

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MINUTES – APRIL 19, 2017

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on April 19, 2017. Ms. Tyler called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Those present:

Board of Supervisors: Kristin Tyler, Chair
David Fritchey, Vice Chair
John B. Lewis, Secretary
Judi Reiss, Treasurer
Jeff Benedetto, Supervisor

Others: David Truelove, Township Solicitor
Mark Eisold, Township Engineer
Kenneth Coluzzi, Chief of Police

Absent: Terry Fedorchak, Township Manager

PROCLAMATION DECLARING MAY 17, 2017 WORLD NEUROFIBROMATOSIS
AWARENESS DAY

Ms. Tyler stated Ms. Lara Mukabenov contacted her to raise awareness of a disease her family has been dealing with for some time. Ms. Mukabenov was present with her daughter, Altana, who has neurofibromatosis. Ms. Mukabenov discussed the disease. She thanked the Board for recognizing May 17 as World Neurofibromatosis Awareness Day, and Ms. Tyler read the Proclamation into the Record. Ms. Tyler noted all those present this evening in support of Altana.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Reiss stated an event will be held on Tuesday May 16 beginning at 7:30 p.m. at the Bucks County Community College featuring two men who prevailed during the Holocaust. Information on the event will be posted on the Township Website and TV Channel.

Ms. Tyler stated today the Township received a letter from FEMA which she read into the Record regarding the Township's Amended Floodplain Ordinance which brought the Township's Ordinance into compliance with the National Flood

Insurance Program. Ms. Tyler thanked Ms. Saylor, the Township engineer, and the Township Administration for making sure the Township had the proper Ordinance in place which FEMA has now recognized.

Ms. Tyler stated in connection with the Scudder Falls Bridge project, the Bridge Commission purchased a home at 1167 Woodside Road that was on the National Historic Register. The Township sent the Bridge Commission documentation and a letter hoping that they would not demolish the home, and in response the Township received a letter from the Bridge Commission which she read into the Record indicating that their intention is to pursue an adaptive reuse of the original property although not the 1940 addition. They requested that if the Township has additional information about the property particularly with regard to the Underground Railroad, that they forward it to their attention. Ms. Tyler stated she will pass this information onto the Chair of the Historic Commission and asked that Ms. Heinz provide additional information as well if she has anything additional.

Ms. Tyler asked Ms. Casey Shaeffer to address the Board, and Ms. Shaeffer announced that their Second Full Heart Kids Carnival will be held on Saturday, May 6 from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. in Chester Meadow on Lakeview Drive. She reviewed the activities to take place that day. She stated she started Full Heart in 2015 to promote community involvement by kids and to help raise funds to be donated to organizations. She thanked those helping her as well as her sponsors. She stated this Carnival will benefit A Soldier's Hands, an organization that provides skin care products for troops deployed overseas. She stated Full Heart activities raised \$500 for a Soldier's Hands in 2015, and they hope to top that in 2017. She stated those interested in learning more about Full Heart and the Kids Carnival can go to their Facebook page FullHeart.org or pick up a flyer available this evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Tim Ponento, a Junior at Pennsbury High School, stated his Second Annual 5K Fun Walk will be held on April 29, 2017 at 9 a.m. in Buttonwood Park, Yardley. He reviewed the activities to take place along with the Run. Ms. Tyler stated he is welcome to post his flyer on the Township bulletin board, and to put it on the Township Website. Mr. Ponento stated tickets can be purchased on their Website or at the event. He stated this Sunday there will be a fundraiser at Vince's Pizza which will donate 20% of the proceeds provided you show the paper flyer or an image of it on your phone.

Ms. Tyler commended the young people in the community for all they are doing.

Mr. John Heilferty, Naturalist at the Five Mile Woods, was present and stated he presented his annual update to the Park & Rec Board last evening; and Mr. Fritchey had asked him to speak to the Board of Supervisors this evening to share some information that he had shared with the Park & Rec Board. Mr. Heilferty stated Mr. Don Formigli was a former member of the Park & Rec Board and a Supervisor, and he was significantly involved in the effort that resulted in the preservation of the Five Mile Woods. He stated Mr. Formigli had a significant amount of information about the process of preserving the Woods, and he contracted with an author who is writing a book about the preservation of the Five Mile Woods. He has been working on the book with Mr. Formigli for almost a year, and Mr. Heilferty as well as some of the Friends of the Five Mile Woods, Ms. Helen Heinz, and Ms. Pat Miiller of the Historic Society have been helping as well. Mr. Heilferty stated the author is Mr. Peter Osbourne, and there will be a book signing at the David Library on Sunday, June 4 at 3 p.m. He stated the event is free, but you need to make a reservation on the David Library Website. Mr. Heilferty stated Mr. Osbourne will also be attending the Five Mile Woods fall Open House which will be the day after Harvest Day in September.

Mr. Fritchey asked that Mr. Heilferty discuss some of the other upcoming events to be held at the Five Mile Woods. Mr. Heilferty stated their spring Open House will be held this Sunday from 12 to 4:00 p.m.; and weather permitting, they will have tours as well as items on display in the Office. He stated they will have a talk about bats this summer which was a very successful event last year, and that date will be announced in the future. He stated they will also have a table at Harvest Day, with the fall Open House the day following Harvest Day.

Mr. Benedetto asked that Mr. Heilferty speak about the problems with emerald ash and what is being done at the Five Mile Woods. Mr. Heilferty stated the emerald ash borer is an insect that targets ash trees, and they do not have a significant number of ash trees in the Five Mile Woods. He stated they do monitor if there are dead or dying trees along the trails in the Woods; and if they experience emerald ash borer symptoms which they have not to date, if it were a tree that were not located along a trail, they not do anything about it as their management philosophy at the Five Mile Woods is often to let nature take its course. He stated in the Five Mile Woods dead and dying trees do provide a valuable habitat for certain species.

Mr. Jeff Hirko, 1450 Dolington Road, asked for an update on the Conservation Easement for the twenty-nine acre property on Oxford Valley Road; and Mr. Truelove stated he has started the dialogue with Mr. Jeff Marshall of the Heritage Conservancy and Ms. Lynn Bush from the County Planning Commission.

Mr. Hirko noted the Holocaust Remembrance is sponsored by Patterson Farm Preservation, and all of the donations will be going to Patterson Farm Preservation.

Ms. Sue Herman, Boxwood Drive, stated at a recent Board meeting there was an Agenda item regarding adding an access road and parking at Memorial Park, and she asked if they could describe the location of the road and the parking. She also asked if it is all within the Park or is it proposed to come out to adjacent neighborhoods. Ms. Tyler stated it is all within the Park. Mr. Eisold stated it will be internal to the Park and where you come up the main drive to the circle where the road goes off to the right, it will be extended to cross the small wetland area and go to the middle where the two farm fields are located to the right. He stated they are basically in conformance with the original Master Plan for the Park as to what was proposed for that side of the Park.

Mr. Mark Paroly, 221 Grant Way – Regency at Yardley, stated in the past they talked about an emergency road that would run from Matrix III into Regency; and based on the map he saw dated 2/24/17 it appears that will not occur and there will be an Easement, the grass will remain, and there will be no emergency roadbed. Mr. Eisold stated there will be an emergency road bed; but you will not notice it as it will be constructed with stone underneath to provide a stable base, and the surface will be grown over, and it will be marked so that emergency services know where it is. Normal cars will not be going through there. Mr. Eisold stated the Plan shows exactly what they are doing as there are a number of ways to stabilize a base.

Mr. Paroly stated the Plan also shows a crosswalk coming from the main entrance from the carriage homes across Big Oak into what will be Matrix III, and he asked when that will occur. Mr. Eisold stated it would be part of whatever project it is connected to, and he could check with Mr. Majewski on this. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels that would be a dangerous spot for a crosswalk since there is no light there.

Mr. Paroly stated he understood that Toll Bros. was going to present the results of their testing, and this was postponed. Ms. Tyler stated the Township Manager was the one who was most involved in this; and since he is not present this evening, it will be on the next Agenda. Ms. Tyler stated they will continue to advocate to get the test results, and she imagines they will be here when the matter is on the Agenda.

Ms. Kathleen Hirko, 1450 Dolington Road, stated with regard to the road in Memorial Park, she was under the impression that it was on hold. Ms. Tyler stated it is part of the Plans that were approved by Park & Rec, and it has not been placed back on the Agenda at this time as there are other items the Board of Supervisors is dealing with at this time. She stated she feels it will appear back on the Agenda some time in the summer. Mr. Benedetto stated there is a Grant available, and Mr. Fritchey stated the Grant has been submitted. Ms. Hirko asked if they have to build the road in that exact location as a number of residents are concerned about how close the road will be to the 9/11 Memorial. Ms. Reiss stated she has looked at

the site, and she feels where they are proposing it there is buffering. She stated when they have events at the Memorial, there is not sufficient parking. Ms. Reiss stated they want to make sure that they keep the Garden well buffered. Ms. Hirko asked if it has to go in that location since that area is being farmed. Mr. Fritchey stated it was always intended that it would be park land, and it was just being farmed in the meantime; and the intention was never that it would become farmland.

Mr. Benedetto asked the amount of the Grant, and Mr. Eisold stated it is a \$500,000 matching Grant, so \$250,000 would be the match from the Township. Mr. Benedetto asked if they could match it with the value of the land; however, Mr. Eisold stated although they could, the cost for the package they were submitting was \$500,000 and he reviewed the items to be constructed including tennis courts, bocce courts, horseshoes, a pavilion, and an extended walking trail with exercise equipment. Mr. Benedetto asked if the Board budgeted \$250,000 for 2017 for that specific project, and Mr. Fritchey stated he believes they budgeted \$400,000 improvements to Memorial Park for this calendar year; and the thought was other items would be completed in 2018.

Ms. Hirko asked if there is a need for bocce courts. Ms. Tyler stated Park & Rec has discussed this for a long time, and the Board has their recommendation. She stated it is part of the Comprehensive Master Plan to build out that Park. Mr. Lewis stated there are a number of people who have been asking for tennis courts for years, and Mr. Fritchey stated they are part of this Plan.

Ms. Julie Macguire, 2000 Makefield Road, stated she lives across from the Makefield Elementary School on the corner of E. School Lane and Makefield Road. She stated while there is a crossing guard there to assist them during School hours, there are other times when they need to cross the road; and they run into major issues trying to cross Makefield Road. She stated Makefield Road is marked as 35 miles per hour; however, when you Google Lower Makefield speed limits by street, Makefield Road is shown as 25 miles per hour for the entire length of the road. She asked that they have Makefield Road completely re-signed with the proper speed limit of 25. She also asked that they consider installing additional lighting that flashes possibly with a button when a pedestrian wants to cross. She stated there are night events at the School with people trying to cross Makefield Road, and there have been some close calls.

Mr. Benedetto stated this issue has been brought up previously by residents, and there was discussion about E. School Lane having speed bumps installed. Ms. Macguire stated E. School Lane is used as a cut through, and this is a different problem. Mr. Benedetto stated at that time a resident did indicate that if you do a to be posted at 35 miles per hour. Ms. Macguire stated all the other Schools in the

Township have a 25 mile per hour speed limit in front of them. Chief Coluzzi stated they will look into the discrepancy between the two different speed limits and will look at signage and lighting. He stated he will contact Ms. Macguire tomorrow to see how this can be resolved.

Mr. Ken Boyle, 1686 Barnswallow Road, stated he is a representative of Bike Bucks County which is an advocacy group looking to improve bicycle/pedestrian trail facilities across the County. He discussed the Circuit which is a nine-County regional effort with a planned trail network which has been planned out by the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission and endorsed by the County Commissioners, and is an on-going effort. He stated they are going to each of the Municipalities in Bucks County asking them to consider a non-binding Resolution in support of building out the Circuit over the next ten to twenty years. Mr. Boyle stated he has a draft Resolution which he can leave for their consideration. Ms. Tyler asked that he e-mail it to the Township Manager.

Ms. Tyler asked Mr. Boyle if he has any concept of where it would be in Lower Makefield Township, and asked if he could provide a map etc. showing that; and Mr. Boyle agreed to do that. Mr. Lewis stated in the Township's Agreement with the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, the Township agreed to build the remainder of the bike path down Woodside to connect with the towpath, and the Bridge Commission will build up; and that would connect the northern part of the Township and all the bike trails therein. Mr. Lewis stated that would get you almost to the 9/11 Memorial. Mr. Lewis stated this evening they are also considering the Award of the 2017 Road Paving Project which includes Bid Alternates for the repair and expansion of bike paths. Ms. Reiss stated they also want to get connections in the southern part of the Township where there are places with bike paths that are starting and stopping.

Ms. Tyler asked that Mr. Boyle provide the information discussed to the Township Manager, and they could put this on the May 3 Agenda.

Mr. Boyle asked that the Board of Supervisors consider creating a Bike and Hike Committee for the Township. Mr. Fritchey stated that could be done as a Sub-Committee of Park & Rec. Mr. Boyle stated there is money available through Grants to expand the trail network, and there are Municipalities in Bucks County getting millions of dollars every year. Mr. Fritchey stated he feels there is considerable sympathy on the part of the Board and the Township Administration for bike paths and walking trails and connecting them. He stated the challenge is because of the way the Township developed historically there are individual properties that never had sidewalks before they ever talked about bike paths, and completion of the Township Bike Trail Master Plan would require substantial exercise of eminent domain. Mr. Boyle stated he feels there are ways to work through that.

Mr. Boyle stated the laws in Pennsylvania are also changing regarding on-road bike facilities which could provide some flexibility in the completion of the trails.

Mr. Benedetto stated he feels they could coordinate with Newtown Township connecting their southern end with the northern end of Lower Makefield.

Mr. Boyle stated Newtown is very well organized in this regard, and they published a map in August. Mr. Benedetto asked that Mr. Boyle provide them with a copy, and Mr. Boyle agreed to do so.

Ms. Tyler asked that Mr. Boyle provide the information requested to Mr. Fedorchak and suggested he attend a Park & Rec meeting where he could propose the idea of a Sub-Committee on the trails.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 5, 2017 PUBLIC MEETING

Mr. Lewis moved, Mr. Benedetto seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of April 5, 2017 as written.

APPROVAL OF MARCH 20, 2017, APRIL 3, 2017, AND APRIL 17, 2017 WARRANT LISTS AND MARCH, 2017 PAYROLL

Mr. Fritchey moved, Mr. Lewis seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the March 20, 2017, April 3, 2017, and April 17, 2017 Warrant Lists and March, 2017 Payroll as attached to the Minutes.

DISCUSSION AND MOTION ON SANDY RUN ROAD

Mr. Phil Wursta, Township traffic engineer, was present. Ms. Tyler stated Sandy Run Road has been closed, and the Board of Supervisors is trying to determine what they can do about this. She stated the Township has engaged two traffic engineers to provide advice. Mr. Wursta stated this evening he plans to provide information on the closure of Sandy Run Road at Edgewood Road, a broad analysis of the problem, potential solutions and a broad analysis of over twenty-five alternatives, and viable solutions of those potential alternatives. He provided a copy of the power point presentation being shown this evening as well as additional information including maps.

Mr. Wursta stated based upon changes to the profile of Edgewood Road, sight distance for Sandy Run Road users has significantly decreased. He stated the worst case is for vehicles turning left from eastbound Edgewood Road to Sandy Run Road

where the sight distance is 167' which is considered acceptable for vehicle speeds up to 20 miles per hour. Mr. Wursta stated the current posted speed in the vicinity of Sandy Run Road is 25 miles per hour and increases to 40 miles per hour west of the bridge over Brock Creek. Mr. Wursta stated Lower Makefield conducted a speed study at Sandy Run road to identify the 85th percentile speed, and found it to be 39 miles per hour in both directions. Mr. Wursta stated his firm did a speed study to verify that number, and they came up with a speed of 36 miles per hour.

Mr. Wursta stated the speed is based upon the restriction of vehicles on Edgewood Road and their ability to see people turning onto Sandy Run and for vehicles that are waiting to turn from Edgewood onto Sandy Run who need to see vehicles coming over the hump to be able to safely make a turn. Mr. Wursta stated to the right there is not a sight distance issue, but to the left coming over the Railroad tracks going westbound for people to make a safe turn onto Sandy Run they must go no more than 20 miles per hour. Mr. Wursta stated the speeds they documented that are happening now are between 36 miles per hour and 39 miles per hour.

Mr. Wursta stated the sight distance in question is as you exit Sandy Run looking to the left in order to be able to safely make a right or left-hand turn from Sandy Run onto Edgewood, and for vehicles waiting and stopping on Edgewood to safely make a left onto Sandy Run while encountering a vehicle coming westbound over the hump toward Sandy Run Road so there are three sets of sight distances. He stated the worst case scenario is for left turning vehicles on Edgewood waiting to make a left onto Sandy Run making sure they can see a car coming over the Railroad tracks, and in order to meet the present sight distance those vehicles have to be traveling 20 miles per hour on Edgewood. He stated if they are going faster, there is not enough sight distance to be able to safely stop. He stated this is the reason why the road was closed because that sight distance is not there.

Mr. Wursta stated they had to determine the existing speeds and what remedies they could do to be able to re-open Sandy Run Road.

Mr. Wursta showed a slide of the Sight Line Profiles, adding that blow-ups were included in the Board's packets. He stated it measures the sight distance based upon the driver's eye connection with the driver's eye coming at you as you look from Sandy Run to Edgewood either turning left or right from Sandy Run and Edgewood or from Edgewood onto Sandy Run making a left turn. Mr. Wursta stated their initial site visit confirmed the sight distance, and they coordinated with PennDOT and the Township with regard to the closure of the roadway. He stated PennDOT was involved because it is their bridge, and they were detouring onto a PennDOT road for a small section.

Mr. Wursta stated they collected information from the design engineer and analyzed all the problems they could determine to create solutions. Mr. Benedetto asked who was the design engineer, and Mr. Wursta stated it was Boucher & James.

Mr. Wursta stated they reviewed the conditions prior to Edgewood Road being reconstructed, the current location of Sandy Run Road, they reviewed proposed relocation options moving the road west 100', moving the road west 114', moving the road west 140', and moving the road east back up the hill 90'. He stated all of those options have varying speed criteria to make them work.

Mr. Wursta stated prior to the third rail construction speed and crash history are unknown. Mr. Benedetto asked how that is possible. Mr. Wursta stated they did not have speed/crash history to review. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels the Police Department would have that information; and Chief Coluzzi stated they have some accident history over the last ten years, and they attribute fourteen total accidents over the last ten years at the intersection of Edgewood and Sandy Run Roads, but they would have to go into each accident and read the summary as to how it occurred. Chief Coluzzi stated as far as speeds prior to that, he does not recall the Police Department doing a speed survey on Edgewood Road at that location. Chief Coluzzi stated the road has not always been 25 miles per hour, and it was 40 miles per hour when the Township took it over around 2001 or 2002.

Mr. Wursta stated he looked at over twenty-five alternatives. He stated they always look at a base condition which is doing nothing and they found the speed criteria is not met, there could be a potential increase in major injuries, and there would be significant liability. He stated this is the reason they closed the road.

Mr. Wursta stated he looked at traffic calming including putting in speed humps for westbound traffic, but that did not meet the speed criteria; and while it would cause significant reduction in major injury type angle crashes, it did not improve the sight distance even if the speeds were reduced to 25 miles per hour with a speed hump.

Mr. Wursta stated they considered intersection advisory signage with may reduce existing running speeds, but it still does not provide any sight distance relief and will not eliminate the chance of high-speed angle crashes.

Mr. Wursta stated they looked at putting up warning lights for the vehicle approaches, and while it may reduce running speed, it does not impact the sight distance. He stated any electronic devices like this would be subject to PennDOT approval.

Mr. Wursta stated they considered putting in a chicane which is a weave in the road either done by a median or by a series of curves, and that would reduce existing running speeds, but it would reduce existing shoulder width and does not provide any sight distance relief for 25 miles per hour.

Mr. Wursta stated he considered removing the intersection and creating a cul-de-sac which would completely eliminate the sight distance issue and potential crash issues. He stated since it would be closed, this would provide the safest improvement to the intersection. He stated it would reduce mobility, there would be an access issue for the two parcels on the corner, and there is an existing utility line that would have to be maintained. This option would also increase traffic on nearby roads.

Mr. Wursta stated a number of options were recommended by the staff and residents, and they looked into those options as well. Mr. Wursta stated for each of the alternatives, they have additional data for review if that is the desire of the Board.

Mr. Wursta stated another alternative was to realign Sandy Run Road to intersect with Schuyler; and this would eliminate the intersection issue but it would still create a cul-de-sac at the very end of Sandy Run Road out at Edgewood, and it would require a new stream crossing that would be a bridge, as well as a new roadway through open space. He stated this would also increase the traffic on Schuyler Drive. He stated they would also have to evaluate the traffic at Edgewood and Schuyler with regard to a traffic signal.

Mr. Wursta stated another alternative was realigning Sandy Run Road 100' west which would increase the sight distance to a minimally acceptable level for the posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour. He stated it would not accommodate the running speed of the existing traffic, and what they are looking for are improvements that would handle speeds of 36 to 39 miles per hour. He stated this alternative would involve the removal of a wooded lot, right-of-way acquisition, and most likely NPDES Permit and stormwater mitigation.

Mr. Wursta stated another alternative was relocating the road 114' west, and this would meet the 25 mile per hour intersection design criteria and the 36 miles per hour safe stopping distance criteria. He stated it increases sight distance to the minimum required for the existing running speed. He stated it would require wooded lot removal, would need a 4' to 8' retaining wall along the 100 year floodplain, would require right-of-way acquisition, and most likely require an NPDES Permit and a FEMA Map revision. He stated the intersection sight distance looking left is 33 miles per hour, and they would need to raise the Edgewood Road and Sandy Run intersection about 3.2' to 3.5'. Ms. Tyler asked if raising the road

would solve the sight distance; and Mr. Wursta stated this alternative would only allow for a 25 mile per hour intersection sight distance approval. He stated it meets the safe stopping sight distance, but the intersection sight distance has a stricter criteria. He stated safe stopping sight distance is the sight distance you need to avoid something that is in the road.

Mr. Wursta stated Alternative 5C is to realign Sandy Run Road 140' west on Edgewood Road. He stated this achieves all the minimum intersection safe stopping distance for the existing speeds; however, it would require a wooded lot removal, unavoidable impact to the floodplain, right-of-way acquisition, and most likely an NPDES Permit. Ms. Reiss stated when they move it 140' west, they would be closer to Schuyler, and Mr. Wursta agreed as well as closer to the bridge. Ms. Reiss stated she is concerned with someone turning left out of Schuyler and someone turning right out of Sandy Run. Mr. Wursta stated they are not recommending this option; however, there is enough distance between Schuyler and the sight distance is acceptable over the bridge.

Mr. Wursta stated Option 5D involves realigning Sandy Run Road 114' west on Edgewood Road and raising Edgewood Road 3.25'. He stated this would achieve all the minimum sight distance requirements, but it would require bridge replacement associated with reprofiling the road, right-of-way acquisition, impact to the floodplain, and Permit involvement so it is not a practical solution. Mr. Wursta stated it had been asked why they could not do certain things, so they looked at all these options but rejected some. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels this option could be done, and he asked if it was the cost why they rejected it; and Mr. Wursta agreed the cost was a factor. He stated they could build a bridge over the Schuyler Drive and solve the problem, but it would cost \$3 million for a bridge. He stated they felt the cost/benefit for this option made it impractical.

Mr. Wursta stated they felt Alternative 5E was a viable alternative, and it moves Sandy Run Road 114' west on Edgewood but that in itself would not meet the speed requirements for sight distance. He stated for this one if they could get the speeds down to 33 miles per hour, it would be viable. He stated they are recommending traffic calming in the form of a temporary chicane which should reduce the speed from 36 miles per hour to 33 miles per hour; and if that is successful, it would allow them to move the road 114'. Ms. Reiss stated they would also have to add in the cost of a permanent chicane. Mr. Wursta stated they would add a temporary chicane, a permanent chicane, and they would still be subject to all the Permitting. He stated the costs and timeframes that they have provided are conservative. He stated during the midst of the design if this was an option they wanted to proceed with, a lot of elements of value engineering would be in play.

He stated if they could keep the disturbance to the area less than an acre, they may be able to avoid getting an NPDES Permit, and the construction could move along in a shorter period of time which would help with design and construction costs. Mr. Fritchey asked assuming they were to consider this a viable option what timeframe would they be considering since there seems to be a lot of Permitting and approval required. Mr. Wursta stated the bridge and guiderails are owned by PennDOT so they would have a say in this, and he would ask them to do a design review of whatever is done. Mr. Wursta stated he feels the timeframe would be one to two years. Mr. Fritchey stated it appears that construction would probably take place in 2019, and Mr. Wursta agreed. Mr. Fritchey asked if this Alternative would necessitate the closing of Edgewood Road for a period of time, and Mr. Wursta stated they would not know until they see what the construction would look like and the construction phasing, although he does not believe they would have to close the road; and anything they did would probably involve lane closures although they cannot be sure until they get soil analysis, etc., but they would try to keep at least one lane open.

Mr. Wursta stated Alternate 5F is essentially the same as 5E except that is a more optimal solution if the temporary traffic calming in front of the Township Building brings traffic down to 31 miles per hour. He stated if that is the case, they would reduce the costs fairly significantly, and they would not need the road to be as long. He stated 5F increases the sight distance, but it still involves the wooded lot removal. He stated the floodplain would be taken out of the equation as would the retaining wall if they can move the road 100' versus 114'.

Mr. Benedetto stated 5F would be \$240,000 less than 5E with the speed for 5F being 31 miles per hour versus 33 miles per hour. He stated they are talking about a difference of \$270,000 since the speed is critical. He stated currently the speed is 36, and if they reduce it 3 miles per hour, they could do 5E as an alternative. He stated with 5F they would have to reduce it 5 miles per hour which would be difficult. He stated if they do not reduce the speed the Township is holding themselves as potentially being liable since they are opening up a road where they know speeds are going in excess of the safe sight distance, and Mr. Wursta agreed.

Mr. Wursta stated Option 6 was realigning 90'. He stated Alternative 7 was installing a roundabout, and PennDOT demands that they consider this on all of their projects. He stated they felt that this would be impractical in this case.

Mr. Wursta stated Alternative 8 was installing a three-way stop; and this would eliminate sight visibility issues for Sandy Run Road only, but it did not provide westbound approach safe stopping sight distance. He stated this would require advanced signing which may blend in with advance railroad crossing signage and possibly not be allowed. He stated this also forces vehicles to stop on a 10%

downgrade which is undesirable, and it assumes that they would meet Warrants for a multi-way stop. He stated there are also a lot of additional criteria associated with this that would cause difficulty.

Mr. Wursta stated Alternative 9A is the installation of a traffic signal which would cause significant delays on Edgewood Road. He stated it would be a split-phase traffic signal which means that each leg of Edgewood Road would have to go separately, and Railroad preemption would have to occur so it would have to be tied into the Railroad tracks. He stated a traffic signal alone would not eliminate the sight distance issue because traffic along eastbound Edgewood making a left turn onto Sandy Run would be unprotected. He stated it is very unlikely that this would meet traffic signal Warrants.

Mr. Benedetto stated a number of people have indicated that they feel installing a traffic signal would be the easiest solution, and he asked if the biggest problem is that the signal Warrants would be unlikely to be met. Mr. Wursta stated Sandy Run compared to other roads is a very lightly traveled road. He stated Edgewood Road has approximately 6,000 cars on it a day, and Sandy Run Road has approximately 1,200 cars a day. He stated PennDOT's criteria for Warrants is that you would need approximately 100 cars an hour coming out of Sandy Run Road. He stated Schuyler carries much more traffic than Sandy Run, and there is no traffic signal there. Mr. Wursta stated another issue associated with the traffic signal is that they would have unprotected left turns.

Mr. Wursta noted Alternates 9B is a traffic signal with a 50' left turn lane and 9C would have a 75' left turn lane which would require 280' of road widening.

Mr. Wursta stated Alternate 10A would prohibit left turns into and out of Sandy Run Road and while that would eliminate most of the severe crashes, it would reduce mobility, would be difficult to enforce without the construction of an island, and would have substandard sight distance for southbound right turns. Alternate 10B would be construction of a right in-right-out island on Sandy Run Road but that would not help the sight distance looking left.

Mr. Wursta stated Alternative 11A is to raise Edgewood Road three feet which would require grading within the 100-year floodplain and involve a detour of Edgewood Road for construction, and it only provides the minimum sight distance. He stated it would not meet the speed criteria for 36 miles per hour, but it would for 25 miles per hour. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels this option makes sense. He stated it would be \$500,000 to raise the road. He stated it would take one year, but the detour is a non-factor because they will have an issue with Edgewood Road during any construction. Mr. Wursta stated it meets intersection sight distance criteria for 25 miles per hour and the safe stopping distance for 36 miles per hour, but it does

not meet the intersection sight distance requirement for 36 miles per hour. He stated it would meet two out of three of the criteria they are looking at. Mr. Wursta stated his concern with recommending something that does not meet all the criteria is that they are building something brand new; and if they are building something brand new for him or anyone else to seal it, it has to be done according to the current standards. He stated it is critical that they get the speed reduction as low as they can with some kind of traffic calming above the tracks.

Ms. Reiss stated Alternative 11B is similar but they are raising it five feet, and then they need a new bridge; and Mr. Wursta agreed.

Mr. Wursta stated 11C is to lower the hump; and while there would be less construction impact, it would require coordination with the Railroad, involve re-construction of Edgewood, and a detour of Edgewood would be required. He stated this is not a huge cost, but the time to complete would probably be significant.

Mr. Wursta stated 11D is removing the profile hump 5' and many of these raising and lowering of the hump options involve putting it back the way it was. He stated the sight distance they had previously was not an acceptable sight distance to begin with. He stated the original sight distance was 218' and the current condition is 165'. Ms. Tyler asked what is meant by original sight condition, and Mr. Wursta stated they previously had 218' which was good for 29 miles per hour; but they know that is not the speed being traveled.

Mr. Wursta stated they feel that a viable solution is 2D which is to add traffic calming which would be a type of chicane located east of the railroad tracks, and he showed pictures of what a chicane could look like. He stated another viable option would be 3 which is removing the intersection and constructing a cul-de-sac. Another viable option is 5E which is the realignment of Sandy Run 114' west on Edgewood Road that involves acceptable speed reduction, and the last is 5F realigning 100' west on Edgewood Road and again acceptable speed reduction would be necessary.

Slides were shown of what temporary and permanent chicanes may look like. He stated for the temporary chicane he showed a portable curb that would be in place; and they would suggest putting it in temporarily to see if they can get the speeds reduced. He stated they would look to get the speeds reduced to an acceptable mile per hour which would be 31 or 33 miles per hour. He stated 31 miles per hour would allow them to move the road 100' and 33 would allow them to move it 114'. Mr. Wursta stated if this were an approved plan, it would have to be made into a permanent traffic-calming situation, and he showed slides of what that could look like.

He stated they had good reviews on one in Delaware and they saw a speed reduction of 17% on that road. He stated they feel they have a good chance of reducing the speed by doing something like this. He stated the cost for the temporary chicane would be approximately \$20,000.

Mr. Wursta showed slides of what the cul-de-sacs could look like. He stated this would be an extension of what is happening now but it would be permanent. He stated the cul-de-sac would be the most appropriate from a safety standpoint.

Ms. Reiss stated there are traffic lights at Oxford Valley and Big Oak, and she asked Chief Coluzzi how many people are going through the lights or having accidents there. Chief Coluzzi stated they do have a problem with people running lights at all signalized intersections, and the problem with a signalized intersection is that you cannot guarantee that everyone will obey it. He stated if you put in a signalized intersection, and you have a safety issue beyond that intersection, it would not solve the problem.

Ms. Amy Kaminski, Gilmore & Associates, was present this evening. Ms. Tyler stated Ms. Kaminski has reviewed Mr. Wursta's recommendations. Ms. Kaminski stated she agrees with a lot of the analysis that was put together, but she did find out that chicanes should not be constructed on roads with over 3,500 vehicles per day; and this particular road has 6,000 so it is probably not a good idea to construct a chicane on this road. She stated there are other traffic-calming elements that could be used and she described speed tables which comes up approximately 6", flatten out to 10", and then drops back down for 6". She stated it is also a raised pedestrian crosswalk so they could install something out front of the Township Building leading to the park if this was something they were interested in. She stated one of her concerns about relying on traffic-calming to reduce the speed on the road is that you know that there is a 15% non-compliance so they would be knowingly constructing something that they know 15% of the time, they would not be meeting the safe stopping distance criteria. She stated even if traffic calming would work for the next six months, driver behaviors could change as they get used to this method; and once they construct it, they could end up with a situation where crashes could increase.

Ms. Kaminski stated she would be interested in looking at the historical crash records since that could provide insight into whether they had a problem previously at this intersection. Mr. Benedetto stated people driving 50 miles per hour is a problem that existed before any work was done in that area. Ms. Kaminski stated in this situation they know that there is a safety issue they are concerned about, and she does not feel traffic calming would be appropriate at this location although it may be appropriate in some other situation.

Ms. Kaminski stated with regard to traffic signalization the minimum Warrants for a major road range from 800 to 1,000 depending on the type of road. She stated they do not meet that for this road. She stated she looked at the traffic counts that were available from the DVRPC, and she has counts from 2013 at the bridge and in front of the Township Building. She stated PennDOT obtained another count in 2016 in front of the Township Building. She stated it looks like there volumes are less over time as in 2013, there was a peak volume; and in 2016 it went down approximately 1,400. She stated when traffic count information was taken from the Police Department, it dropped another 600 vehicles in the six-month period. She stated this tells her that there is the potential that some of that traffic could have been associated with Sandy Run Road coming out of that intersection.

Ms. Kaminski stated she has put together a proposal, and she provided this information to the Board this evening. Ms. Kaminski noted Page 6 which shows her proposal to go to an all-way stop with flashers at the intersection. She stated she would suggest advance signage with flashers to warn motorists as they are approaching that there is a stop sign ahead, and she would further recommend a sign stating “New Traffic Pattern Ahead” for a period of three to six months to alert motorists that there is a change in the operation of the intersection. She stated she feels it would also be helpful to have a sign “Do Not Stop on Tracks” posted on either side of the Railroad tracks.

Ms. Kaminski stated in order to resolve the problem they either have to improve the sight lines by either lowering or raising the road or they need to completely eliminate the need for sight lines which would be installing a traffic signal, shutting off the road, or going another way. She stated with her proposal, it would not require sight lines since everybody will be stopping at the intersection. Ms. Reiss stated she is assuming that drivers would be stopping, and Ms. Kaminski agreed adding that this would be the situation at any intersection. She stated there are many all-way stops. She stated this road is posted 25 miles per hour, and she has proposed advance signing at the locations she has identified. She stated she has run the capacity analysis at the intersection to make sure the westbound stop will not spill over to the Railroad tracks, and it does not. She stated she used the traffic volumes from 2013 when the traffic was at its peak even though it has been coming down incrementally.

Mr. Wursta stated he does not agree with Ms. Kaminski’s proposal. He stated they would be making people stop on a 10% downgrade from the Railroad tracks down toward Sandy Run which he does not feel is a good idea. He stated this proposal would also reduce the safe stopping sight distance for the speeds being traveled, and you could have someone coming over the hill and encountering a car unexpectedly. He stated just because they put up a “Stop Ahead” sign that does not mean the people are going to slow down. He stated this proposal will create a sight distance issue by stopping on the decline which is the hardest part to stop when you

are going downhill as opposed to a flat area. He stated he also feels the red flashers would also interfere with the grade crossing and the gates and the red flashers when a train is coming. He stated he also believes the yellow flashers on the “Stop Ahead” sign will do the same thing. He stated they talked previously that if you put enough flashers and signals it would be a “carnival-effect” with signs, lights, flashers, and gates. He stated adding more and more of these signs and lights will provide a sensory overload to the driver as there is too much activity going on.

Ms. Tyler asked if Ms. Kaminski’s proposal is sound from an engineering perspective, and does it meet the requirements of the roadway. Mr. Wursta stated he does not believe so because they still have the sight distance problem, they are relying on drivers slowing down with a sign, and that they will not encounter a queue. He stated a stop sign and stopping traffic on a road increases rear end accident as a rule. He stated when the gates are down at the Railroad, they have queues that reach past Mill Road so when the gates go back up, you will have to travel across the tracks and stop with some drivers then making turns. He stated he feels people will be going 40 miles per hour and hopefully stopping in time so they do not hit anyone. He stated he feels this is an artificial means of resolving the issue and is not practical.

Ms. Kaminski stated it is the duty of the driver to stop at a stop sign, and the advance warning is to provide them the information so that they know they should be slowing down. She stated she disagrees with Mr. Wursta’s position, and she does not believe that this will be a “circus” effect.

Mr. Wursta stated the problem from a Lower Makefield perspective is that they have created this issue. He stated all-way stops are to provide corrective action to pre-existing conditions. Ms. Tyler stated Mr. Wursta had stated earlier that they had a sight distance problem before the construction so it is a pre-existing condition. Mr. Wursta stated they made the problem worse.

Ms. Reiss asked Chief Coluzzi his opinion. Chief Coluzzi stated he did review Ms. Kaminski’s suggestion as did former Captain Tom Roche who is the Traffic Safety Officer. He stated he agrees that in this situation “our fingerprints are on this issue,” and they cannot remedy this with stop signs as it will leave the Township open for liability issues from a legal and an ethical standpoint. He stated he believes that the queuing will effect the Railroad tracks, and even on a slow day it will back up. He noted the numerous events held in the Township in this area, and he feels a stop sign at the proposed location when all these cars are trying to get through is a problem. He also noted the impact on emergency services. Chief Coluzzi stated when he was coming to the Township Building today, he came upon a SEPTA train which is a quicker train; however, the gates stayed down for quite a bit of time after that SEPTA train passed because there was another train coming. He stated traffic queued up past Mill Road as well as in the other direction to Whitehall, and it took a

long period of time for that to clear. He stated if there were a stop sign there as proposed by Ms. Kaminski it would completely tie up Edgewood Road, frustrate the residents, and hamper rescue vehicles and the Police coming out of the Building. He stated he does not feel it is a practical idea in this situation.

Ms. Reiss stated Sandy Run Road was built before Schuyler, and there was nothing on that end of Edgewood Road so the sight problem was not an issue because there was very little traffic. She asked what is the difference time wise for response now that Sandy Run is closed. Chief Coluzzi stated when this issue first came up a resident at a meeting asked about emergency response, and they had the Rescue Squad go out and time going around Oxford Valley and it was probably a little less than a minute longer.

Mr. Wursta stated he agrees with Chief Coluzzi, and the queue would go past the Railroad; and he is also concerned with the queue starting on the downgrade of a hill. He stated beside the activities taking place in the area, there is also School traffic and emergency responders; and when they laid out the temporary chicane, they had to take all of that traffic into account. He stated from a safety perspective, you do not want to stop a through road unless you really have to.

Mr. Fritchey asked given the current location of the Railroad tracks, the current location of Edgewood Road and the bridge over Brock Creek, and given current Nationally-accepted traffic safety standards if Sandy Run Road did not already exist would it be responsible to build it today; and Mr. Wursta stated it would not. Ms. Kaminski stated she agrees with Mr. Wursta. Mr. Fritchey asked if it would be responsible to have a road intersecting into Edgewood Road from the north at any point between the Railroad tracks and the bridge coming in from the north side, and Mr. Wursta stated it would not be responsible given Edgewood Road as it is today. Mr. Fritchey stated what they are discussing is whether or not they should re-hook up a road that would not be acceptable under current standards or whether they have to do something different such as putting in a cul-de-sac or hook up Sandy Run Road to another road network such as going to Schuyler.

Mr. Fritchey asked when they are talking about the ISD criteria being met at the 85th percentile of speed by reducing traffic to a speed of either 31 or 33 miles per hour does that mean that they would be accepting that 15% of the cars would be traveling through that space at a faster rate of speed than that, and Ms. Kaminski agreed. Mr. Fritchey stated he feels there is a legal dilemma in terms of liability since the Township is probably liable for injuries that happen because the Township created or tolerated a poor road design. Mr. Fritchey stated they could be exposing the Township to an enormous amount of liability. He stated there is also the moral issue as to whether they want the residents and those visiting the community to come into a situation that the Township knows is potentially very dangerous.

Mr. Fritchey stated he feels there are three possible solutions with the simplest, cheapest, and quickest being to cul-de-sac the road. He stated a second solution is to use traffic-calming devices, and conduct an experiment to see how low they can get the speeds toward an acceptable line of sight. He stated once they have this data, they might be in a better position to make a considered judgment on whether the risk is acceptable in terms of legal liability to the taxpayers and moral responsibility. Mr. Fritchey stated the third would be to connect it in some way to another road such as Schuyler which might present its own traffic-calming issues. Mr. Fritchey stated it is clear that there is no rapid solution to this. He stated the solution Ms. Kaminski recommended could probably be done fairly quickly; however, the Chief has expressed reservations with that solution, and he himself has concerns about back up of cars onto the Railroad tracks. Mr. Fritchey stated construction of a cul-de-sac could probably be done in 2018. He noted the Board has not budgeted any money for this project in 2017. He stated if they were to opt with the cul-de-sac solution there would not really be any urgency to try to do it in the next six months as they would be leaving the situation status quo. He added the cul-de-sac solution would probably be nicer visually, and it may enhance property values in some respects as there are many people who want to buy houses on cul-de-sacs in the Township.

Mr. Benedetto asked if Chief Coluzzi would be in favor of this becoming a cul-de-sac; however, Chief Coluzzi stated he has not made a decision as to what he is favor of although he does know that he is not in favor of Ms. Kaminski's solution of signage at that intersection. Chief Coluzzi stated he also does not feel 5E or 5F are viable solutions in that they would not put in a roadway in at this location with the current conditions, and he does not feel any engineer would seal it. Mr. Wursta stated he feels 5E and 5F would be an extraordinary, expensive project; however, they would be improving the situation over and above what it is now and what it was before. He stated when you do these types of design, the criteria and standards revolve around the 85th percentile speed. He stated this would give some coverage with regard to liability. Mr. Wursta stated with the cul-de-sac, there would be no opportunity for accidents at that location any more; and there would be no reduction in speeds associated with responders coming over the hill. Mr. Wursta stated they would be improving the situation and making it better than it was before they did the Quiet Zones.

Mr. Benedetto stated Mr. Wursta indicated the problem was reduced sight distance caused by changes to Edgewood Road profile. Mr. Benedetto stated he wants to know if it was the addition of the third rail, the Quiet Zone, or a combination of both. Mr. Wursta stated it was the Quiet Zone. Mr. Benedetto stated the Quiet Zone is the reason why there was a change to the Edgewood Road profile, and the Quiet Zone

created a sight distance problem; and Mr. Wursta agreed. Ms. Kaminski stated she disagrees. She stated when the third rail went in, they did not meet the safe sight distance needed. She stated when the grade was fixed after that, it made it worse.

Mr. Benedetto stated he feels there are three options – 5E, 5F, and the cul-de-sac. He stated he feels the cul-de-sac is “absolutely ridiculously absurd.” Mr. Benedetto stated they need to fix this problem since it was created either by CSX/SEPTA which was the third rail addition which caused a problem, or it was caused by the Quiet Zone. He stated he feels they should go back to CSX or SEPTA and ask them to pay for some of this. He also stated he feels Mr. Eisold should have caught this, and the Township should not have to pay anything for the engineering costs of this because it should have been caught right away. He stated they should have already had a solution for this problem and be moving forward on the solution. He stated the cul-de-sac is not a solution. He stated Sandy Run is a major thoroughfare in the Township, and it is not a little side street where people have a cul-de-sac in their neighborhood. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels 5E is the simplest fix. He stated the Township should put up the \$1.3 million. He stated the Township is willing to spend money on the Community Center, the Snipes Tract and other things that are not necessities in the Township, but they will not fix a road in the Township.

Ms. Tyler stated they have two engineers telling them that they would not build that road today. Mr. Benedetto stated Mr. Wursta looked at numerous solutions and indicated the three that work the best, although Mr. Benedetto stated he does not feel they should consider the cul-de-sac. Ms. Tyler stated they are not solutions until they can reduce the speed being traveled. Mr. Benedetto stated that is why he indicated 5E is the easiest fix because they would have to lower the average speed being traveled only three miles per hour. He stated they should spend the extra \$240,000 to get the speed down to 33 miles per hour so they can move forward and open up the road.

Mr. Lewis asked for further explanation about the sight line profiles. Ms. Kaminski stated it is looking at the grade and taking a slice of the grade along where you look and setting up what the line is. She stated they would need to be above the profile of the road in order to be able to see. A larger copy was shown to the Board of this Exhibit.

Mr. Lewis stated he feels they should do temporary traffic calming as a test to determine what the miles per hour would be at the 85th percentile coming through the intersection. Mr. Lewis asked if someone goes above the speed limit, would they be forfeiting saying that it was the Township’s fault; and the Township would not be liable. Ms. Tyler asked about the person that is hit, and Mr. Lewis agreed that they could sue the Township. Mr. Truelove stated if they design it in such a way that they anticipate some people would be speeding, it would be a risk that the Township

would decide to accept. Mr. Fritchey stated he feels the Township would still be sued by both the speeder and the innocent victim that was hurt because they had a design they were on notice of that did not meet National Safety Standards. Mr. Lewis stated if they did the temporary traffic-calming and found out what the 85th percentile would be, while that is not a hold harmless, it is a way of saying they designed it to meet the traffic specs. Mr. Lewis stated he feels there is low risk for temporary traffic calming to get at what the speeds are, and this would provide a parameter to look at the four alternatives.

Mr. Benedetto stated the stop signs would not require traffic calming, and Ms. Kaminski agreed although she stated there is no reason they could not implement them just to slow down the traffic prior to reaching the Railroad tracks. She cautioned that it would also slow the emergency vehicles, and she added chicanes do not give emergency vehicles area to maneuver around in that section of road. Mr. Wursta disagreed and stated they took into account the driveways and everything associated with the emergency vehicles. He stated this would be a hybrid chicane more like a median. He stated the cost they have shown is a total of \$27,000 for the temporary chicane.

Mr. Lewis stated he feels this would be a test to understand better the remaining more expensive options with the exception of the all-way stop. He stated he feels having a temporary chicane will provide better speed data and analyze the questions about emergency management vehicles which he feels are issues, adding that they have the issue now with emergency vehicles with the road closed. He stated he feels all of the choices will have unintended consequences.

Mr. Lewis stated they are looking at this issue on two tracks – one being what is the optimal solution given this challenging circumstance, and another separate process which is looking into how did they get to this situation and who was responsible. Mr. Lewis stated he would be comfortable with the temporary chicane as a test measure especially during the summer months when they have higher traffic with PAA, soccer, and the Pool; and this will provide the metrics that they need to help assess the speed if any of the relocation options are viable at the 85th percentile. He stated he recognizes that this does not open Sandy Run immediately which an all-way stop control would do and also has the appeal of being low cost.

Mr. Fritchey asked if Mr. Lewis is indicating he would opt for re-opening Sandy Run Road to Edgewood even if it is a road that would not be built today under existing standards provided they get the speeds down to 85%, and he would be willing to accept that 15% of the traffic will exceed the speed. Mr. Lewis stated he feels if they can demonstrate that they have met what the standards are at the 85th percentile, whether or not someone would build that road today is not necessarily the driver as

to what the decision is. He stated if they can get something that meets safety standards at the 85th percentile level of speed, he feels that gets the Township out from the legal liability. Mr. Lewis stated if the mid-term solution was an all-way stop control, anyone who violated that all-way stop control would be violating the law although they would probably sue the Township. Mr. Lewis stated they would also have reduced the chance for high-speed crashes. He added that he is concerned about access for emergency vehicles. He stated he would like to try temporary traffic calming to get a better sense of whether he wants to take the risk as he feels this is a responsible way of approaching this in that he is testing whether he can get the traffic speeds down.

Mr. Benedetto stated it was indicated that fourteen total accidents occurred here over ten years. He stated before any work was done on the third rail or the Quiet Zone, there was a sight issue. Ms. Reiss stated it was not as bad. Mr. Benedetto stated the moral issue was always there as coming out of the road, there was a sight issue. Ms. Tyler stated the difference is that they have now been alerted to this.

Mr. Wursta stated what they were responding to was would they build from scratch a brand new road today if it was not there, and their answer to that was no. He stated when tasked with building a road with a sight distance obstruction, to provide a proper design, this is what they have laid out; and this is something that he would sign and seal to make sure it met standards. He stated he is improving it over and above what it was before the Quiet Zone and way over and above what it is after the Quiet Zone. He stated they are meeting acceptable standards as long as the speeds are at the 85th percentile. He stated the answer to the question of whether he would build a road there today is that he would not; but if there is a road there, he would want to build it to acceptable standards, and this is why it will cost \$1.5 million and take one to two years. Mr. Wursta stated proceeding with the cul-de-sac option would completely take away the accidents, but the other option allows for access and is done in a safe manner. He stated the 85th percentile is a reality at every single intersection in the Commonwealth. He stated he would sign 5E, 5F, and the cul-de-sac; but he would not sign for the four-way stop.

Ms. Reiss stated the closing of Sandy Run Road does inconvenience her, but she also knows the high rates of speeds that people are traveling on Edgewood Road. She stated now that the road is closed, she is inconvenienced by about one minute depending on where she is going; and that inconvenience is far less than if someone is broadside and children are involved. She stated if they can put in a temporary chicane and get the traffic slow enough, she would be willing to look at all three of the options.

Chief Coluzzi asked what a temporary chicane would cost and how long would they need to keep it in place. Mr. Wursta stated he feels it could be installed in three weeks, and the cost is approximately \$20,000. Mr. Wursta stated he feels they should keep it up for six months so they can get a cross section and make sure that the speeds are consistent. He stated they would then have the information to see if they are reducing the speed enough so that they could consider 5E, 5F or the cul-de-sac. Chief Coluzzi asked if the chicane would have raised crosswalks, and Mr. Wursta stated they would. Chief Coluzzi asked about access for U-turns and emergency vehicles, and Mr. Wursta stated they were accommodated in their design.

Ms. Tyler asked if Mr. Wursta considered the raised speed table suggested by Ms. Kaminski, and Mr. Wursta stated he did not. He stated they would need a number of them, and Ms. Kaminski agreed they would need three. Mr. Wursta stated the temporary chicane is easier to do from a temporary perspective to see if they are going to get a reduction. He stated the problem with speed tables is that people speed up between the speed tables and after the speed tables so being in the chicane as long as possible has more likelihood of getting speeds down as they cross the Railroad tracks. He stated the speed tables would work if they put three or four in a row up to the tracks.

Ms. Tyler asked about the volume of traffic on Edgewood Road and the use of chicanes. Mr. Wursta stated there are many different kinds of chicanes. He stated what he is proposing is more like a median. He noted an example in Northampton where they put in two medians in front of their Community Park. Ms. Tyler asked if the volume of traffic on Edgewood factors into this. Mr. Wursta stated they have used it in Delaware where there were 14,000 cars a day. Mr. Wursta stated they only need to get the speed down 3 miles an hour. Ms. Tyler asked if there are temporary speed tables, and Ms. Kaminski stated there are.

Mr. Lewis asked the cost of temporary speed tables; and Ms. Kaminski stated a few years ago they were approximately \$3,000, and she feels they would need three of them. Mr. Wursta stated speed tables are different than speed humps, and he feels if they need three it would cost approximately \$60,000; however, Ms. Kaminski stated these would be temporary speed tables. Mr. Lewis stated the temporary chicane was \$20,000; and Mr. Wursta stated that was a quote, and they could also get a quote for a speed table.

Mr. Lewis discussed the potential cost of the ultimate solution versus the economic loss to the community because of Sandy Run being shut down. He stated they also need to balance out potential litigation and/or potential accidents.

Ms. Tyler asked if the speed tables could get the speeds down to 20 miles per hour, would the intersection need to be reconfigured. Ms. Kaminski stated if they are concerned about the liability related to the 15% traveling over that amount, she would recommend that if they put in the traffic calming, they put in a stealth radar system that would pick up this information so that they can see how this is progressing and so that they will be aware if speeds start going higher. Ms. Tyler stated her question was if there is a speed at which traffic could travel where the intersection would be safe without reconstruction. Mr. Wursta stated the sight distance available is for 20 miles per hour so the answer would be yes if they could get the speeds to 20 miles per hour or less. He stated this would be true for any traffic calming method that could get the speeds down to 20 miles per hour, and they could open the intersection. Ms. Kaminski stated she does not feel they could get the speed down to 20 miles per hour. Ms. Tyler asked if a chicane or a speed table would be more effective on speed reduction on this road. Ms. Kaminski stated she feels a speed hump would be the most effective.

Ms. Reiss stated she is aware of an area where they put in rumble strips, and this did slow the traffic down and did not impact the appearance of the road. Ms. Kaminski stated she does not feel that would be as effective as the chicanes or the speed tables. Mr. Wursta stated he does feel speed tables would work as a distraction to the motorist but it would also be a problem with the emergency responders since they have to go up and down, and a chicane is a smoother reduction in speed. Ms. Tyler asked which will slow traffic more, and Mr. Wursta stated he does not know that. Ms. Tyler stated if someone went 38 miles per hour over a speed table, they would damage their car. Mr. Wursta stated the chicane they did obtained a 17% decrease in the speed. He stated the issue of the speed table is that you have to account for plowing, emergency response, and how much the speed is reduced. He stated speed tables usually reduce the speed greatly over the table, but then speed picks up. Ms. Kaminski stated they need to make sure the speed tables are spaced out 200' apart so that they are as tight as possible.

Mr. Benedetto stated he feels they are overcomplicating this. He stated for 5E they have to reduce the speed 3 miles per hour with the traffic calming to get to the 85th percentile. He stated they do not need to get it to 20 miles per hour to be able to open the road. He stated the criteria can be met under 5E or 5F.

Mr. Wursta stated they have a quote from a contractor ready to proceed with a temporary chicane, but he does not care if they use speed tables provided they get the speed down. He stated if they can get a reduction of 3 miles per hour, they can go to 5E or 5F. He stated using the temporary chicane or speed table would require six months of data collection, and then it would take one to two years to construct 5E or 5F so people will be living with the cul-de-sac for two years. He stated they

can design a safe, efficient intersection based upon the existing conditions; however, if the road was not there now, he would not be in favor of building a road there today. He stated the road is there now, and if they want to open it back up, they should proceed as they are discussing.

Mr. Benedetto stated the people in the area are having increased traffic in their neighborhoods, and there is also a new development going in at St. Ignatius which will increase traffic; and people will be adversely impacted if Sandy Run is made into a cul-de-sac.

Chief Coluzzi stated whatever traffic calming option they go with, they need to recognize that if it works, they will have to go to a permanent version; and they need to consider if they want the look of a permanent chicane or a permanent raised speed table.

Mr. Fritchey stated Ms. Kaminski recommended three speed tables, and she stated she felt they would need three in that area. Mr. Fritchey asked where they would be proposed to be located; and Ms. Kaminski stated they would want to keep it away from the Railroad tracks, but probably 500' on the approach, and then back off from there so it would then be every 200' beyond. Mr. Fritchey asked if she would propose one to be between the Railroad tracks and the bridge, and Ms. Kaminski stated she would not on that side. She stated she would only recommend that they be on the east side of the Railroad tracks. Ms. Kaminski stated the sight distance on the other side is adequate, and they do not have a problem with sight issues for the eastbound approach of Edgewood. Mr. Fritchey stated they would be on the westbound lane alone, and Ms. Kaminski disagreed. She stated it would go along the entire frontage of the road, and they would not split it at the half line. Mr. Fritchey stated it would go across the road and effect both eastbound and westbound traffic and all of them would be east of the Railroad tracks, and Ms. Kaminski agreed. Ms. Tyler stated they would double as a pedestrian crosswalk to the ball fields, and Ms. Kaminski agreed.

Mr. Fritchey asked if there are any downsides to speed tables, and Ms. Kaminski stated the emergency response time would be lower as it is with any traffic calming. She also stated the first few times Public Works would come out to plow, they would have to learn that they need to lift the blade up slightly to get up over the lip area where it meets the pavement. She stated drainage can be accommodated as there is curbing there, and this could be accommodated in the design. Ms. Reiss stated there is only curb on one side of Edgewood at that point, and there is only a bike path on the other side.

Mr. Harold Kupersmit, 612 B. Wren Song Road, stated he would be in favor of the chicane. He stated as soon as the Supervisors act to solve the problem, their liability will go down to 15%. He congratulated the Supervisors for dealing with a problem and trying to find the best solution.

Mr. Dave Vetter, 878 Sandy Run Road, stated he did not buy a house on a dead-end street. He asked why a sight line study was not done when the hump was put in, and he asked if whoever designed the hump is held liable for this. Ms. Tyler stated they are not at that point yet, and added that Ms. Kaminski was retained for the purpose of reconstructing what happened. Mr. Vetter stated none of the “cons” addressed the inconvenience to the Sandy Run residents. Ms. Tyler stated she recognizes that the residents have been significantly inconvenienced, but safety trumps all. Mr. Vetter asked if in the interim between now and when Sandy Run is reopened are there any plans to do anything at Oxford Valley Road which is a “disaster area” as you come through the tunnel.

Ms. Reiss stated she and Mr. Lewis went on a road trip with PennDOT representatives and they looked at that area. She stated it will definitely be paved. She stated PennDOT made a suggestion that they contact the Safety Commission about the tunnel; and if a complaint is made, they will have everyone come out including CSX who owns the overpass. Ms. Reiss stated she feels there are a lot of Grants available to improve this. Ms. Reiss stated they are working very hard to get Oxford Valley and Reading Avenue repaired.

Mr. Benedetto stated he lives in the area off of Oxford Road, and he asked if the Township could take this over as he has heard previously that the State was going to repave the road. He stated it is about a couple hundred feet, and the Township should be responsible for paving it. Ms. Reiss stated the State has indicated it will be done this summer; however, Mr. Benedetto stated it was supposed to be done for years, and he feels the Township should do something about the problem that exists.

Mr. Vetter stated one of the solutions was moving Sandy Run 100’ closer to the creek, and he does not believe that solution included a retaining wall. Mr. Vetter stated that creek comes when it rains which is why the Township has barriers there all the time. He stated this happens whenever there is a heavy rain. Mr. Vetter stated when he would approach the stop sign before, he would stop 20’ before the stop sign, and he could easily see up the road. He asked if any of the solutions looked at raising Edgewood east of the Railroad tracks so that when cars are coming to the tracks you could see them from down low, and Ms. Tyler stated she did not see that as one of the options. Ms. Reiss agreed that would be a good idea. Mr. Wursta stated they did not look at that but to do that, they would need to reprofile the road and make another curve starting in front of the Township

Building. Ms. Tyler stated that would not solve the speed issue. Mr. Wursta stated he feels the road would have to be raised 5' to 6'. He stated there is also the flat area on top they would have to deal with because of the Railroad tracks.

Mr. Vetter asked why the option where the road goes up to Schuyler was not one of the final solutions. Mr. Wursta stated it would cost \$2 million to \$3 million and would be a two-year minimum project. He stated it would be a bridge so there would be a lot of Permits required including DEP and other studies. Ms. Reiss stated it is also a wildlife sanctuary and wild bird sanctuary, and there are wetlands and flood problems. Mr. Vetter stated no solution they come up with will ever accommodate reckless drivers as there will always be speeders.

Mr. Adrian Costello, 2122 N. Crescent Boulevard, stated he feels making this decision now is tantamount to LMT taking responsibility for the problem as the only discussion now is what they are willing to pay for. Ms. Tyler disagreed, and she stated their concern is safety. Mr. Costello stated he understands this, but they are not putting any accountability on others. Mr. Costello stated he does not feel they should solve this before they know who is responsible for what happened and what help they can get to solve the problem as that could impact the decision the Board makes if they feel they have to be responsible for everything as opposed to if they knew someone was "on the hook" for helping them fix this versus just the Board and the taxpayers. Mr. Costello stated this is not about the viability of a road since this road has existed for a long time. He stated it is about the failed execution of adding a third rail line and somehow it falling through the cracks since they came up with a design that was bad and out of spec for what they should have allowed. He stated they had the Quiet Zones after that which exacerbated it, and the Township is now left on the hook to deal with it. He stated an answer is not just cutting the road off saying it was "not that good anyway." Mr. Costello stated this is about an insufficient design that the Township got stuck with, and they need to know who is responsible for helping them get out of it. He stated he feels they should spend money up front and find out who those people are. Ms. Tyler stated they are already doing that.

Mr. Costello stated with regard to managing the speed, they are trying to manage the speed down close to the speed limit in an area that goes right by the Police Station. He stated he feels they need to give the Chief some additional money for traffic speed control on this main thoroughfare.

Dr. Darryl Francomacaro, owner of Makefield Animal Hospital, 1095 Reading Avenue, stated there are businesses that count on Sandy Run Road to get their clients back there. He stated since the road has been closed, he has lost about 10% of his business and people are having a hard time trying to find where the business is. He stated even though they have the detours, they are not easy to follow, and they need better signage for the detours. He stated he has noticed in other

Townships that have businesses that are not on main thoroughfare that they have erected signage that directs people so they can help businesses that are effected by the road being closed. He stated there will be an economic impact of his livelihood and other businesses by having the road closed for up to two years.

Mr. Lee Polsky, 724 Salem Court, stated he is the closest residence to Sandy Sun road at the Edgewood Road intersection. He stated people are flying down Edgewood Road over the Railroad tracks. He stated he feels 85% are speeding every day, and 15% might be going close to the speed limit. He stated he feels everyone is mixing up the third rail and the hump with the Quiet Zone, and he feels this issue had nothing to do with the Quiet Zone. He stated there was no leadership when they installed the third rail, and people were not talking to one another. He stated Mr. Lewis is concerned who is to blame and who is to pay for it, and Mr. Polsky stated he feels it is everyone's fault; and they should stop pointing fingers and try to find the correct solution to resolve the situation. He stated he feels they need to get the speed under control, and whatever that costs, that will help save peoples' lives and prevent accidents.

Mr. John Sees, 48 Fairway Drive, asked if they have considered relocating the westbound stop sign to the top of the tracks; and Ms. Tyler stated they did discuss that and it would not be Warranted since a stop sign is meant to control opposite moving traffic, and they do not have that situation there. She stated she feels this is a special circumstance, and she feels common sense has to come in at some point. Ms. Tyler stated she is not ready to give up on that option. Ms. Kaminski stated the idea was to put a stop sign at the Railroad tracks to stop the traffic before it crosses the Railroad tracks heading toward Sandy Run. She stated there are a number of Warrants for determining whether or not you can put the stop sign in, and at that location, they do not have a conflicting movement; and the conflicting movement is at the intersection. Ms. Tyler stated she feels that one stop sign would stop the traffic, solve the speed problem, and it could solve the sight problem. She stated she feels they should look at the circumstances there. Ms. Kaminski asked who she means by "they," and Ms. Tyler stated it would be whoever would approve it. Ms. Kaminski stated it is a Township road, and the Township can do what they like with it. She stated the question is that if it gets taken to Court or the Township is sued because of something that happened because of the location of the stop sign, they would need to defend it. She stated this is why the Township goes to traffic engineers that have a professional License to give their opinions and recommendations; and if the Township chooses not to listen, and the Township has to go to Court because of the stop sign that was placed there and did not meet the normal and customary reasons for a stop sign, she feels they would have a liability issue.

Mr. Benedetto stated there are two traffic engineers that have looked at every possible solution, and he is very frustrated about “talking this to death;” and he would like to move on a decision. He stated they have to slow down the traffic and get it down 3 miles per hour which is really not that complicated. He stated they have the information before them, and they need to make a decision.

Mr. Sees stated he is looking at it as a taxpayer, and he is looking at spending several \$100,000 to \$1 million to get speeds down to 20 miles per hour. He stated he feels they should put giant signs there that say they ticket at 21 miles per hour, and he feels people will then go 21 miles per hour. Mr. Sees stated there has also been a lot of discussion that since they now know about this situation, they could get sued; however, he does not feel ignorance is a defense, and he feels there are many other intersections with problems one of the most important being the one under the bridge where there is a blind curve. It was noted that this is a PennDOT road.

Mr. Richard Miller, 868 Sandy Run Road, stated he moved here twenty-three years ago, and they have doubled the traffic in front of his house because they cut the road off. He stated to access any shopping, etc. he has to go down Reading and go through the tunnel, and they have doubled the traffic on those roads. He stated he is now cutting Yardley Hunt which is not fair to those residence. He stated they need to open Sandy Run Road back up, and a cul-de-sac is not a solution nor is spending \$3 million on a bridge. He stated he feels they need to move the road down 100’, shave the hill off, and elevate the east side of Edgewood Road. He stated they cannot “kill” a road that has been there forever.

Mr. Bill Parkes, 23 Fairway Drive, stated with regard to the speeding problem, he feels everything emanates from the speed; and he asked if they put in the chicane or speed bumps in where they have been discussing will that stop speeding at the point where you take the measurements which are at the bridge and/or Sandy Run Road. He stated he does not feel it will stop the speeding because the acceleration coming down the hill will negate any positive impact they would get preceding the Railroad tracks on the east side of the tracks. He stated he feels a speed bump on the downside might possibly work. He stated he is not happy about spending \$1.5 million even with the possibility that they might be able to recoup it. He stated he needs to have the road open. Mr. Parkes asked that the road crew fill in some of the holes under the bridge to make it a little more accessible, and they should not wait for PennDOT. Mr. Parkes stated the downhill side of the westbound direction is where the problem is. He stated people do slow up coming at the tracks; but as soon as they hit the crest, that is when they hit the gas pedal; and he does not feel a speed bump preceding the tracks will help a lot. He stated if a stop sign will do this at a cost of \$5,000 and it achieves the speed restriction, that would be a good enough reason for the Township to make that happen and get the road back open.

Mr. Jim Rogers, 22 Fairway Drive, stated he feels part of this is due to the Quiet Zones; and if they are going to make Sandy Run Road a cul-de-sac, they have made a small percentage of Township residents happy who moved in where Railroads were located but did not like the noise, and now they are making another small percentage of people in the Township unhappy. Mr. Rogers stated with regard to safety and children, Fairway Drive has experienced an explosion of children in the last five to seven years. He stated it is a small street, and it was not built to handle a lot of traffic; and it is getting a lot of it now and people are speeding up and down the street. He stated he feels it is also probably happening in Yardley Hunt and other neighborhoods. He stated they cannot close Sandy Run Road as that would be irresponsible.

Ms. Maryanne Widenmeyer, Yardley Animal Kennel, 1085 Reading Avenue, stated having the road cut off has impacted her business. She stated there is a large amount of traffic coming when Church starts and when Church stops, and they are cutting through all the neighborhoods and going fast. She stated Sandy Run has to be opened. She stated the bridge on Edgewood Road is ancient, and the water goes over it every time it rains. She stated she has people passing her on the left hand side going fifty miles per hour just past the Police Station and yelling at her because she is making a right-hand turn. She stated they need to fix Edgewood and the bridge. Ms. Reiss stated the bridge on Edgewood Road was done in 1994 as there was a major storm that took the bridge out, and PennDOT raised it since it was their road at the time. Ms. Widenmeyer stated she still feels the bridge should be higher which would get rid of some of the slope.

Mr. Ed Gavin, 904 Sensor Road, stated he is having a problem with the logic of a Warrant for a stop sign when there is no Warrant required for a chicane or a speed bump on the road. He stated if they have a stop sign, they would not have to do anything else. He stated a car would be going 20 miles an hour down the hill if they stopped at the Railroad. He stated he feels they should be able to install a stop sign in a safety situation. Ms. Kaminski stated they are required to follow National standards, and you need to have conflicting traffic before you can install a stop sign. Ms. Tyler asked if the train would qualify as conflicting traffic, and Ms. Kaminski stated it would not because you are already required to stop for that when the gates are down. Ms. Kaminski stated the problem would be if a vehicle did not stop at a stop sign which was not Warranted to begin with and then they get to the intersection and hit someone. Ms. Tyler stated they would then face a negligent design allegation, and Ms. Kaminski agreed. Mr. Wursta stated he cannot condone a stop sign at any of the circumstances. He stated because you do not have the sight distance, you are not sure that the other drivers are going to stop even if there is a stop sign there. He stated if they put it in front of the tracks, he feels people may go through that stop sign since there is not really a reason to stop at that location.

Mr. Benedetto stated they have professionals telling them that what Mr. Gavin is suggesting is not a viable solution. Mr. Wursta stated a chicane makes a driver conform to a way to drive, but a stop sign needs obedience from the driver that no one can guarantee. He stated a chicane forces an action. He stated he does not want to take the risk with a stop sign because there is a sight distance issue.

Mr. Tim Collins, 479 Jenny Drive, stated he disagrees with not allowing stop signs without conflicting traffic; and he stated there are thousands of Railroad crossings without gates and with gates where they have stop signs at crossings.

Ms. Tyler asked if the Federal Railroad Administration would be able to speak to this, and she asked if the engineers have consulted the Federal Railroad Administration Codes; and Ms. Kaminski stated she could do that.

Mr. Dave Kelliher, 591 Aspen Woods Road, asked if there were no Quiet Zone would this still be a problem as there seems to be some confusion that the Quiet Zone caused this. Ms. Kaminski stated although she did not do a complete evaluation, it looks like they did not have the sight distance after the third rail was constructed. Mr. Kelliher stated the third rail was not put in with the Quiet Zones, and the Quiet Zone had nothing to do with this issue whatsoever. Mr. Benedetto stated Ms. Kaminski had indicated earlier that it did; however Ms. Kaminski stated she had indicated that the third rail created a situation, and it was further exacerbated by taking the hump out and smoothing that area. Mr. Benedetto stated Mr. Wursta indicated that the Quiet Zone did have something to do with it as the quote in the presentation was “caused by changes to Edgewood Road profile.” Mr. Wursta stated he did not have any survey information from before the third rail was put in. Ms. Tyler stated Ms. Kaminski has indicated they did have that information; however, Mr. Wursta stated he did not have it. He stated he used the survey information from Boucher & James before the Quiet Zone was done and after the Quiet Zone was done; and before the Quiet Zone was done there was a certain sight distance, and after the Quiet Zone was done, there was another sight distance. He stated their analysis was based upon what happened with the Quiet Zone when that was done. He stated he does not have an answer as to the third rail issue although Ms. Kaminski may.

Ms. Kaminski asked Mr. Eisold if he had provided Mr. Wursta with the survey information; and Mr. Eisold stated they did provide a lot of information although he does not know exactly what as it was some time ago. He stated Mr. Wursta asked them for a list of items which they provided. Ms. Kaminski stated although she does not have the exact numbers, when the third rail was constructed, they did not have adequate sight distance at that point; and it became even less when the hump was taken out of the road.

Mr. Kelliher stated when the third rail was completed, the Quiet Zone was not in place at that time. He stated there was an issue with the hump which was addressed by making adjustments to the road. He stated once the hump was corrected, the Quiet Zone was installed simultaneously so it was not the Quiet Zone that created the problem, and he feels it was the correction of the hump that created the problem.

Mr. Benedetto stated there is a conflict between what one traffic engineer is saying and what the other is saying. Mr. Kelliher stated he is not trying to place blame on anyone, and he only wanted clarification that the Quiet Zone did not cause this problem; and he is asking if the Quiet Zone caused the problem or the removal of the hump caused the problem.

Mr. Eisold stated while the Quiet Zone did not directly cause the problem, it would not have been prudent to construct the Quiet Zone on the very insufficient and dangerous slope that was created by the third rail. He stated the third rail made the slope and the condition worse, and it would have been very difficult to put the Quiet Zone on that steep slope; and he would not have done that because it was well over the maximum slope and not in conformance with design standards as to the curvature of the road.

Mr. Kelliher stated if the Quiet Zone were not an issue, they still had a ramp there that needed to be corrected after they put the third rail in, and Ms. Kaminski agreed.

Ms. Tyler stated she is not comfortable that the engineers are not on the same page, and she does not feel the Board has been given a strong recommendation on which way to proceed because of the speed. Ms. Tyler stated she feels that they have to try traffic calming, and they need to know what speed they are dealing with so that they can make an informed decision on a solution for Sandy Run Road. She stated she feels a temporary chicane is warranted, and she also feels they should look into the speed tables since she feels they will slow cars down more than a chicane will. Ms. Tyler stated this is not going to be a quick fix although she wishes they could make a quick fix for the residents. She stated as far as businesses and signage, she will discuss this with Chief Coluzzi to see if they can help them. She stated they recognize that traffic is being redirected to other roads. She stated the Board does not have enough information to make an informed decision on how to work this out, and they need to continue to collect data. She stated they need speed studies, and she would like to try the chicanes and the speed tables three months each to see which are more effective in bringing the speed down.

Mr. Benedetto stated they hired a traffic engineer, and Mr. Wursta made the recommendation to do the temporary chicane. Mr. Benedetto stated he does not feel they should do both, and they should pick one and do it for six months.

Ms. Tyler stated she feels they should see which one is more effective.

Mr. Benedetto stated he does not feel three months of data is sufficient, and he would be in favor of six months using the temporary chicane. He stated they should approve it tonight so that the people can get some relief in a timely manner.

Ms. Reiss stated she agrees that a temporary chicane would give an idea of whether they are realistic on the speed, and they would have better data to make a decision.

Ms. Tyler stated if the chicane does not get them down to the speed they need, they would have to look at the second option of the speed tables; and Ms. Reiss agreed.

Mr. Lewis stated he believes that there is a general consensus that they want to try calming first, and the question is whether they want to do the speed tables or the chicane. He stated given the relative cost and downside risk of the tables, he is more inclined to try the chicane. He stated with the speed tables there are issues with snow removal and emergency vehicles. He would be in favor of doing the chicane now, but he would not have an issue if other Board members want to look further into the speed tables. Ms. Tyler stated she feels they should do the chicane; and if that fails, they can then look into the speed tables.

Mr. Fritchey moved, Ms. Reiss seconded and it was unanimously carried to authorize the Chief of Police to coordinate the installation of traffic chicanes as described by the engineer for the purpose of slowing traffic on Edgewood Road for six months.

AWARD OF 2017 ROAD PAVING PROJECT

Mr. Eisold noted the letter provided in the Board's packet dated April 13 recommending the award of the 2017 Road Paving Project to the low bidder, Harris Blacktopping, Inc. He stated they were the low bidder for the Base Bid as well as all Alternates. He stated Harris has gone through the Responsible Contractors timeframe; however, one of their sub-contractors had some information that is due tomorrow, so a Motion should be Awarded subject to meeting the Conditions of the Responsible Contractor's Ordinance.

Mr. Fritchey moved, and Mr. Benedetto seconded to award the 2017 Road Paving Project to Harris Blacktop subject to meeting the Responsible Contractors Ordinance including the Bid Alternates as described by Mr. Eisold.

Mr. Lewis asked if Harris has done work before for the Township, and Mr. Eisold stated they have; and the last time they did the Road Project was in 2012.

Mr. Lewis asked about the Bid Alternates, adding he feels strongly that they should do all the Bid Alternates. Mr. Benedetto asked the total amount. Mr. Eisold stated he and Mr. Fedorchak have discussed the roads over the last three to four weeks,

and they have agreed to the final list which he felt was included in the Board's packet. Mr. Eisold stated he does have a copy of that this evening. Mr. Eisold noted this list was dated April 12, and he specifically noted Page 5. He stated the Alternates included are #3, #6, #7, and #8 and the total cost for the road work will be \$1,348,106, and Ms. Tyler stated they budgeted \$1.5 million. Mr. Eisold stated on the last page it shows the work for bike paths, etc. for a total cost of \$121,000 which brings the total to \$1.5 million.

Mr. Reiss asked about bike paths/walking paths at the Community Center and the baseball fields. Ms. Tyler stated she understood that this was going to be done next year. Mr. Eisold stated the discussion was that there needed to be a bike path to connect all of those facilities; however they were going to wait until everything was built and they would then get a better idea of where people were going.

Mr. Benedetto asked about the Oxford Valley Road portion that was discussed with Mr. McCartney. Mr. Eisold stated at the last meeting the sewer engineer discussed the sewer issue at Mr. McCartney's property. Mr. Eisold stated he met with the sewer engineer, Mr. Fred Ebert, and the section that they are doing in the Bid is from Stony Hill Road to Heacock Road this year. Mr. Eisold stated the sketch which Mr. Ebert provided showed that they would connect with a low pressure grinder pump, and they would not have to go in the road on the west side of Stony Hill Road, and they would do everything on the east side. Mr. Eisold stated once the sewer issue is resolved, they will do the road at that time which would be next year.

Motion was amended to include bid Alternates as described by Mr. Eisold, and the Motion carried unanimously.

QUIET ZONE UPDATE

Mr. Eisold stated he provided a copy of the engineering status update on some of the projects which included the Quiet Zones. He stated the Township improvements are complete, and SEPTA has done their work with the power off lights; and they are waiting for CSX to finalize theirs. Mr. Eisold stated CSX told him that they would have it done no later than three months after they received the Agreement from the Township, and they are coming up on that time; however CSX has to get their sign off internally, and he does know what that status is. He stated he has called them several times this week, but they will not give him an exact date. Ms. Tyler stated she feels they should send a letter indicating that the Township is requesting some certainty with respect to when this will be done.

Mr. Benedetto stated residents have been asking why this is taking so long, and he stated it is CSX is who is causing the delay.

Mr. Eisold stated the Township did receive the check for the Grant from SEPTA for the PennDOT Multi-Modal Grant.

Mr. Tim Collins, 479 Jenny Drive, stated he spoke to the Project Manager at CSX who indicated they received the check on February 28; and he spoke to him the other day and the Project Manager advised him that they have to design the signal system that parallels with SEPTA's signal system, and he advised that it would be done in June. Ms. Tyler stated the Township has very little leverage to make CSX do anything in an expedited manner. Mr. Collins stated he feels a State Representative or a Congressman should contact them. He stated CSX is going through positive train control which must be done by 2018, and the Project Manager assured him that PTC would not tie up the Quiet Zone lights. Mr. Lewis stated the State Representative has called CSX, and they are pushing them as well. He state hopefully the State Senator can do this as well.

AUTHORIZATION TO BID FOR DOG PARK

Mr. Eisold stated the Plans are complete, and they received the sign off from DCNR that they can go out to Bid.

Mr. Fritchey moved, Mr. Lewis seconded and it was unanimously carried to authorize to go out to Bid for the Dog Park.

Mr. Truelove stated that the Board met in Executive Session commencing at 7:00 p.m. and items of litigation, Real Estate including Land Development, and other informational items were discussed.

ZONING HEARING BOARD MATTERS

With regard to the Stephen W. Tamburo Variance request for the property located at 1 Plymouth Lane in order to permit construction of a 6' high fence within the front yard of Plymouth Lane and Highland Drive which exceeds the permitted height, it was agreed to leave this matter to the Board of Supervisors.

With regard to the Neil and Michele McKeon Variance request for the property located at 1081 N. Kimbles Road in order to permit construction of a pool resulting in greater than the permitted impervious surface, it was agreed to leave the matter to the Zoning Hearing Board, but the solicitor will send a letter to the Zoning Hearing Board that stormwater mitigation should be included if this is approved.

SUPERVISORS REPORTS

Mr. Fritchey stated the Dog Park Sub-Committee appeared at the Park & Rec Board and they have a number of fundraising efforts which are in publications which will be posted on the Township Website, and these involve selling sponsorship of different gradations. Mr. Fritchey stated there was also a presentation by the Five Mile Woods group, and he noted the comments made earlier by Mr. Heilferty during Public Comment this evening. He stated they did report that the deer population has declined probably attributable to the hunts in the area and the vegetation loss from deer has been reduced. Mr. Fritchey stated on Arbor Day, Friday, April 28, planting of Phase IV of the Arboretum will occur.

Ms. Reiss stated HARB met and they are recommending improvements to the Janney House, and a letter will be sent to the Board of Supervisors. She stated Citizens Budget is waiting to get a new Mission Statement.

Mr. Benedetto stated the Planning Commission is still reviewing the Master Plan, and they will be making a recommendation on the O/R. He stated the Trenton Mercer Airport Review Panel is meeting tomorrow. Mr. Benedetto stated he received an update from a member of BRRAM indicating that the negotiations that were taking place with their Counsel took a turn for the worse, and they are not encouraged that this will settle since the settlement negotiations were abruptly cancelled by the Department of Justice. Mr. Benedetto stated BRRAM has indicated that they would like the Township to take over and retain outside Counsel as BRRAM will probably not continue to fight this battle. He stated the Township needs to make a decision as to how they want to proceed, and he feels doing nothing is not an option. He stated a recommendation should be forthcoming shortly from the Trenton Mercer Airport Review Panel.

APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION NO. 2337 AUTHORIZING CREATION OF A FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Truelove stated Ms. Gladwell is present who was involved in the preparation of this. He stated Resolution No. 2115 was approved in 2006 and it authorized the creation of a Citizens Budget Committee. He understands that there has been some re-vamping of that process, and the proposed Resolution No. 2337 establishes a Financial Advisory Committee with different reporting mechanisms with respect to dealing with some of the same issues that the CBC did before. Mr. Truelove stated he would recommend that if the Board approves this Resolution that the Motion indicate that by passing Resolution No. 2337 and implements the Financial Advisory Committee that the Citizens Budget Commission would no longer exist.

Mr. Benedetto asked why they are moving away from the Citizens Budget Commission and toward a Financial Advisory Committee, and he asked if they have the same function with a different name or is there some other reason behind it. Ms. Reiss stated she believes there is a change in function now that we have a Finance Director, and they would be looking at reviewing Capital projects and advising the Board of Supervisors on policy. Mr. Benedetto stated he does not know if there is support by the current members of the Citizens Budget Commission to move into a different direction. He also asked if the Board of Supervisors would need to interview new Committee members. Ms. Tyler stated she feels they would disband the CBC as Mr. Truelove outlined, and they would start again from the beginning with the Financial Advisory Committee, and anyone who wants to serve on it would indicate that although those who were interviewed recently from the CBS may not have to be interviewed again.

Mr. Benedetto stated he is opposed to changing this since he feels they already have an effective Citizens Budget Commission in place. He stated the Township Manager never attended the CBC meetings, and now they have a Finance Director who can attend their meetings. Mr. Benedetto stated at Budget time the Citizens Budget Commission members should be in attendance and make contributions as they have in the past. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels it was more of a function of the Board not listening to the CBC as opposed to changing them into a financial advisory role.

Ms. Reiss stated she feels that they formed the original Citizens Budget Commission because they had done away with the Finance Director position, and she was tasked by the Budget Committee to find out the direction the Board of Supervisors wanted them to go, and she felt that this was what the Board had come up with. She stated she spoke to Ms. Gladwell who also agreed that they needed to re-focus how they worked. Mr. Benedetto stated he is not criticizing the work Ms. Reiss has done. He stated he feels there was a Finance Director in place when the Citizens Budget existed.

Ms. Ann Gladwell, Finance Director, stated the Budget process goes very smoothly; but in the past the Citizens Budget Commission felt that their recommendations/interactions were not really appreciated. She stated the last time she and Ms. Reiss met with the Citizens Budget Commission, they talked about how to revamp the Committee and how they could best help the Township. She stated they came up with this idea because there are a lot of special projects that the Committee could work on that the Finance Department does not have time to do although they could guide the Committee and give them projects such as a Capital Plan. She stated they agreed that they would be willing to do this if the Board of Supervisors would select the same people to be on the Committee to do that kind of research and make recommendations to the Township.

Mr. Fritchey moved and Ms. Reiss seconded to approve Resolution No. 2337 authorizing the creation of a Financial Advisory Committee and disbanding the Citizens Budget Commission. Motion carried with Mr. Benedetto opposed.

APPROVAL OF REVOCATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 2115

Mr. Fritchey moved and Ms. Reiss seconded to revoke Resolution No. 2115 which created the Citizens Budget Commission.

Mr. Benedetto stated the Citizens Budget Commission did work on special projects like the Pool and other Capital projects, and he feels they are just changing the name and potentially the members which he does not feel would be a good idea.

Motion carried with Mr. Benedetto opposed.

APPROVE AWARD OF BID FOR SIGN MATERIALS

Mr. Greg Hucklebridge was present and reviewed the Bids which were bid out by the Bucks County Consortium that he would recommend for approval.

Mr. Fritchey moved, Mr. Benedetto seconded and it was unanimously carried to award the Bid for Sign Materials as outlined by Mr. Hucklebridge.

AUTHORIZE TOWNSHIP MANAGER TO SIGN SOLICITOR RETAINER AGREEMENT

Mr. Truelove stated when his firm was retained in 2016, they were retained at the same level and the same arrangements that Begley Carlin had and that his firm had back in 2006 to 2012. Mr. Truelove stated earlier this year, it was requested by the Board that his firm consider a Retainer Agreement arrangement which he provided to the Board in a letter dated January 17, 2017. He stated he understood that the Board had agreed to it; but unfortunately it did not happen at a Public Meeting, although he felt it had been. Mr. Truelove stated they have been operating under that arrangement at the direction of the Board since March 1 of this year, so all bills the Township has received since March 1 including this month reflect that arrangement. He stated this is just a “belts and suspenders approach” to have that formalized with the acceptance of the Retainer Agreement dated January 17, 2017 to be effective March 1, 2017.

Mr. Benedetto stated he has a problem with this as it was an Agreement that took place that the Board never voted on at a public meeting. He stated it was never signed by anyone in the Township other than he believes Mr. Truelove. He stated they are making an agreement retroactively that was not agreed to at a public meeting, and they are back dating it. Mr. Benedetto stated they had a Right-To-Know Request by a citizen who may come to the next meeting and raise significant issues. He stated he feels they need to get on firm legal standing on this since they never agreed to it at a public meeting, and now they are agreeing to something retroactively. He feels they are making a mistake, and he feels they should get a legal opinion of how this should be handled since they have been operating without any Agreement with legal counsel.

Mr. Fritchey stated they reached an understanding with the solicitor, and he has been operating under that understanding. He stated they probably should have ratified it at a formal meeting after it was agreed to by all Parties in Executive Session. He stated the solicitor is entitled to compensation for his services, and Mr. Fritchey stated he does not feel it would be appropriate to say they are not going to pay because they did not sign the Contract. Mr. Fritchey stated they are stating now what they actually did previously. He stated he feels they have a Contract with the solicitor even if they may not have reached it in the best fashion that they should have with public notice. He stated they are obligated to compensate the solicitor for services his firm has rendered.

Ms. Reiss moved and Mr. Lewis seconded to authorize the Township Manager to sign the Agreement as agreed upon by the counsel and the Board effective March 1, 2017.

Mr. Lewis stated he feels this is a good catch by the gentleman who filed the Right-To-Know Request, and he urged that person to file a similar Right-To-Know Request on all professional services. Mr. Lewis stated he feels what the Board is doing is a fair and reasonable correction.

Motion carried with Mr. Benedetto opposed.

There being no further business, Mr. Lewis moved, Mr. Benedetto seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 12:00 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

John B. Lewis, Secretary

