welcomed Supervisor Coyle to their meeting as they value dialogue with the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Steadman stated the Committee did not have meetings in November or December.

2. Review and Approval of the October 28, 2025 Meeting Minutes – Mr. Childs

Ms. Stark moved, Mr. Schmid seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of October 28, 2025.

3. Summary Status of Patterson Farm Master Plan Implementation – Mr. Steadman

2026 is the beginning of the third year of the Phase 1 Plan. The Master Plan was developed over 24 months led by a volunteer committee some of whom are now on the Implementation Committee. Based on that Committee's input, community involvement, LMT staff resources, and outside expertise a comprehensive plan was developed. The volunteer committee included those with expertise in Real Estate, finance, economics, historical architectural, the environment, agriculture, and project management as well as two Supervisor liaisons. The Committee held 28 public meetings including multiple stakeholders from interested groups in the community and numerous outside experts. There were also 3 in-person public forums with well over 200 in attendance, and resident ambassadors from certain neighborhoods were involved as well.

The Township expended about \$135,000 in professional services with a team hired that includes those with expertise in historical architecture, historical landscaping and environmental architecture, engineering, and community economics.

Through the process it was learned that Patterson Farm has a very high level of interest in the community, with a wide range of opinions as to what should go on at the site. There was a clear consensus on the following: (1) It should remain active agriculture land which is preserved as agriculture land, (2) the farm vista is valued, (3) the property embodies our community's history in farming, (4) the building conditions area a shame, (5) greater access by the community, apart from AOY, (6) there was a strong desire to save the most-important buildings but without "busting the taxpayer bank," (7) desire to expand the uses in arts and culture building on the current success of the non-profit, AOY, and finally, (8) it should be under non-profit management. Mr. Steadman stated every consultant they spoke with indicated that municipal governments cannot manage these kinds of properties as they need access to charitable funding and not just taxpayer and grant funding plus volunteers as well as the fact that a non-profit can do things much cheaper than a municipality.

The Master Plan was built on four principles one being Patterson Farm will remain in agriculture. Mr. Steadman stated the farming operation is farmed using modern techniques in a safe, quality way; and it is more productive now than it has been in its 300-plus year history. The next principle was to preserve historical structures and the natural farming vista. Mr. Steadman stated the 15 structures are the challenge as they have been obsolete for over 75 years, and a farmer today would not use them since they were designed for different technologies in different eras. The third principle is that without active use any building will "die." He stated a building must create hard value - money - or soft value - community benefit - and hopefully, both. Any use needs to be compatible/consistent with the historical/natural farm setting which eliminates large venue uses such as large concerts and weddings. The final principle is that the plan must be fiscally responsible as sources of money are limited and at this point it is undefined.

Recommended uses were put together by the consultant group working with the Committee and the community and included low-impact uses without high-volume traffic. Visual arts such as painting, ceramics, sculptures, trades, crafts, etc. could be built at the Janney Farmstead where AOY is currently headquartered. Recommendations also included access to nature trails and educational programs, as well as a cultural/agricultural heritage center potentially at the Satterthwaite Farmstead. The property could also be a home for the non-profit organization that is managing the property.

The Plan called for a three-year Phase 1 with achievable goals that would lay the foundation for the full execution. Successes and failures of Phase 1 will define what the next stages would be. It is known that non-profit management would have substantially lower cost structure.

The Plan was presented to the Board of Supervisors and unanimously approved in December, 2023 with a funding of \$700,000. Phase 1 priorities for 2024 through 2026 were that it would be managed by a dedicated non-profit to raise funds, run programming, and utilize volunteers, which is the core of executing the Plan. Another priority was to submit the site for listing on the National Registry of Historical Places, and that work is nearly done. Another was to quickly address water abatement to keep the buildings dry, improve some roofs, gutters, and soil grading as well as to paint buildings that could be painted with only light carpentry to help halt deterioration and to show the community some visible progress being made. Also high on the list was environmental clean-up, including pesticides and lead paint. It was also a priority to improve the farmer's access to fields so that they do not have to drive through the farmsteads so equipment can move safely without going between buildings being used by the public. Another priority was readying some "first-rung leasing opportunities" as there are buildings that are closer to being usable.

Mr. Steadman stated one of the recommendations in the Plan was to form the Implementation Committee, which would support the Township in moving the Plan forward, and would be dissolved once the non-profit was in place to manage the property. This Committee then formed sub-committees comprised of Historical Registry, Structural and Environmental issues, Non-profit and Funding, and Community communications. In 2024 fresh assessments were done of the building conditions and the Plan was updated, and the Phase 1 Environmental Safety Assessment was executed. Many non-profits associated with these kinds of historical properties were interviewed, and a firm recommendation was made that a new non-profit needs to be formed that is dedicated to this property as there was no opportunity to tap into an existing non-profit. In outreaches to large donors, potential contributions of about \$400,000 were identified. Updates about the implementation activities were provided to the community in the Township Newsletter.

Mr. Steadman stated in 2024 Patterson Farm was a high priority in the Township, and they were getting the attention of Public Works and Township staff and more was accomplished in 2024 than had been accomplished in a long time. He stated at this point the status of property management is about 25% completed as they studied 501C3s and learned what needs to be done

to set one up. A draft of the lease was targeted to be provided to the Committee in 1Q of 2025, but was not received until September, and so this priority is still unfilled. The application for National Registry is ready for submission. The necessary water abatement was not completed as no roof, gutter work, or soil grading was done. Because of the lead soil contamination around the buildings it is inappropriate for grading to be done. Ten buildings were painted following light carpentry repairs, but the Committee was disappointed in the quality of the carpentry. The painting was done in such a way that it sealed the lead contaminant on the outside. Minor asbestos was removed in two buildings. Mr. Steadman stated the Phase 2 Environmental Safety Assessment and Phase 3 Remediation have not been done. Nothing was done about farmer access and nothing was done on near-term leasing opportunities. He stated we are at about 31% completion after 66% of the first phase time period.

Mr. Steadman stated the Committee wants to advance the Plan through the Stage 1 priorities. He stated the non-profit will need time to get started. A number of members of the Implementation Committee have indicated that they would be willing to be founding board members of a non-profit, but they also need other members from the community and will then develop a communications plan, capital plan, and a fund-raising plan. He stated the new non-profit would partner with the Township; but he understands that there has been concern at the supervisor level about losing control of the property, although the control would be managed through the lease which would be negotiated. He stated the new non-profit would be dedicated to increasing the value of this asset which the Township owns. He stated the probability of the property becoming something of real utility to the community outside of non-profit management is zero since it has been under township management for 27 years.

Mr. Steadman stated they need the cooperation of the township. He stated the Committee has not had a Board Liaison present at their meetings in 2025. Mr. Steadman stated they look forward to working with Mr. Coyle this year.

Mr. Childs stated he shares Mr. Steadman's frustration. He stated there was no reason for the Committee to meet in November and December because the Board of Supervisors had done nothing to get the Plan moving forward in 2025 despite having unanimously approved it two years ago. He particularly noted the lease agreement. He stated when the Ad Hoc Property Committee was established several years ago they had the strong support of two members of the Board of Supervisors who are no longer Supervisors. Mr. Childs stated a statement was sent to the

Board of Supervisors that the Committee needed to know by February what was going to be done with the Plan; however, there was no response from the Board of Supervisors. He stated they are now looking to Mr. Coyle to give direction as to whether they are going forward with the Plan approved by the Board of Supervisors two years ago or we go backwards and the property remains the way it has for the last 27 years.

Mr. Coyle thanked the Committee for the details of what has happened in the past. He stated at the end of 2023 he served on the Board of Supervisors for four months to fill the end of Dr. Weiss' seat after he retired. He stated in 2023 Mr. Steadman showed him a way to help improve the property and he did that with the help and support of the Board of Supervisors. He stated Mr. Kratzer identified a source of funds to get some momentum. Mr. Coyle stated when he was running for Supervisor last year, he spoke to people about Patterson Farm. He stated while he agrees that the Township purchased the property a long time ago and has yet to move forward on a vision for it, he feels that we should now look to moving forward. He stated he is supportive of the goals and of clear communication, but he cannot make promises on behalf of the Board. He stated he will listen to the Committee and take that to the other members of the Board to see what he can do to advocate for this work. He stated he cannot promise that he will be able to present a plan next month, but he will do his best.

Mr. Steadman stated he knows that Mr. Coyle was engaged when he was on the Board of Supervisors, and it did have an impact. Mr. Steadman stated the Committee sent a well-crafted memo to the Board of Supervisors in mid-October that asked the Board how they were going to proceed and requested a meeting with the Board of Supervisors or a sub-Committee of the Board of Supervisors in January so that the Committee could have better direction by February particularly with regard to whether or not there was going to be a lease since that is the fundamental decision to be made. He stated the Committee heard nothing. He stated while they have worked very well with Mr. Kratzer, when he asked Mr. Kratzer about the status of the letter this in December, Mr. Kratzer only indicated that he had forwarded it to the Board.

Mr. Coyle stated he feels it is best to assume that the Board was giving space for new members to be elected, come on Board, and have discussions on this as it will be the new Board who will be making these decisions going forward. He asked that he and Ms. Reiss have time to work with the other

Board members and understand the prioritization. Mr. Steadman stated such a response from the Board of Supervisors would have been excellent to receive in October, November, or December, but there was silence.

Mr. Schmid stated the Committee pushed the Board of Supervisors last year because the Committee had a passion to create the non-profit. He stated to get it started and raise the amount of money needed will take more than six months or a year; and in the meantime, the buildings are falling down. Mr. Schmid stated he would like to know what has held this up, and he asked if there are substantive issues with moving forward with the non-profit. He stated the Committee would like a response to their legitimate questions. Mr. Coyle stated he will always provide a response to the Committee, and he will do what he can as the Liaison to help navigate the process.

4. Review of PA LSA Grant Award – Mr. McLoone, Planner LMT Community Development

The Township staff applied and was awarded a grant via the 2024 Local Share Grant for the restoration and adaptive reuse of five of the historic farm buildings at Patterson Farm. The Township received letters of support from Steve Santarsiero and Perry Warren. The project aligns with the Township's goals of farmland preservation and open space. The project will ensure that the uses of the five buildings align with farm-compatible uses and preserve the scenic farm vista for the Township's gateway. The project plans to create structural stabilization and weatherproofing, perform exterior repairs such as siding, trim, masonry, roofing, paint, etc.; and there will be necessary utility upgrades such as sewer, electric, and safety upgrades plus ADA improvements where appropriate in preparation for productive farm-compatible reuse. All buildings need exterior carpentry repairs to siding and trim as well as painting for water abatement. The near term costs are intended to make the exterior envelopes tight with structural repairs completed to bring the structures to a stable condition and ready for fit-outs per market opportunities and Township goals.

Mr. Steadman stated in the Grant Application specific buildings and projects were cited for which these funds could be used, and he asked if we are constrained to those specific projects; and Mr. McLoone stated he believes it is specifically for the five buildings mentioned in the Grant. He stated he assumes that if there were to be a large change in the scope of work, there would need to be an amendment; and he is not sure if that is possible.

Mr. McLoone stated the five buildings to be worked on are the Janney-Brown House, the caretaker's house, the packing house, the equipment garage, and the first garage. He stated the proposed use for the Janney-Brown House is education, a gallery, or administrative use, the caretaker's house is proposed for an artist's studio/small business, the packing house is proposed for artisan workshops/agricultural support space, the equipment garage is proposed for farm and site support, and the first garage will be used for farm operations and infrastructure.

Mr. McLoone stated these market-receptive uses meet the following requirements: Are consistent or compatible with the farmstead, offer revenue-generating opportunities for the Township and/or leisure benefits to residents, and would not interfere with the farming operations on the surrounding area.

Janney-Brown House near-term repairs consist of painting the exterior, dormers, and shutters, repair/replace basement windows, selectively repair stone, basic exterior carpentry repairs, connect to sewer service, keep the well for water, and masonry repairs. These repairs total about \$105,435 with Stage 1 costs totaling \$72,360. Long-term repairs for Option 2 consist of additional miscellaneous repairs and electric and life-safety upgrades totaling \$23,625. All costs including contingency and general conditions plus design, and Permits are soft costs; and that is the case for all five buildings. Mr. McLoone stated Option 2 will result in the house being stable/ready for a fit-out for a classroom/gallery space, and it will continue to operate within the building inclusive of conducting its admin activities, art shows, and classes.

Caretaker house near-term repairs consist of new Bilco door, repair windows, paint/repair exterior trim, siding, doors and windows, basic exterior carpentry repairs, connect to sewer, water as is, and gutters and downspouts. Near-term repairs total \$40,905, with Stage 1 costs totaling \$32,130. Long-term repairs for Option 1 consist of upgrades to basement including steps/lighting/ventilation, miscellaneous structural repairs, and life safety upgrades in addition to miscellaneous lights and power upgrades, minimal bathroom and kitchen upgrades, and paint interior. This totals \$29,405. Option 1 will result in the house being brought to stable condition and will continue to operate as a studio. This option will upgrade the interior to allow for the same or similar tenant to utilize the space as a business or studio. The space can also be used as an upgraded studio space with basement storage.

Near-term repairs for the packing house consist of selective demo, replace windows and doors, repair overhang doors, new gutter/downspouts, structural repairs of windows/door heads, basic exterior carpentry repairs/

paint trim, paint and repair stucco, connect to sewer and water, electrical panel and security lights, and ventilate the attic. Near-term repairs total \$104,625 with Stage 1 costs totaling \$16,200. Long-term repairs for Option 2 consist of all Option 1 costs plus Option 2 costs, and the scope consists of interior structural repairs, minimum interior upgrades, an ADA-restroom with heat which is optional, miscellaneous lights, power, and life-safety, sink/drain (no toilet), new overhead door, south wall ventilation, and basic heat. Mr. McLoone stated there will be the need for additional interior upgrades and insulate the exterior walls, sink/drain (no toilet), additional outlets/lighting/data, additional HVAC, additional ADA-ramp and steps, connect to gas (optional), and insulate the attic. Option 2 will result in the building being a large workshop/studio; and ideally it would be leased to an artisan which is compatible with the arts village concept such as a woodworker, blacksmith, furniture maker, etc. to use as a workspace and/or display gallery.

Near-term repairs for the equipment garage consist of selective demo, repair the windows, repair doors, new gutters/downspouts, structural repairs of foundations, basic exterior carpentry repairs, basic structural repairs, fill groundhog holes, connect to sewer and water, paint/repair exterior trim and siding, plus electrical panel and security lights. Near-term repairs total roughly \$100,000 with Stage 1 costs totaling roughly \$59,000.

Mr. Steadman stated the equipment shed would not accommodate the equipment that he had on his farm in 1970, and that is how old the building is relative to agricultural use.

Near-term repairs for the first garage consist of repair windows and upper door, paint/repair exterior trim and siding, structural repairs, wood frame and foundation, basic exterior carpentry repairs, connect to sewer and water, electric panel and security light, gutters and downspouts. Near-term repairs total roughly \$65,000, and Stage 1 costs total about \$29,000.

Mr. McLoone stated the estimated project cost at the time of submittal was \$969,181. It was recently communicated from the DCED that the Township was awarded \$861,147, and about \$773,000 has been budgeted for the renovations, \$28,000 for contingencies, and \$59,000 for engineering. To cover the difference between the estimated project costs and the award amount, Mr. Kratzer confirmed that the Township has budgeted funds of about \$500,000 allocated in the 2026 Budget specifically for the Patterson Farm rehab. The Township will place the project out to bid to hire a contractor in

addition to retaining an architect/engineer for the project. Prevailing wage determined by the PA Department of Labor and Industry will be utilized. No local match is required for this program. Funds will go toward Stage 1 costs, near-term and long-term costs for three buildings and two additional buildings will use funds for just the short-term and near-term costs.

Mr. McLoone stated this is consistent with Township open space and farmland preservation priorities, will protect 183 acres of permanently preserved farmland, insures that non-farm development remains compatible with the agricultural use, and it strengthens the long-term viability of Patterson Farm as working landscape. It will preserve irreplaceable historic agricultural resources, support local farming and farm-based enterprises, create construction and long-term management jobs, increase educational, recreational, and tourism activity, and generate sustainable revenue for farm stewardship.

Mr. McLoone stated the project started in January, 2026 through community engagement such as this presentation and communication with the DCED. Throughout the winter of 2026 the Township will begin to start the process of bidding and site prep. The project is estimated for completion as indicated in the Grant for December, 2026/Winter, 2027 although it might take a little longer. A phased approach is being taken by the Township.

Mr. Solor stated since this was submitted in 2024, and work is getting done 18 months later he asked if inflation was considered in the costs. Mr. McLoone stated while contingencies were put in the costs, he does not believe inflation was. Mr. Solor asked if the Extra Conditions Report that he generated in 2024 was incorporated into the proposed Budget or did they rely on the 2023 information, and Mr. McLoone stated they relied on the 2023 information. Mr. Solor stated there is therefore more work that needs be done than what was incorporated. Mr. McLoone stated he worked with "Joe and Dennis," and they decided specifically what specifically they wanted to see in the Grant so it was just the five buildings. Mr. Solor stated while he agrees with the five buildings, he feels that we are going to be short-scoped and short of money. He stated he feels it would be valid for the Committee to lobby for more money. Mr. McLoone stated the shortfall is about \$130,000, and the Township did put a line item for \$500,000 in the 2026 Budget although it would be up to the Board of Supervisors if they want to use the remaining \$370,000 specifically for this Grant. Mr. Solor stated most of that \$500,000 being rolled over is for other items that still need to happen including Phase 2, the driveway, and the soil and grading which will be critical. Mr. Solor stated this relates specifically to the caretaker's cottage where they are proposing to fix the siding; however, there is dirt piled up against it, and there is lead paint in that soil which

involves having the soil cut down low and hauled off site, and new top soil brought in, and that is not part of this scope; and Mr. McLoone agreed.

Mr. Solor asked if they are proposing to structure this as a Base Bid plus Options such that the Base Bid would be the Janney House and the caretaker's cottage and they would add options for the packing house, garage, etc. Mr. Solor stated there is also the inflation and the items in the Conditions Report. He added things have also continued to deteriorate.

Mr. McLoone stated he will discuss all of this with Mr. Kratzer. Ms. Stark asked if they could do an "SD-level pricing exercise" to get a better sense of the costs which will help determine what the Base Bid scope should be, and Mr. McLoone agreed.

Mr. Schmid stated he recalls going to the equipment garage with the DeLuca brothers who discussed providing some assistance at that time. He stated it was indicated at that time that there would not be a connection to sewer and water because it would be too expensive. Mr. Solor stated in his Conditions Report he indicated that there were foundation issues in the southwest corner. He stated he also does not feel water and sewer make sense because there is no heat and no way to put heat in. Mr. McLoone stated because we are a Municipality, we have to do bidding, and he does not know how that would work with the DeLucas although he will discuss it with the DeLucas.

Mr. Steadman congratulated Mr. McLoone for putting this together and winning the Grant as the funds will go a long way toward the Phase 1 targets, although we know the costs will be greater than what they were estimated to be in 2023. Mr. Steadman stated the proper deployment of the Grant will involve a lot of work by the Committee on the structural and environmental side prioritizing the projects and integrating them with other things such as the work at the caretaker house and the soil remediation that may need to be done before any siding can be done. Mr. McLoone stated he appreciates their guidance.

Mr. Solor stated the scheduling will have to work around not only the farm operations but also AOY operations, particularly their Summer Camp.

Mr. Childs asked how the painting and minor carpentry that was done ties into this work, and will the costs for that be from this Grant. Mr. Solor stated the painting will all have to be done again. He stated they did not do "a great job," and it was only meant to be a ten-year stabilization. He stated the wood trim repairs were not historically compliant; and if these buildings are done, they should try to do them right. He stated the painting costs should be a little lower because there will be less prep for the new painter.

Mr. Childs stated “farm-compatible use” was part of the terms, and he asked who determines what that is. Mr. McLoone stated his understanding was that it would be a “farm-compatible use” if it aligns with the Plan itself and if in general it aligns with the Ordinance because it is in the Edgewood Village Historic District. Mr. Steadman stated what was talked about in the Plan was that compatibility to some degree was non-interference with the farm use. Mr. Childs stated he is not sure what the funding source’s definition is.

Ms. Bette Sovinee, Executive Director of AOY Art Center, stated she is a 44-year resident of Lower Makefield on Ferry Road. Ms. Sovinee asked how long the process will take reviewing the on-site conditions and bidding given that they are to be finished by winter, 2027. Mr. McLoone stated he assumes it will take longer than the timeline he provided. Mr. Solor stated they have to do a design first. Ms. Sovinee asked about the opportunity to have input regarding improvements that were articulated. Mr. Steadman stated the Master Plan Sub-Committee that is responsible for the structures will have discussions on the projects and look at the scope in more detail, and that would be the opportunity to bring in AOY as the tenant of the Janney House to make sure it is still compatible with the uses and the needs. Ms. Sovinee stated she did not see parking in the scope of work in the Grant, and Mr. McLoone stated that was not part of the Grant. Ms. Sovinee asked if all of these buildings are connected to sewer will that connection be from the Satterthwaite side, and Mr. McLoone stated he can look into that and let her know.

Ms. Sovinee asked if the Committee will be working on the non-profit issue since at this point AOY does not know what their role is because they do not have a structure to work with. Ms. Stark stated what usually happens is the professional team that is selected will be introduced to a proper stakeholder sub-committee to work with to develop the concept design and move it through to Permit-level drawings. She stated AOY would definitely be part of that stakeholders subset, and she would recommend that AOY be involved from the beginning; and Mr. McLoone agreed. Ms. Sovinee stated she would also suggest that we get the community back involved to discuss what they would like to see at the usable buildings.

5. Subcommittee Updates

A. Structures & Environment – Mr. Childs, Mr. Solor, Ms. Stark

Mr. Solor stated he has not heard anything about Phase 2 or Phase 3 or the survey for the access road.

B. Non-Profit & Funding – Mr. Camaratta, Mr. Schmid, Mr. Steadman

Mr. Steadman stated there is nothing new to report on this.

C. National Registry Submission – Mr. Camaratta

Mr. Steadman stated the Historical Commission met last night and decided not to approve the submission at this time as one member wanted to review it more closely and possibly add some additional detail. Some members of the Historical Commission were not happy with that outcome and believed that it was ready to submit. He stated it is the Historical Commission's intention at their February meeting to make a formal Motion to vote to approve it for submission. Mr. Coyle stated he is the Liaison for the Historical Commission and did attend that meeting. He stated extending the timeline to submit the Application to February has not slowed down the process since the Board that reviews this at the State level only meets periodically, and submitting in February rather than January will not change when we get evaluated.

Mr. Steadman stated the Patterson Farm Master Plan Implementation Committee sees getting this listed on the National Registry of Historical Places as very important to the success of the renovation of Patterson Farm since it will greatly help in winning Grants and doing fundraising. Mr. Coyle stated he believes that the next review opportunity is June. Mr. Steadman stated if the Historical Commission feels that it will successfully get the listing, it should be submitted as soon as possible.

There was discussion if the Patterson Farm Master Plan Implementation Commission should make a formal motion in that regard. Ms. Stark stated Mr. Camaratta was working with PHMC and getting interim reviews and constructive criticism, and they were steering him. She stated if Mr. Camaratta feels that he is at a level that is acceptable based on all the data and comment provided, she feels it is ready. She stated they are giving the one member a grace period; and hopefully at the next meeting they will move ahead. She stated if they do not move ahead at the next meeting, then it would be appropriate to ask them to proceed. Mr. Childs stated he feels it would be good to make a recommendation now advising that we feel it would be helpful and compatible with the Master Plan. Mr. Coyle stated he feels it would be helpful to frame this related to the upcoming RFP activity and emphasize that it would be helpful for the Township in that process to mention that the submission is in for inclusion on the Registry.

Mr. Schmid moved, Ms. Stark seconded and it was unanimously carried that the Patterson Farm Master Plan Implementation Committee send a letter to the Historical Commission thanking them for their work on the submission for the inclusion on the National Registry of Historic Places and requesting that the Historical Commission authorize the submission of that package by the end of February so that the Township may include the status in any future RFP documents related to the recent LSA Grant that the submission is in process which would help with defining qualified contractors to do the work.

D. Community Communications – Mr. Schmid

There has been no need for public communication, but they have been meeting with other organizations that are interested in moving Patterson Farm forward. He stated once Mr. Camaratta feels comfortable doing a public communication, it would be a good opportunity to do a news release in conjunction with the Township and others on the submission of the Application for the National Registry.

Mr. Schmid will meet with Ms. Sovinee on the potential of a public meeting to gather more input in the future when the time is right to do that.

Mr. Childs thanked Mr. Steadman for the summary he provided using data from the National Registry Application that could be used in the future for publicizing the history of some of the buildings.

6. Other Business

Ms. Stark stated Mr. McLoone had indicated that the property is part of the Edgewood Village Historic District; however, she does not believe it is included, although it is adjacent to it. Mr. Steadman stated at some point it was to be considered if there is an advantage to making it part of that District. He stated during the Master Plan process with the outside experts, it was felt that there was not an advantage, although that could change over time.

7. Review of Assignments and Future Schedule – Mr. Childs

The next meeting will be Thursday, February 12. The second Thursday of the month is the normal meeting night.

- A. Mr. Childs will forward the October memo to Mr. Coyle and Ms. Reiss
- B. Mr. McLoone has indicated an openness with the Committee interfacing with the Township as the design and bidding documents are being worked on for the five buildings.
- C. Mr. Childs will share his notes with Mr. Steadman who will draft the letter to the Historical Commission.
- D. Mr. Coyle will discuss some of the comments made tonight to the other members of the Board of Supervisors and look for a response to the October letter. Mr. Coyle stated he will respond to it. He asked that he be sent anything the Committee feels is important adding that he has been watching their public meetings.

There being no further business, Mr. Steadman moved, Mr. Solor seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Fred Childs, Secretary

