

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MINUTES – JULY 15, 2009

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on July 15, 2009. Chairman Maloney called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. noting the Board met in Executive Session to discuss litigation and real estate matters.

SWEARING IN OF JASON SIMON AS SUPERVISOR

Ms. Felice Smith was present and swore in Jason Simon as Supervisor. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he was not able to be present at the last meeting when Mr. Simon was appointed, and he welcomed Mr. Simon to the Board adding that he looks forward to working with him. Mr. Simon stated he also looks forward to working with Mr. Stainthorpe.

Mr. Caiola called the roll.

Those present:

Board of Supervisors: Matt Maloney, Chairman
 Ron Smith, Vice Chairman
 Greg Caiola, Secretary
 Pete Stainthorpe, Treasurer
 Jason Simon, Supervisor

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Tim Malloy, 1902 Makefield Road, stated at the 6/17/09 Board of Supervisors meeting, there was discussion about a Green Building Ordinance that would be for Township buildings only. Mr. Malloy stated Mr. Maloney indicated at that meeting that it was the “sense of the Board” to have the Township Solicitor work with the Township engineer and the EAC on a draft Ordinance. Mr. Malloy asked what “sense of the Board” means; and Mr. Maloney stated there was no official vote taken, but there was no dramatic opposition from the members present with proceeding. He stated no formal vote is necessary to have the Solicitor draft an Ordinance. Mr. Malloy stated only three Supervisors were present at that meeting, and he asked if the “sense of the Board” was unanimous; and Mr. Maloney stated none of the Supervisors present were opposed to this measure.

Mr. Malloy stated he has done some research on LEED, and he reviewed his understanding of the green building system and the point system involved. He stated it appears to be technology driven. He stated he is a proponent of green building and there is one green building in the Township where the developer voluntarily sought certification. He stated he understands that using this system may result in lower electric bills. Mr. Malloy stated some of what he has read indicated there are considerable up-front costs that the Township would accrue. He asked if the Township has any plans for a new building, and Mr. Maloney stated they do not at this time. Mr. Maloney added that during the meeting when this was discussed, it was explained that additional costs if there are any are approximately 1% to 2%.

Mr. Malloy stated he understands that Newtown Township is building two new buildings under LEED standards and are trying to achieve a Gold standard, and they do not have this type of Ordinance and are building it without an Ordinance. Mr. Malloy stated he does not feel Lower Makefield needs to pass such an Ordinance and nothing prevents the Township from building green. He stated since the Ordinance will only apply to Government buildings, the proposal from the EAC would require the Board to regulate itself; and if future Boards were to consider any new buildings, he feels they should be free to consider the technology at the time and the costs of that building at that time. He stated a future Board could repeal the Ordinance.

Mr. Maloney stated originally the EAC approached the Board about wanting to create a green building environment in Lower Makefield; and primarily this would be driven by new development in the private sector. He stated the motive of the Board was to create a points-driven system similar to Doylestown to incentivize green building, and they felt a good place to start in developing a framework for green building would be related to Municipal buildings. He stated this started as a draft Resolution, and the Planning Commission suggested that it be codified rather than resolved. Mr. Maloney stated whether it is a Resolution or a Code, the Board of Supervisors in the future would have the ability to waive those requirements if they so desired.

Mr. Malloy stated he feels it would be good to have the Planning Commission come in to answer questions in a public forum. He stated he is in favor of the incentivized-approach to build green which he feels is a better approach. Mr. Malloy stated since the Township can do this without an Ordinance, he questions what the Ordinance will accomplish other than tying the hands of a future Board. Mr. Maloney stated a future Board would be free to waive the requirements. Mr. Maloney stated this began as a Resolution of the Board to identify the desire of the Board that in the future all buildings in the public sector would be done in a green way. He stated there is little difference in practice between it being a Resolution or Code because of the ability of the Supervisors to waive this at any time. He stated they want to create a framework for private sector development, although they are not there yet. He stated the easiest way to start was in the self-regulation arena whereby they can set an example for the private sector.

Mr. Malloy asked if the Ordinance would have to be repealed by a future Board, and Mr. Maloney agreed it would have to be repealed as would a Resolution.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated he was not present at the last meeting when this was discussed. He stated he was the Supervisor who in 2008 brought the homebuilders in to discuss their Keystone Green Building Program, and he is in favor of green building. He stated he read the Minutes from the last meeting, and is concerned that creating an Ordinance for future Boards is a redundancy. He stated there are no plans in the immediate future for the Township to build any buildings. He stated if they did in the future, technology will be different and what they vote on today may or may not be relevant at that time. He stated he feels a future Board should be free to make whatever decisions they want based on the economy at the time and what makes good cost/benefit sense. Mr. Stainthorpe stated there is a cost to creating an Ordinance including the time spent by the solicitor and the engineer; and while some may say this is insignificant, it could minimally be a few thousand dollars, and he questions the real benefit to the community today of spending those dollars. He stated he also is concerned about the phrase “sense of the Board;” noting that while it is legal, approximately three years ago there was an argument between himself and Mr. Santarsiero over a “sense of the Board” for the Low Impact Development Ordinance and this resulted in no vote at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he does not feel the Ordinance under discussion now is necessary or provides any real benefit adding he is not against green building. He feels they should move on to the next step and develop incentives. He also feels that for the good of the Board and clarity, there should be a vote if they want to move forward with an Ordinance.

Mr. Maloney stated there will be a vote when there is a draft Ordinance; and Mr. Stainthorpe stated he would like to see a vote taken now before money is spent. Mr. Maloney stated they can take a vote later on in the meeting, if it is felt to be appropriate. Mr. Maloney stated he feels it is money well invested if they are going to be drafting an Ordinance for an incentive system as the same Code would apply.

Mr. Jack Morrison, 18 Del Rio Drive, noted the Samost, Snipes, and Vargo (Memorial Park) tracts were purchased at a cost of \$2.4 million. He stated at this time only a portion of the Vargo Tract has been developed. He stated there is a need for a number of recreational fields in the Township, and he asked if there is a plan to address the construction of these three parks recognizing that it will take significant dollars to do so. Mr. Maloney stated at the May 20, 2009 Board of Supervisors meeting the Park & Rec Director made a presentation on the financial needs of pursuing those projects. Mr. Maloney stated since those properties were purchased, Fee-In-Lieu money has “dried up,” which was usually the means by which they had paid for parks development in the Township. He stated at the 5/20/09 meeting they did review the framework of the plans that have been on the table since they were sketched out a number of years ago. Mr. Maloney suggested Mr. Morrison review the Minutes of that meeting on the Township Website.

Mr. Morrison asked what the next step would be, and Mr. Maloney stated each property could cost between \$1 million and \$2 million so that it would be approximately \$6 million to develop all three properties to completion. He stated Samost is intended for baseball and tennis courts and Snipes is primarily soccer fields with a skate park and some other ancillary facilities. He stated Memorial Park has been able to be moved along through Grant money; and to the extent that this money continues to flow in for that project in the way it has, they may be able to develop this for less money. He stated there are a number of non-organizational fields planned for that location. Mr. Fedorchak stated the cost to complete Memorial Park and the Snipes Tract would be approximately \$2.5 million each.

Mr. Caiola stated they will discuss this during the Budget Hearings, and they must consider parks and recreation in terms of the other needs of the Township. He stated Mr. Fritchey did make a plea to do some of the work, and he is sure that they will be discussing this at length during the Budget Hearings for the 2010 Budget.

Mr. Smith stated he was on the Park & Recreation Board for many years before he became a Supervisor, and he is aware of the needs of the different user groups in the Township. He stated there have been two vacancies for Supervisor seats during the last year; and when the Board questioned the candidates for this position, there were questions about spending and building. He stated he feels all Board members would like to be able to complete these projects, but they must consider "needs and wants" in the Township. He stated they must consider what they are able to do in these economic times with a very tight Budget. He stated he feels it would be difficult to justify to those in the community who are having a difficult time financially, completing these parks at this time.

Mr. Keith Pladsen, Brookfield Road, stated he understands that the Zoning Hearing Board will soon be making a decision on the Frankford Hospital/Aria relocation. He stated he understands that the entire Board of Supervisors opposes this relocation; and the Board agreed. Mr. Pladsen stated he feels it was unfair of the Chair of the Zoning Hearing Board to put into print that this matter will likely be decided by a Judge. Mr. Pladsen stated he feels Mr. Truelove has done an excellent job of putting on the record a good dialogue for the Judge to read. He asked that the Board of Supervisors encourage everyone to attend the next meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated the Zoning Hearing Board in the past has turned down applicants if two neighbors were opposed, and RAFR (Residents Against Frankford) has collected over 1,500 signatures. He encouraged everyone to go the RAFR Website to look at the information there before making a decision; and if they are opposed to this, that they attend the meeting as well.

Mr. Maloney stated he feels if this project is built, that part of the Township will never be the same.

Mr. Pladsen stated he is also concerned about the current discussions by Congress about health care; and he is concerned that this could result in a partially-built building at the location for the proposed Hospital.

Mr. Maloney stated he is the Liaison to the Zoning Hearing Board, and it is important to make clear how the Township feels as a unified voice since the Zoning Hearing Board are the representatives of the Township to hear these cases which is why they are selected as residents of the Township. He stated while the Zoning Hearing Board members need to be objective, they also need to be balancing the fact that they are residents of the Township.

Mr. Smith stated he has attended a number of their meetings and he thanked RAFR for stepping up and leading the way against this. He stated he is disturbed that a number of Township residents are still not aware of this situation, and will then question how this happened if construction on this Hospital begins. Mr. Smith stated he feels this is one of the most important decisions that has faced the Township since the Matrix situation. He stated the residents should attend the upcoming meeting to speak on this issue. Mr. Smith noted while a resident recently wrote in the newspaper that he was in favor of the project since it would bring in \$100,000 to the Township, Mr. Smith stated it will cost almost \$500,000 for additional Police officers. He stated this project will be a cost to all residents of the Township, and he asked that all Township residents come out to the meeting and voice their opinion.

Mr. Pladsen noted that the meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board when this will be heard will be July 21, 2009 at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Harold Koopersmith, 612 B Wren Song Road, thanked the Township staff for making the Budget for 2009 available. He read a letter he sent to the President and Congress expressing his concern for the future of the American middle class.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Caiola moved and Mr. Smith seconded to approve the Minutes of the Special Meeting of June 3, 2009 as written. Motion carried with Mr. Simon abstained.

Mr. Caiola moved and Mr. Smith seconded to approve the Minutes of June 17, 2009 as written. Motion carried with Mr. Stainthorpe abstained.

APPROVAL OF JULY 6 WARRANT LIST AND JUNE, 2009 PAYROLL

Mr. Stainthorpe moved, Mr. Caiola seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the July 6, 2009 Warrant List and June, 2009 Payroll as attached to the Minutes.

DISCUSSION OF READYNOTIFY PA

Chief Coluzzi stated this is an emergency notification system which is free to the community; and is a community alert system whereby residents can log onto and set up a secure, personal account to be notified of a number of emergency situations including natural and manmade disasters, traffic congestion, and road closure messages put out by PennDOT. He stated residents can also provide a cell phone number and be notified by e-mail, text messaging, or a call to their cell phone. He stated those interested should go to the Ready PA Website and set up the account. He stated you can choose which messages you would like to receive; and if you decide later that you are receiving too many messages and it is a burden, you can go back to the Website and cancel out those you no longer wish to receive. He stated if residents decide not to sign up, their home phone numbers are currently in the system so that they would still receive notification of emergency situations that may affect them.

Mr. Maloney stated the address is ReadyNotifyPA.org. Mr. Maloney asked to what extent do the local emergency services interface with this; and Chief Coluzzi stated they send direct messages over the system. He stated they would not do this for a normal traffic delay; but if there is a significant delay, they would put this out.

Mr. Fedorchak stated they have established a link for this on the Township Website.

Mr. Zachary Rubin, 1661 Covington Road, stated he is the Chairperson of the CATV and Communications Council, and they will be exploring these types of access to the community. He stated they will invite the Chief to attend one of their meetings to explore this in more depth.

Mr. Simon asked if there is a tie-in with the School District for School closings, and Chief Coluzzi stated there is not.

AWARD CONTRACT FOR ELEVATION OF EXISTING HOUSE AT 1411 RIVER ROAD

Mr. Majewski stated the Township received six bids for the elevation of this house which is being funded by a Grant from the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program which will finance 75% of the eligible costs for the

home being elevated, and the property owner will be responsible for the remainder. He stated the bidder's qualifications have been reviewed and meet all requirements, and they would recommend award of the bid to the low bidder Sakoutis Builders & Land Developers, LLC.

Mr. Stainthorpe moved, Mr. Caiola seconded and it was unanimously carried to award the bid to Sakoutis Builders & Land Developers, LLC in the amount of \$128,000 subject to approval of PEMA and execution of a Reimbursement Agreement between the property owner and the Township.

ZONING HEARING BOARD MATTERS

With regard to the Deborah Doud, 1155 Colts Lane, Variance request to construct a 5' high fence in the front yard, it was agreed to leave the matter to the Zoning Hearing Board.

With regard to the Barry Rush, 6014 Thistlewood Drive, supplemental Appeal to a prior Appeal to the determination of the Zoning Officer regarding a Building Permit issued to convert a neighbor's existing attached garage into living space, Mr. Caiola moved, Mr. Stainthorpe seconded and it was unanimously carried that the Township oppose.

With regard to the Sherri Barnett, 395 Hidden Oaks Drive, Variance request to construct a 6' high fence within a 50' planted buffer yard, it was agreed that the Township should participate to make sure certain issues are addressed.

With regard to the Leshner matter, Appeal #09-1519, scheduled for August 18, 2009 for the property at 1117 Roelofs Road, request to house ten pet chickens on a .30 acre lot where five acres may be required if these are in fact livestock instead of pets, within 50' of the property line, it was agreed that the Township should participate.

SUPERVISORS' REPORTS

Mr. Caiola stated Economic Development will meet the end of August and there will be another meet and Greet in October. He stated the Historical Commission met last week and considered a number of items including the potential Designer House use of the Patterson Farm and discussion of the Veterans' Memorial. He noted the Bucks County Performing Arts Council recently held a successful fundraiser.

Mr. Simon stated he attended the Environmental Advisory Council meeting last week, and they reviewed the processes to consider some initiatives including becoming a Tree City USA.

Mr. Maloney stated the Golf Committee met recently and reviewed management company opportunities as the Contract expires the end of the year with Kemper. He stated they will have a Five Year Anniversary Celebration on July 22 and fees will be rolled back to the prices that were charged five years ago which were \$5 less than they are currently. He stated over 200 people have signed up to play that day. Mr. Fedorchak stated the morning is filled, but he feels there are a few opportunities for foursomes to play in the afternoon at 2:00 p.m. Mr. Maloney stated they will also host an event later in the month for organizations which host outings which is a three-hour training class on how to get the most out of your Outings by a professional in the industry, and all those who participate will receive a free round of golf. He stated they targeted a potential of 120, and over 75 have signed up. Mr. Maloney stated the next time the Board passes an Ordinance update, which he expects will take place in the next six months when he and Mr. Majewski will be bringing forward technical corrections, Farmland Preservation has requested that the Board amend the part of Ordinance that applies to farmland properties so that if there are any additional Farmland Preservation developments in the future, that buffers of a vegetative nature be eliminated as they have been a maintenance issue for them for the past twenty years.

Mr. Smith stated the Veterans Committee is working very hard to try to put together a design for Veterans Square, and are working to raise funds through a number of events. He stated Special Events is working on Community Pride Day to be held on Labor Day.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated the Park & Rec Board will be holding their Road Tour on Tuesday, July 21 and all Supervisors are invited. He stated there will be a joint meeting tomorrow between the Historic Commission and the Historical Architectural Review Board to review plans for the Veterans Memorial.

PUBLIC WORKS PRESENTATION LEAF AND RECYCLING PROGRAM

Mr. Hoffmeister, Public Works Director, was present with Donna Reardon, Public Works Department, to discuss the leaf and recycling program five year plan. He reviewed the history of the Township leaf pick-up program. He stated they currently do two rounds of leaf pick-up in the Township which takes a minimum of two and a half months. He stated since 1992 the Township has purchased all of its leaf machines with monies from the State Department of Environmental Protection through the Recycling Grant Program. He stated they currently have a fleet of seven machines and complement these with contractors. He stated in 2008 the last machine cost \$42,900, and the Township paid 10%. He stated they have been advised that in the future Grant monies will no longer be

available for those kinds of purposes. Mr. Stainthorpe asked why this is the case, and Mr. Hoffmeister stated Governor Rendell has cancelled this program as well as the Act 339 funds three to four years ago for all the sewer systems in the Commonwealth. He stated Governor Rendell has been systematically reducing funds for programs such as these.

Mr. Hoffmeister stated to keep pace with the increasing workload involved with the leaf pick-up program, the Township has hired contractors for twelve years; and they are now looking to increase this with one or two more contractors so that they can complete the rounds in the appointed time. He stated presently they use three contractors in addition to their own Township crews; and as the Township ages, there are more mature trees and they continue to have to pick up more and more leaves and will need additional crews. He stated to minimize the operation costs, they rely on temporary employees to do the ground work, with the Township employees driving the machines and supervising the crews. He stated on average they need 20 to 22 individuals to do this kind of work, and they staff the six to seven machines and have also provided temporary employees to some of the contractors to help out. He stated these employees are transported from site to site which is an expense in addition to their hourly wage. He stated they contract with two different temporary agencies.

Mr. Hoffmeister stated for the past thirty years, Lower Makefield Township has used the Patterson Farm for the leaf operation. He stated when Mr. and Mrs. Patterson were alive and operated the property, they agreed with Mr. Coyne to take on the leaves and to apply them. While this has been the primary disposal site, since 2005, with an average of 25,000 cubic yards of leaves collected in the Township, they have had to dispose of some of the leaves at other facilities as well. He stated if they were to do it with an outside recycling company, it could cost the Township \$30,000 to \$50,000 to have the leaves trucked out and used in compost or other leaf-recycling materials.

Mr. Maloney asked if the leaves do not have any commodity value to any of the entities, and Mr. Hoffmeister stated the leaves are not the wood product which makes the basis of mulch; and it costs the Township money to have it trucked out. He stated while the Township may get money for single-ground mulch, the costs for trucking are the same whether it is for hauling leaves or mulch.

Mr. Simon asked about the problems that would result if they did not remove the leaves and the Township was not involved in getting the leaves off the street and curbs. Mr. Hoffmeister stated the State does not allow burning of leaves and the residents and the Township do not want leaves laying at the curb adding this is a fire hazard. Mr. Simon stated he feels it is important for the residents to understand the importance of removing the leaves which is why the Township has made the investment it has in this process.

Mr. Maloney asked what other Townships do with their leaves, and Mr. Hoffmeister stated in Falls Township the leaves are picked up provided they are bagged in biodegradable bags and they are then taken to GROWS. He stated there are some Townships which do pick up leaves but on a more limited basis than Lower Makefield. He stated in other Townships, the residents' haulers take them and charge the residents.

Mr. Fedorchak asked Mr. Hoffmeister if the estimated \$30,000 charge includes the cost of transportation of 25,000 cubic yards of leaves from a storage site in Lower Makefield to a composting facility; and Mr. Hoffmeister stated he has had some discussions with one company, and this would involve the Township loading the leaves on the company's vehicles who would then transfer them out to another facility and charge the Township on a per cubic yard basis. Mr. Fedorchak stated a staging area would still be required in Lower Makefield, and Mr. Hoffmeister agreed.

Mr. Simon asked the number of calls they get from residents about the leaf pick up, and Ms. Reardon stated they typically get thirty to forty calls per day from residents. She stated she advises callers that they normally start leaf collection the first or second week in November and advises them to look at the Township Cable TV Channel or Website for the pick-up schedule. She stated the program is also weather dependent. She stated once they go through the whole Township once, they go back one more time. She stated if residents put their leaves out the day after the first collection, they do not go back until the second round of collecting.

Mr. Hoffmeister stated in the spring, he had discussions with Penn State Agricultural Extension Service about the impact of the leaves on the Patterson Farm which has had leaves applied to it for over thirty years; and the problem with applying partially decomposed leaves is that it starts to remove nutrients from the soil. He stated through his discussions with the Agricultural Extension Service, it was determined that for 2008 to 2010 that they should not apply the leaves to the soil at Patterson Farm; and the leaves need to be removed. He stated they have built a ramp at Patterson Farm so that they can load trucks and take the leaves away. He showed a map of areas in the Township where they placed leaves last year which never previously had leaves. He noted specifically the Black Farm. He stated they also used the Samost Tract and were able to get rid of them by putting them on top of loads of single-ground mulch or mixed them in with the mulch they will double-grind for the residents. Mr. Maloney asked how much of the 25,000 cubic yards they are able to mix in, and Mr. Hoffmeister stated they applied it two yards of mulch to one yard of leaves so they are not able to get rid of all the leaves through the mulch and got rid of most of them through trucking. He stated if they were to use it one to one, it would not be productive for landscaping use. He stated they typically get 10,000 to 15,000 yards of wood mulch through the course of a year so that the leaves exceed the wood mulch; and they have to get rid of the excess.

Mr. Hoffmeister noted they have stored leaves at Samost and Patterson Farm; and in the future they will store them as well at the Black Farm, and the Stackhouse and Bond properties on Dolington Road where it would enhance the soil by loosening it up since those properties have never had leaves. He stated it would be difficult to access the property near the Garden of Reflection for this purpose.

Mr. Maloney stated in the past there was concern about the Farmland Preservation properties as to who was paying for this and who is responsible for it; and he asked if there has been an agreement reached with the Farmland Preservation Corporation. Mr. Hoffmeister stated he does not have a problem taking the leaves to those properties, but he does not have the manpower nor should the Township take on the expense of spreading the leaves. He stated he has billed Farmland Preservation Corporation for transportation costs, but has yet to receive any monies for the Township. Mr. Maloney stated this matter needs to be addressed because the Farmland Preservation Corporation did not feel they had authorized anything other than accepting the leaves that needed to be dumped. He stated they did not feel they were responsible for the cost.

Mr. Hoffmeister stated in lieu of the leaf spreading for the next few years, they are looking to contract with a recycler and have had discussions with an individual about taking his trucks to Patterson Farm and either taking the leaves as a top dressing to the mulch or as a straight leaf load and the costs involved.

Mr. Hoffmeister showed a graph of cost estimates for the leaf collection and disposal over the next five years. He stated in 2009 they are charging \$40 to 9,204 households for leaf collection; and they anticipate the Board will approve a \$10 increase for next year and a \$10 increase in 2012. They also anticipate there will be more homes in Lower Makefield which results in a slight different in revenues. He stated they anticipate purchasing a leaf sub soiler which would take the partially-decomposed leaves and drill them into the soil and turn the soil over so that it would be assisting the soil as opposed to being put on the top and drawing the nutrients out. He stated they will also need to purchase a backhoe and a tractor to be used as a spreader as the one they have which was provided by the Pattersons has reached the point where it needs to be replaced. He stated they will also need another leaf machine and a new spreader in the future as the machines they have are also reaching their life expectancy. He stated these costs will have to be borne by the Township without any Grant money unless there is a change at the State level. He stated this year they are also looking to improve the leaf storage area at the Patterson Farm. He stated in 2011 the Township will have to look at expanding the facility and possibly combining with the recycling program.

Mr. Maloney noted the equipment purchases and stated in 2015 they are showing the need to purchase an \$850,000 tub grinder. Mr. Hoffmeister stated they use this two to three weeks at a time over a period of three to four months, and they have been able to maintain it so that hopefully it will last until at least 2015. He stated the problem they

have is when materials are brought in by residents and/or contractors it sometimes includes Belgian block curbing, cinderblocks, concrete curbing, steel mesh; etc, and these materials create down time when the machine is impacted and parts need to be replaced. He stated if this did not occur, the tub grinder could possibly last until 2025. Mr. Smith asked how this can be monitored to prevent contractors from doing this; and Mr. Hoffmeister stated it is not only contractors doing this and they recently had someone dump four mattresses. Mr. Hoffmeister stated there is a limit as to how many employees they can have available to monitor this and still do other work for Lower Makefield. He stated unless they have the ability to laser the truck loads, they cannot see what is inside the load. Mr. Maloney asked if they have considered use of cameras; and Mr. Hoffmeister stated he is looking into additional security items including cameras. Mr. Smith asked if they can do periodic inspections, and Mr. Hoffmeister stated while they could, they would need to have them dump the load, inspect it, and then push it into the pile after taking out any unwanted material. He stated he is not sure there is mechanism in place to then fine the contractor or resident. Mr. Simon asked about looking into the ability to sift the load and then determine if the cost of downtime and maintenance that is occurring because of the existing situation is more than it would cost to support that with personnel; and Mr. Hoffmeister stated he will discuss this with the security experts.

Mr. Maloney stated he feels the Board would be receptive on a cost perspective if they can justify that they are spending a certain amount on maintenance each year because of these problems. Mr. Simon stated he feels that whenever they consider a Budget expenditure or investment, they should consider what will provide the longest term solution to get equipment which will be as viable as possible for as long a possible or if there is an aftermarket for the equipment, that they make a determination as to when the equipment should be moved to get newer and better equipment that will last longer. He stated he also feels there should be a notification program to residents as to what is or is not acceptable which he feels would be a wise investment.

Mr. Maloney stated assuming the tub grinder does need to be replaced, the projection shows billing Capital Reserve and in 2014, they are only at approximately a \$250,000 reserve compared to an \$850,000 item. Mr. Fedorchak stated the Capital Reserve is actually approximately \$500,000. Mr. Hoffmeister stated in prior discussions they have looked at spreading the cost on a 25/75 basis so that the one operation would not bear the entire cost. Mr. Maloney asked what they will do about the other items that need to be replaced such as the leaf spreader and the tractor and asked if the projections include the salvage of the items they are replacing. Mr. Hoffmeister stated he did not include this, and for the leaf machine there may be something on municibid so that could offset the full bid somewhat. Mr. Maloney asked about the potential salvage value, and Mr. Hoffmeister stated the leaf machine could bring in \$10,000 but the tractor and spreader would not bring in that much.

Mr. Richard Johnson, Evergreen Road, stated he lives in West Acres which is one of the older developments of the Township. He stated he has lived there for twenty-two years and has never taken his leaves to the curb. He stated he mows the lawn with a piece of equipment that puts the leaves into the lawn and he feels his lawn is attractive. He stated he pays the leaf collection charge every year despite not putting out any leaves.

He suggested that the residents be responsible for their own leaf collection. He stated when the residents put their leaves up at the front of their properties, it gets into the drains; and this would not be a problem if people took care of this when they mowed their lawns. He stated many lawn mowers have a mulching feature.

Mr. Simon stated his concern with this is that there are some highly populated areas of the Township and the leaves could end up back in the street and create a safety hazard. He stated the expectation that individual residents will be that accountable is something that they need to consider. Mr. Johnson stated he feels most people mow their lawns or have a lawn service, and he feels this is something that could be done. He stated looking at Township finances and all that they have to do, he would prefer to see Public Works repairing pot holes and doing other projects rather than collecting leaves.

Mr. Smith stated he would also question if two pick ups are necessary in every portion of the Township; and Mr. Johnson stated there are trees which have leaves that come down early and trees which have leaves that come down late. Mr. Smith stated he does feel that in certain more mature areas of the Township two pick ups are needed. Mr. Hoffmeister stated the older areas of the Township do require more than the new areas, but they still get residents from new areas calling the Township to tell them have a pile of leaves out. He stated they typically have two pick ups, but they also have a third as a back up.

Mr. Simon asked if they are tracking the residents who are calling, and Ms. Reardon stated she tracks them on a daily basis. Mr. Simon stated it may be worth tracking to see who is calling for a third pick up because they did not put their leaves out in time; and they need to make sure that the notification process they are employing is reaching all the residents so that they do not have to go back into neighborhoods multiple times as there are costs associated with that. He stated if they find that even with suitable notification there are properties which require them to go back to a third time, they may want to consider an additional surcharge to that property owner. He suggested that they track this during the current year.

Mr. Maloney stated he does have the type of mower to which Mr. Johnson is referring, and he did try to mulch his leaves; but it did not work because of the number of leaves he had.

Mr. Zachary Rubin, 1661 Covington Road, stated he disagrees with Mr. Johnson. Mr. Rubin stated he lives in a condominium community and they pay for leaf removal and their streets are not dedicated and the Township does not come in and collect any of their leaves, yet he is still paying \$40 per year to the Township for leaf collection. He stated he is glad to pay it. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he feels that a number of years ago at Mr. Rubin's request, the Township stopped charging them the leaf collection fee. Mr. Fedorchak stated this is correct, and Mr. Rubin is not paying this fee.

Ms. Rebecca Cecchine, 9 Manor Lane, stated she is the Tax Collector and does get calls from people who have contractors taking their leaves and complaining that they are still being charged \$40 by the Township for leaf pick up. Ms. Cecchine stated her trash hauler is Allied Waste and they collect her leaves so that she is charged by both her trash hauler and the Township. She stated she feels the Township should do away with the leaf collection system and sell the assets. She stated no other Township is doing this, and she feels the trash haulers, who they are already paying, should take away the leaves. Mr. Smith asked Ms. Cecchine if she is aware what the other trash haulers charge for leaf collection; but Ms. Cecchine stated she did not know. She stated she receives constant calls from residents who are paying \$40 for the Township leaf collection, and they are not using the service. She also gets constant phone calls from people who are complaining about having to rake their leaves again because the wind blew their leaves into the street before they were collected. She stated there is a tremendous amount of labor devoted by the Public Works Department as well taking these phone calls. She stated she feels the Township should do away with this service.

Mr. Hoffmeister reviewed the recycling operation which takes place ten to twelve weeks a year using five employees each time – a grinder operator, a loader to push the material to the tub grinder, and three drivers to haul materials to the Samost Tract for storage. He stated the mulch is made from material that is dropped off by residents and contractors all of whom must first stop at the Public Works office to register their load providing their name, originating address, phone number, and type of material. He stated acceptable material for recycling includes grass clippings, wood (whole logs or chips), and brush or shrubs with no root ball. Sod, dirt, and pressure-treated and painted wood is not acceptable; however, there are contractors and residents who deposit items that are unacceptable. He stated to monitor this would require additional time to periodically check the loads or the yard for acceptable materials.

Mr. Smith asked why they allow the contractors to come to the Township as he feels they should be taking these items to a private dump where they pay for it and not cost the Township money by bringing it to the Township. Mr. Hoffmeister stated this is why in April the Board of Supervisors instituted the \$100 a month charge to contractors to drop off materials, and since then they have reduced the volume from contractors as well as the number of contractors who are bringing material to the Township. He stated last year they had 65 to 80 contractors coming in, and the Board of Supervisors agreed that there

would be a \$100 a month charge and a requirement for insurance certificates and licenses. He stated this has dropped down to fifteen to twenty contractors per month. He stated the trash haulers have indicated that the residents are putting items into bags for pick up such as oil and latex-based paints. Mr. Hoffmeister stated when they start grinding and want to keep moving, an item may damage the equipment and cause them to have to shut down for a number of days to repair the equipment. Mr. Smith asked if the \$100 fee is worth it in the long run as he does not feel it is worth it to allow contractors to come in. Mr. Hoffmeister stated if they are going to close the facility to the contractors, they may want to shut down the entire operation since the residents alone would not bring in enough material to keep a piece of equipment on site to operate at this expense at minimal times of the year. He stated they will not have the double-ground mulch available for the residents. He stated the contractors they have coming in bring in the bulk of the material that becomes the mulch.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated when they discussed this some years ago, it was decided that the contractors were to bring in only waste from the Township residents and there was discussion about an ID card; and Mr. Hoffmeister stated they have this. Mr. Stainthorpe stated they are not an open dump for contractors from anyplace and it is supposed to be only for contractors who are doing work for Township residents, and Mr. Hoffmeister agreed.

Mr. Smith stated if Allied Waste is already charging for this task perhaps other haulers are as well, and they could use the Township employees in other areas where they are needed and eliminate this service. Mr. Hoffmeister stated it is not the trash haulers that are coming in, but rather it is landscaping services and they have licenses and the insurance and are paying the fee to come in.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated he understands that this is a report on the five year projection as to what they might expect, and he does not feel they will be making any decisions this evening as to whether or not they should continue this program. He stated one of the options they may want to consider in the future is whether they want to continue this process. He stated he feels for \$40 a household, this is a good deal for the residents, but if the Township is going to be faced with purchasing an \$850,000 tub grinder with no Grant money available as well as the purchase of other pieces of equipment, the Board needs to decide if this is a service that the Township can afford to provide to the residents.

Mr. Simon stated he would caution that any service that the Township is providing to the residents will be valued by some portion of the residents and others will view this differently; and they must consider where they will draw the line. He stated they need to look at future costs, and he would encourage the Board to discuss this further and also to hear from the residents.

Mr. Maloney stated this also relates to site management issues. He stated they have sited the Samost Tract to be used for recreation fields. He stated Patterson Farm houses the bulk of the operation, and in the future they are going to either need more space on the Patterson Farm or move the operation elsewhere because the current footprint is not adequate long term. Mr. Hoffmeister agreed that they are going to need a larger facility than what they have currently. He stated if they were to use the area which was the former Water Company and clear approximately ten acres it would cost approximately \$60,000 and this does not include leveling, etc. so that it could cost \$200,000. He stated if they want to expand at Patterson Farm where they currently use two acres, there is some other acreage they could consider and there is a fence proposal for security which would cost approximately \$50,000. He stated he has not included costs for security cameras.

Mr. Smith stated if they eliminate this service, they would avoid 90% of the problems that they have discussed. Mr. Maloney stated Mr. Hoffmeister is providing options which is what is needed. Mr. Maloney stated when they discuss a single-site operation, assuming Samost is not available, they would need fifteen to twenty acres, and he stated he does not feel anyone's vision for Patterson Farm included 10% of the current tillable acreage being turned into a recycling site particularly between the two houses which is the most visible part of the Farm. Mr. Hoffmeister stated this is where the leaves are now. Mr. Maloney stated while this is true, two acres does not have the same visual impact as a fifteen acre operation would south of the Satterthwaite House. He stated from an aesthetic perspective, the only site that has ever been raised that makes sense is the Black Farm; however, it is not as accessible and the land is hilly and not really conducive to that type of operation although it is twenty-five acres of space which is not really being used currently and is out of sight. Mr. Hoffmeister stated it could be made accessible. Mr. Maloney stated there would still be a cost of approximately \$200,000 to make it a proper site, and Mr. Hoffmeister agreed.

Ms. Virginia Torbert asked if the leaves would be recycled if they are trucked away, and Mr. Hoffmeister stated the contractor would put them into their final product. Ms. Torbert stated she has not heard discussion of any of the environmental considerations adding that the original reason behind the leaf operation was that they were supposedly helping the environment which is why the Township got the Grant money. She stated if they are not going to get the Grant money and not going to spread the leaves, she feels they should consider doing away with the program. Ms. Torbert stated they discussed at the Patterson Farm Committee that if they are going to continue to have the leaves, they would need a composting facility; and they do not want a composting facility on the Patterson Farm. Mr. Maloney stated this is why they were considering the Black property as a place to compost although this does not address the financial implications.

Mr. Truelove stated in another Municipality for whom he does work where they have private haulers, they were required by DEP to participate in a leaf and yard waste recycling program; and the haulers have to take the materials to authorized composting facilities.

Mr. Maloney stated they will put this entire presentation on the Township Website, and asked that Mr. Hoffmeister review the options. Mr. Hoffmeister stated they can continue the program as is but at a nominal charge to the residents to either drop off either raw material and/or remove the finished products. Additional personnel will be needed to help the residents. He stated they could also continue to take the yard waste but contract with a recycler to operate the facility for the Township with a guaranteed amount of double or single-ground mulch available to the Township residents. He stated they could also join the leaf program under an umbrella with the recycling program in a contract that would be mutually-beneficial with the Township providing the raw material. He stated they could also consider doing the program with trash haulers, but they must still use the facility. He stated if they are going to do a Contract, the Township would have to bear some of the cost to provide an environmentally-ecologically sound “pad” for the storage areas.

Mr. Maloney stated the first option would be the closest to business as usual. The next option would be to outsource a part of the operation to a contractor but continue it basically as an in-house operation with the contractor running the operation. He stated in this case there would be roughly comparable costs in the cost of the operation itself as they would be taking the Public Works employees off of that project and putting them on other projects. He stated the next option would be an umbrella contract and contracting out to a recycler to do the work would involve someone coming in and taking the material away which would probably add the most cost to the operation.

Mr. Smith stated asked how much of the mulch is provided to contractors, how much to residents, and how much to non residents. Mr. Smith stated it seems that contractors are coming in and taking the Township mulch and then charging the residents. Ms. Reardon stated the only time they let contractors come in is if a resident calls and asks if their contractor can come over. She stated if it is only one or two loads, they do allow this. Mr. Smith asked if they keep a log as to how many loads have been provided to contractors, and Ms. Reardon stated she has not but she feels 90% goes to residents, and approximately 5% is provided to Churches and Schools. Mr. Smith asked how many goes to non-residents, and Ms. Reardon stated none that they know of although the area is not manned. Mr. Smith stated he would have a problem if a contractor came in and took the Township mulch and then charged the residents for the mulch; but Mr. Caiola stated he feels this would be difficult to police.

Mr. Maloney suggested that the Board of Supervisors review this and they can consider it further during the Budget process.

SIGN INVENTORY SOFTWARE/HARDWARE - AWARD OF CONTRACT

Mr. Hoffmeister stated they have committed to doing the sign program in house as it will save the Township money based on State and Federal mandates. He stated the computer software for the signs and the sign press has been delivered. He stated the sign cutters are on hold until the room is ready which he anticipates will be under construction next week. He stated they will start the garage door replacement the week of July 27.

Mr. Hoffmeister stated staff will be trained on the process and the software.

Mr. Maloney stated the sign program came in under \$10,000. He asked if they have contacted other Municipalities, and Mr. Hoffmeister stated while he has not yet, he will be taking care of this.

Mr. Stainthorpe moved, Mr. Caiola seconded and it was unanimously carried to award the Contract for the software to Softsmart.

GREEN BUILDING ORDINANCE DISCUSSION

Mr. Stainthorpe stated he does not feel it is good use of Township funds to spend money for the solicitor and engineer to prepare an Ordinance to regulate the Township when there are no future building plans, nor does he feel it is wise to tie the hands of a future Board when they do not know what the technology will be. He stated he is also concerned about the term, “sense of the Board,” and feels it would be better to take a vote on this.

Mr. Smith asked if Mr. Stainthorpe would have an issue if they had a Resolution as opposed to an Ordinance; and Mr. Stainthorpe stated he would not have a problem with a Resolution as there is not the same expense as with an Ordinance which has to be advertised and discussed at several meetings and involves the expense of the professional staff. He stated he questions the value to the citizens of spending money on this. He stated he is a proponent of green building and feels they should move forward with providing incentives to have people build in this way.

Mr. Caiola stated he would prefer putting this on hold and see what work has been done already by the solicitor and the engineer. Mr. Stainthorpe stated this would be fine since he feels since it has only been one meeting, they are probably not too far along.

Mr. Caiola stated by the August meeting he feels they will have an idea as to how much money has been expended. This was acceptable to all Board members.

Mr. Maloney stated when Mr. Bray and the EAC asked him whether he felt it should be an Ordinance or a Resolution, he stated he would be in favor of whatever the EAC and Planning Commission wanted to pursue and if a Resolution is more amenable to the Board, he would be content with that as well.

Ms. Torbert stated she feels Mr. Bray and the EAC should have an opportunity to address the Board on this, and Mr. Caiola stated they are putting this off until August so that they can determine how much has been spent. He stated they could also reach out to the EAC to see what their concerns are. He noted he had a discussion with a member of the Planning Commission who indicated that he was not in full support of an Ordinance either. He would prefer finding out what has been spent and at this point they are only putting this on hold.

Mr. Smith stated he feels the entire Board is in favor of green building, and they are only discussing how they are going to achieve this goal.

Ms. Torbert stated before they decide that they are not going to have an Ordinance she feels the EAC should be able to address the Board on this.

Mr. Simon stated he still feels that regardless of what a Committee thinks, the Board of Supervisors is responsible for making sound decisions on what is being brought before them. He stated at this point they only are discussing where they are at.

Ms. Torbert stated she agrees with Mr. Stainthorpe about the term, “sense of the Board.” Mr. Maloney stated any one of the Board members could individually ask Mr. Truelove to draft an Ordinance. Ms. Torbert stated she feels the perception by the average citizen is that it would be much clearer if there is a vote on a decision to move ahead to draft an Ordinance. Mr. Simon stated he does feel it is necessary to see something in its construct to understand what they are dealing with. Mr. Smith added that even if it were presented as a draft Ordinance, it is still subject to further discussion and draft Ordinances in the past have been modified once placed before the Board.

UPDATE ON BASEBALL FIELDS

Mr. Maloney stated he was advised that there were a number of drainage issues during the spring on the baseball fields, and he asked Mr. Majewski for an update on what could be done within the scope of the Budget. Mr. Majewski stated there was a significant amount of rain in June, but there are things that can be done to help the drainage on the fields at Stoddart. He stated a lot of water comes off the field where the mulch piles are located. Field 1, which is the field closest to Oxford Valley Road, is the driest but as you go down to Field 2 and Field 3 toward Mill Road they tend to get more water that comes from the mulch piles. He stated they have discussed carving a swale to divert the water

away from the field and direct it into the woods where there are existing drainage features. He stated they also discussed the fact that there is an existing swale that goes behind Field 1 and stops, and it is feasible to take that swale and carry it on between Fields 2 and 3 to take some of the water down to an existing storm drainage inlet with some minor grading. He stated the fields need maintenance every year, and they are looking into a different type of infield mix that will be better able to absorb more water. He stated they also want to better educate the volunteers from PAA in proper field maintenance procedures. He stated there was a significant amount of rain this spring; but they feel if they do these things he has identified, they will have more playable days.

Mr. Maloney stated he agrees they should have a set of guidelines for the volunteers who have generously donated their time to help with field maintenance, and hopefully they can get all of this implemented by the fall. Mr. Majewski stated he feels this is possible.

WEST FERRY ROAD TRAFFIC CALMING DISCUSSION

Mr. Maloney stated in the spring they were trying to work with different groups of citizens in the area trying to come up with solutions to the traffic problems that exist on West Ferry road. He stated they had set up a working group for the Citizens Traffic Commission to work with various stakeholders and selected representatives of the community to try to come up with some solutions. He stated they had a number of meetings in an attempt to move this forward to reach a consensus on a possible solution.

He stated there was one engineering solution which was left which was speed tables to be placed on West Ferry Road. He stated he and Mr. Fedorchak discussed the fact that when it involves a single neighborhood road, you would need consensus among those residents before they make changes to the road; and it was not clear how much consensus existed. A meeting was advertised for all the residents of that street which was held on July 13 to discuss the proposed last alternative from an engineering standpoint to see if the residents of that street alone were interested in that solution. Mr. Maloney stated out of fifty homes, they feel approximately 15 homes were represented at the meeting. Mr. Maloney stated he feels they would need a significant majority to support altering the road. He stated even if 51% supported the solution, it would mean that almost half would not be in favor of speed tables recognizing that the speed tables may be in front of those homes. Mr. Maloney stated based on the feedback he received on the meetings, he does not feel they have a majority of the residents on that street who are in favor of the solution. He stated they have spent close to one year and a good deal of money on this topic trying to reach a solution. He stated he feels this street is in need of a solution; but if the residents of the street are not in favor of the solution, he would recommend that the Board of Supervisors direct the Citizens Traffic Commission, Mr. Fedorchak, and the Township professionals to cease further work on this project; adding there would be an open-ended offer to the residents of the street to petition Mr. Fedorchak; and if, there is a significant

majority (thirty-five to forty of the fifty homes) who support the speed table solution which the engineer has identified is the last option, that the Township would open the matter back up. Mr. Maloney recommended that the Board vote that the project be put indefinitely on hold until they reach this critical mass of support.

Mr. Smith stated he would agree, and he would not want a petition to come back to put up a wall on the street which is one option he has heard. Mr. Maloney stated this is why he feels the acknowledgement to Mr. Fedorchak's office must be that a significant majority of residents on the street are in favor of the specific engineering solution that is left which is speed tables. Mr. Smith asked if the fifty homes includes Arborlea; and Mr. Maloney stated it is only West Ferry, and they were not able to get even just the residents on West Ferry to agree to a solution.

Mr. Caiola stated from the outset he does not know if they ever felt that there was a majority of residents on the street that wanted something done. He stated the Township has done a significant amount of work on this and sometimes no action is the action they have left to take. He does agree that they should curtail expending any further funds until they get a strong idea as to where the residents from this street are on this option. He stated this was an engineering decision and the engineers were paid to find the best decision for the Township, and he would not want to question their findings.

Mr. Caiola moved and Mr. Simon seconded that the West Ferry Road traffic calming matter be indefinitely tabled until a very significant majority of residents on West Ferry Road identify interest in speed tables as a solution.

Mr. Maloney stated there is no issue that the Board confronts from a policy perspective that ever affects a majority of the residents and it is always about little pockets of the Township and trying to make them better; and it is the Board's job to make sure that when they can they make every opportunity to do so. He stated he feels they have exhausted that attempt, and he would never hesitate to do it again as it is always in their best interest to try to find a resolution. He stated they have explored all the options including barricading the road which was not an option, turn restrictions which PennDOT would not accept in the form that the Township needed them to be manageable to the community, and the engineers have advised that the speed tables are the only option left.

Mr. Smith thanked Ms. Torbert for chairing the meetings.

Mr. Fedorchak stated at the meeting, they did promise the residents that they would send out the informational packet which was presented at the meeting to all the residents of West Ferry. He stated he was disappointed at the number of homes that were represented at the meeting that night as it was less than 50%. He stated he would still like to send out an informational packet that will provide a copy of the Minutes for the meeting that night and a summarization of the speed table proposal in a manner that will be easy to

understand by all the residents. Mr. Maloney asked that he also include in that packet that the Board has agreed that the Township office will be open to responses from those residents on the street, and Mr. Fedorchak agreed to provide his e-mail address in the information sent out.

Ms. Virginia Torbert stated she would have liked to have known that this matter was going to be discussed this evening. She stated they did advise the residents that they were going to send out packets and ask for their feedback. She stated she does not agree that the fact that a meeting that residents were given a few weeks notice of in the middle of the summer and the fact that only fifteen homes were represented is necessarily a sign that half are opposed to a particular proposal that the others did not know about. She stated she is astonished that the Board is considering this action.

Mr. Maloney stated even of the fifteen that showed up there was nowhere near a majority in support of this measure. Mr. Maloney stated if they considered the fifteen a representative sample, he does not feel 2/3 of fifty homes is what is needed to support putting speed tables on a residential street. Mr. Fedorchak stated he recalls that there were four to five residents at that meeting who were opposed to the proposal and out of the remaining ten, possibly two to three seemed to indicate that they were in favor of the speed tables and the rest seemed to want more information.

Mr. Maloney stated they are not “closing the book on the subject,” but they are indicating that the Township is not going to continue to spend money on professional services fees or continue to hold public meetings until they get to a point where they feel a significant majority are in favor of this. He stated they will still send out the information packet and provide everyone an opportunity to provide their feedback. He stated if a significant majority of the residents on the street indicate they are in favor of this, the Board will consider it further. He stated he does not feel this will happen; and until it happens, he is not willing to continue to spend money on this.

Ms. Torbert asked if they are stating they are not willing to survey the residents even after they told the residents that they were going to survey them. Mr. Maloney stated he feels this packet will do that; and they will indicate to the residents that if they support the project moving forward, they should contact Mr. Fedorchak, and he will refer this back to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Smith stated asked if Ms. Torbert feels the working group is any closer to coming up with an agreed upon solution; and Ms. Torbert stated the working group as currently constituted is not. Mr. Smith stated he agrees with Mr. Maloney, and that while the Board will revisit this, they cannot keep spending money on an issue which may not have a solution. Ms. Torbert stated one of the problems is the process which she would be willing to discuss privately. She stated in terms of this particular proposal which the Township has presented to the residents, she feels that the residents of West Ferry are

owed a survey on this particular proposal. She stated this option is not an option that the residents of West Ferry came up with, and it is an option that was presented to the residents of West Ferry as their only choice.

Mr. Caiola stated in Ewing township, 90% of the residents signed a petition, and speed humps were installed. He stated this is significantly different than what is happening in this case. Ms. Torbert stated there is only one option on the table. Mr. Caiola stated this is the option after many months of discussion. Ms. Torbert stated they have been meeting since March. Mr. Maloney stated the single option has been on the table that entire time, but Ms. Torbert disagreed. She stated it was only in the last few months. Mr. Maloney stated it has been a number of months, and they have not been able to build consensus. He stated while they may be able to build consensus, the residents need to do this on their time and not on the time of the Township traffic engineer and the Township staff. He stated if they come back with a 90% number, the Board would reopen the issue. He stated he does not feel the Township should continue to host public meetings to mediate disagreements among neighbors on the same street. Ms. Torbert stated she is not looking to host more meetings, but would like to officially survey the residents as they indicated they would do. Mr. Maloney stated when they send out a packet with an explanation of a proposal and ask if they are in support and would like it to move forward to contact the Township Manager, he feels this is a survey.

Mr. Smith stated the Board of Supervisors made sure that there was an inclusive study group but they have been unable to come to a consensus on a solution. Mr. Torbert stated this is because of the way the group was set up. Mr. Smith stated he feels it was set up very fairly since they were considerate of all the neighbors.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated they have had significant dialogue on this and they are not at a point where everyone will be happy, and he feels it is time for the Board to make a decision. He stated he does not feel it is prudent to spend more tax dollars since they have already spent a significant amount for engineers; and all Township residents have to pay for this and not just the people who live on West Ferry Road. He feels they have given this fair consideration, and he agrees with Mr. Maloney that they need to make a decision.

Mr. Koopersmith stated the Board has considered this in a meaningful way; and if they were to get sued, they would have met their burden and could defend their position.

Motion carried unanimously.

July 15, 2009

Board of Supervisors – page 24 of 24

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Maloney stated he will move the matter of appointment of Chairman of the Vacancy Board to the next Agenda.

There being no further business, Mr. Stainthorpe moved, Mr. Simon seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Greg Caiola, Secretary