

SELINGROVE BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING

MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 2005 - 7:00 P.M.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Pres. D. Mengel, V. Pres. W. Hetherington, C/P S. Christine, C/P C. Handlan, C/P M. Inch, C/P G. Kinney and C/P W. Reuning

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Solicitor R. Cravitz; Mgr. J. Bickhart; Mayor G. Beaver; Police Chief T. Garlock; Deputy Zoning Officer Janet Powers; Recording Secretary D. Long; Daily Item Reporter Marcia Moore; WKOK Reporter Tim Millard; Borough Landlord Association Representative Brian Betz; Borough Landlords Jeff Buckley and Doug Sprenkle II; Borough Residents Terri Beaver, Pete Carroll, Brian Farrell, Dave Rothermel, Joseph and Margaret Siro; Engineer Bob Bickhart

OTHERS ABSENT: None

CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Pres. Mengel called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES FROM MEETING OF JULY 11, 2005:

C/P Hetherington stated that after he left the meeting there were five council members present so the number of votes from that point forward should be changed from six to five. Pres. Mengel accepted the minutes as corrected.

VISITORS TO BE HEARD:

Borough Police Chief, Thomas Garlock – Presentation of Police Report for June 2005

C/P Kinney reported that the retirement of Wayne Brosius is official this week and he would like to recognize Officer Brosius as a good officer who served the Borough well. He also wanted to wish him well in the future. Pres. Mengel stated it is her intention to have Council write Officer Brosius a letter.

Chief Garlock reported that the painting at the new building has been finished. Part of the partition is in and some electric work needs to be done. The security screen is up. The steel doors have yet to be placed. The county has given the police department a new antenna which needs to be put up, and then wiring needs to be done for the radio equipment. Mgr. Bickhart reported the doors should be installed on Wednesday or Thursday.

DH&L Fire Company, Ken Stettler – No report

Robert L. Bickhart, Engineer for Sprenkle/Buckley Subdivision – Bob Bickhart reported that he is representing Doug Sprenkle and Jeff Buckley in their proposed construction of additional housing units at their property at Orange and David Streets. At the last Council meeting, Council directed the matter back to the Planning Commission. He stated he met with the Planning Commission but there is no revised plan being presented for this property because he believes that the understanding of Council at their last meeting was incorrect. Extensive calculations have been done on the 100-year floodplain for this site because the Borough's flood insurance study and floodplain maps do not indicate a 100-year floodplain for this property or any other properties along Weiser Run. No 100-year flood elevations are given so Bob had to attempt to calculate the 100-year floodplain, and in doing so, per the Borough ordinance, he then had to establish the floodway portion of the 100-year floodplain, which is the channel and the adjacent floodplain areas that it is necessary to preserve in order to pass a 100-year flood. This was done and submitted to the Borough engineer, Council, DEP and the Snyder County Conservation District.

The Borough engineer approved those calculations of the 100-year floodplain and the floodway associated with that floodplain. None of the buildings that are being proposed are located in the floodway. In order to establish the floodway calculations had to be done to show what land is necessary to carry the 100-year flood. This includes the channel and additional land. If all the land on the Sprenkle/Buckley side of the run were to be completely obstructed and filled in, it would result in a 0.1 foot rise in the 100-year flood in the area of Orange Street against the retaining wall. There is no proposal to raise that wall or to fill in and totally obstruct that entire 100-year floodplain, so any rise against the floodplain on the other side of the run will be less than 0.1 feet, an amount that would be insignificant and incalculable. Once water passes the floodwall on the opposite side of the run it fans out from a 30-foot floodplain to a 170-foot floodplain by flooding the railroad, railroad station yard and properties over toward High Street, so that any insignificant rise against the floodwall in a narrow channel has to be even less significant when it is spread out into the entire floodplain beyond the wall. The best calculation, which has been accepted by the Borough engineer and by DEP, shows that there is no proposal to build in the floodway portion of the floodplain. The Borough's ordinances specifically allow construction on any part of the property that is not in the floodway. Solicitor Cravitz stated that according to the meeting minutes, the main issues was that Jeff Buckley had stated he was not going to put in three of the original proposed units, thus modifying the plan. It was Solicitor Cravitz's recommendation that the plan go back to the Planning Commission because it was being altered orally at the Council meeting. Bob Bickhart replied that Jeff Buckley's offer to drop three units was made so that he could get Council to approve the other four units. He has been trying to get this through for two years now. Pres. Mengel stated it has not been before Council for two years and Bob Bickhart replied he has been behind the scenes doing all the calculations necessary to satisfy the Borough engineer. Some of this was his fault because it is a very complex floodplain and he had to do a lot of work, but at the same time he would submit calculations one month and it would be four or five months later that he would hear from the engineer. Around April of this year the Borough engineer wrote a letter to Council stating that as far as he was concerned all engineering issues were resolved. The engineer only had a question about what he must have misunderstood or misinterpreted from the report about the 0.1 foot rise in the 100-year flood and whether that would constitute damage to a neighboring property. Bob Bickhart immediately wrote back to the Borough engineer re-explaining and reiterating how the 0.1 foot rise was only a necessary calculation in order to establish the limits of the floodway and not that the proposal was actually going to create a 0.1 foot rise in the 100-year flood. Solicitor Cravitz stated that it was his understanding that this would be an increase in the overall flood area of 0.1 foot. Bob replied that he did four different cross sections. Two of them were against the floodwall at Ken Miller's building, one was at the end of the existing Sprenkle/Buckley building, and the other one was down near the north end of the property. He stated there are two walls, the wall at Ken Miller's and the wall on Sprenkle and Buckley's side. If the wall on the Sprenkle/Buckley side were to be raised and if it were filled in behind it that would be anticipated to raise the level of the 100-year flood in Weiser Run by 0.1 feet against Miller's wall, which is even higher. After it comes around the bend water is flowing out into a much wider floodplain of about 170 feet at its widest from the run east toward High Street and so any increase, if all of the flood fringe area were filled in on the Sprenkle/Buckley side, would have a negligible impact on the wider floodplain. Solicitor Cravitz asked why the Borough engineers are indicating that a minor elevation increase of 0.1 foot in the area of the existing wall is anticipated. Bob Bickhart replied that even if this did occur it is permitted by the Borough's ordinance. The Borough allows the flood fringe areas to be developed. There are no restrictions against development in the flood fringe areas other than using flood-proofing measures such as raising structures up. If development were prohibited in these flood fringe areas there would be no development on the Isle of Que whatsoever. The only things out of the 100-year floodplain on the Isle of Que are the railroad parts of the bypass. Everything else is in the 100-year floodplain within the Borough limits on the Isle of Que. C/P Kinney stated that any development must meet certain requirements. Bob Bickhart agreed, stating that they have to meet the flood-proofing provisions of the building code. The proposed Sprenkle/Buckley units will be 1½ feet above the 100-year flood elevation, which he had to calculate and which the Borough engineer has accepted. C/P Kinney stated when the other apartments were improved to the extent that they were, the cost went over 50 percent of the value. He wondered if the floodplain regulations were met for those improvements. Bob Bickhart replied he was not involved then but his calculations show that the 100-year flood flow can be carried in the run and very minor floodplain areas on the Sprenkle/Buckley side and most of the floodplain area which is on the other side of the run. Therefore, by his calculation of elevations, that building does not sit in the 100-year floodplain.

He reported the other two are being elevated because that is the Borough's requirement as portions of the buildings on both ends, the additions on both ends of the existing building, will be partially within the 100-year floodplain of the run as it is coming around the corner and spreads out down the south end of the building in both directions. A portion of the corners of the additions are in the 100-year floodplain and must be elevated. The Borough does not have an ordinance that says if all of a piece of land is above the 100-year flood then it must be built a foot and a half higher. He does not think there is anything to prevent putting a basement in if the building is not sitting within the 100-year floodplain. The existing units are vulnerable to flooding. The argument is not whether from a regulatory point of view they should have been flood-proofed in accordance with floodplain ordinances; rather the argument is that the calculations show that that building is not within the 100-year floodplain. C/P Kinney stated the Borough has already had one lawsuit on this issue and he does not want a second one. His concern is that if parts of the building are in the floodplain then does the entire building have to come into compliance, and if it does it is already too late. Bob Bickhart stated that by looking at the maps it cannot even be known that that building is in a floodplain at all other than maybe a 500-year floodplain. Weiser Run is such a small watershed compared to Penn's Creek and South Tributary that no one even to this day has done a study of the Weiser Run watershed in order to establish uniform floodplain elevations and a floodway for Weiser Run. Every time there is a project along Weiser Run this is the process that will have to be undertaken. Someone will have to establish the 100-year flood elevation and the floodway before a project can be done along Weiser Run anywhere in the Borough until the day comes when someone actually does that detailed comprehensive study just like the federal government did for the other watersheds – Penn's Creek, the Susquehanna River, and part of South Tributary. The 100-year floodplain for any stream is a dynamic thing which changes every time someone builds in the floodplain, another tree grows or falls over, sediment rises in the stream, etc. These things incrementally change the dynamics of the stream. Weiser Run was cleaned out in 1972 or 1973 after Agnes and from that time until today there has been very little if any maintenance from the Orange Street area to Penn's Creek and the run is suffering. C/P Kinney stated that the grade-all has been in there numerous times since then between Orange and the back end of the run and it was cleaned out several times all the way down to Penn's Creek. Bob Bickhart replied that there is evidence it needs to be done again. C/P Kinney stated the problem is that it is private property. The Borough did some of the work under emergency conditions and got away with it but because it is private property it is up to the property owner to take care of it. Bob stated that other than in an emergency there must be a permit to get in there to the stream and all the permits have to be done together and in unison and comprehensively. He stated that there has to come a time when it becomes a Borough function. Scores of individual property owners cannot be relied on to clean this up. Solicitor Cravitz asked if Jeff Buckley is withdrawing his amendment in which he stated he was reducing the number of proposed apartments by three. Bob Bickhart replied that he has no instructions to revise the plan. Pres. Mengel stated Jeff did this already at the June Council meeting by stating that he was not putting those three units in. Solicitor Cravitz stated if Jeff is rescinding that statement then Council can go forward with the plan as originally presented in June. Jeff replied that the plan could go through as is but with the understanding that those three middle units will never be built. The studies that the engineers have done show that there is no difference in the floodplain whether the three units are built or not. Solicitor Cravitz stated the seven units are before Council based upon Bob Bickhart's calculations that this will only affect the floodplain within the law and will not affect surrounding landowners. If it does impact it will be so minimal that it cannot be calculated. Under those circumstances Council can vote on the plan as presented. Mgr. Bickhart asked if there is a plan showing this. Bob Bickhart replied that his whole involvement in the project has to do with lot drainage and stormwater management. There is another paper that was done by Jim Grose, the surveyor. Bob put his plans on the board for Council to see. Mgr. Bickhart put up another sheet of plans. Bob Bickhart stated that he agrees with Council that the existing units, though they may not be in the 100-year floodplain and though they may have had every right to renovate them to 100 percent value, are vulnerable to flooding and the proposed project will not alleviate their vulnerability to flooding. Sprengle and Buckley understand this, and they themselves are the ones who are most susceptible to damage by what they do to this property. C/P Kinney stated another thing to remember is that when flood insurance is involved, the flood insurance policies of all property owners in the floodplain is affected if Council does something illegal. He stated that he had been threatened as the previous borough manager with losing the Borough's flood insurance because of some illegal activities. Pres. Mengel asked Tom Sauers if he had any expertise in this area and he replied that CKCOG addresses only those areas that are designated on the maps. Bob Bickhart stated that the entire

area that this lies in, all of Weiser Run, is designated Zone B on the maps. This is the area between the 100 and 500-year floods but it can include areas of 100-year flooding, as it must because Weiser Run is there and there is a 100-year floodplain with respect to Weiser Run. The maps do not address what the elevations of that 100-year floodplain are for Weiser Run. Council took some time to go over the plan sheets. Solicitor Cravitz reconfirmed with Bob Bickhart that the existing buildings are not within the calculated 100-year floodplain for the maintained channel of Weiser Run. Bob Bickhart stated if the channel were to completely fill with silt then the 100-year floodplain rises. This is a dynamic thing and it must be maintained at its designed shape and condition in order to function the way it was designed. Calculations for Penn's Creek and the Susquehanna River were done in the 1970s and were revised in the 1980s due to the bypass. Those floodplain calculations are at a moment in time, a condition that no longer exists because things have changed. They may have changed for the better but probably not. All floodplains are constantly changing and therefore the 100-year floodplain is constantly changing. No one is required to recalculate other floodplain areas for today's conditions.

Motion by C/P Reuning to approve the plan for seven additional units to be built on the Sprengle/Buckley property. Seconded by C/P Inch.

C/P Kinney asked if variances were given and Solicitor Cravitz read the four variances that were given at the Zoning Hearing Board. Variance Request No. 1 was for a variance pertaining to the requirement for a minimum lot depth of 100 feet. The plan shows a depth of 84.74 feet along the southern boundary. A variance of 15.26 feet is being requested. A motion was made to show that this was considered to be an existing nonconforming lot of record and that no variance was required. Attorney Slivinski indicated that the prior use of the lot was commercial and the proposed change in use to multi-family dwellings would eliminate the nonconformity and require a variance. An amended motion was made to grant the 15.26 foot variance on the south side of the lot and the motion passed. Variance No. 2 pertains to the requirement for 20 foot side yard setbacks. The plan presented shows a minimum of 15 feet of side yard setback on the southeastern corner proposed unit TH1. A 5 foot variance is needed and the applicant also submitted a mutual agreement signed by Kenneth P. and Gloria Miller, adjoining property owners. They accepted the 15 foot side yard setback. A motion was made to grant the 5 foot side yard variance on the southern line of development because the general layout contained elements that are important to the development, these elements would be diminished by a change in the layout because of the presence of Weiser Run along the property line with unique and unusual circumstances for the side yard, and because the adjoining landowner have no objections. Motion passed. Variance No. 3 pertains to the requirement for setbacks, rooflines, and facades so there will be a distinction between two dwelling units. The proposed future building on the north side of the lot contains three units with no apparent variation between the units. A copy of the previous decision on a similar issue pertaining to the variance request of Charlie Page as provided by Janet Powers was distributed. A motion was made to grant a variance to the requirement for various setbacks and roofline facades so there will be a distinction between every two dwelling units under the condition that Unit TH6 would have a bow or bay window installed that would extend at least 18 inches from the front of the building. Motion passed. Variance No. 4 pertains to the requirement that the entrance and exit driveway not exceed 40 feet in width and wherever practical shall not occupy the full length or width of the streets or alleys. The plan indicates that 15 parking spaces will be along the north side of the property. The 15 spaces would be accessed by pulling directly off David Street with no defined driveway. A copy of a memo from the Borough Manager justifying a previous recommendation from the Selinsgrove Planning Commission and the Selinsgrove Borough Council to amend the ordinance was submitted and discussed. A motion was made to grant the requested variance to permit the construction of the parking lot as shown because this parking lot construction would be advantageous to the Borough by reducing the impervious cover associated with the development and permit the optimum use of the paving on David Street. It would permit a more efficient development of the property and the proposal was reviewed and recommended for approval by Selinsgrove Borough Planning Commission. Motion passed. C/P Kinney stated for the record that not one of those comments met the requirements of a variance.

Pres. Mengel called for a vote on the motion.

AYES: FOUR (4) – C/Ps Inch, Christine, Kinney and Reuning
NAYS: THREE (3) – C/Ps Handlan, Hetherington and Pres. Mengel
MOTION CARRIED

Bob Bickhart stated that he sent a letter to DEP regarding the 100-year floodplain and DEP responded by stating that they agreed that an obstructions permit was not necessary from the state but that they do want a letter from the Borough on floodplain/floodway consistency. The Borough was given a copy of this letter a number of months ago and Bob asked that the Borough send a letter to DEP as they have asked, showing that this project is consistent with the floodplain/floodway ordinances.

Dave Rothermel, Wesley United Methodist Church, Conditional Use – Mgr. Bickhart reported that the church has filed an application to build a pavilion in the corner of their yard area by Magnolia and the football field. The Planning Commission recommended that Council grant the conditional approval with the condition that computations be provided to the Borough engineer and approved for the construction of a structure that would manage the additional stormwater runoff from the roof area so there would be no increase in stormwater runoff from this structure. Dave Rothermel stated the church will do this.

Motion by C/P Kinney to grant the conditional approval with the restrictions as noted above. Seconded by C/P Reuning. Pres. Mengel called for a vote on the motion.

AYES: FIVE (5) NAYS: NONE
ABSTENTIONS: TWO (2) – C/P Hetherington and Pres. Mengel
MOTION CARRIED

UNFINISHED BUSINESS FROM PRIOR MEETINGS:

Review List of Council Issues – Mgr. Bickhart reported that there is a meeting scheduled for August 9 on the decorative street lighting project and construction is proposed to begin on August 15.

The Committee met today regarding the sidewalk program and there is a modified list of sidewalks for Phase 2 and a more definitive list for Phase 3. C/P Reuning reported that Phase 1 is completed. Several problem properties were identified on Phase 2 and they were re-inspected at the end of the meeting. The Committee upheld its decisions regarding these properties. Some Phase 2 projects were moved to Phase 3. The Committee decided to hold back on the South Water Street properties for now. Many of these were small sections that needed to be done to connect sidewalks. Middleburg Yarn, who has an agreement to complete their sidewalks in thirds, has done one section this year and has one section to be done next year. The property across Cherry Street has no sidewalk and the Committee will insist that a sidewalk be built there. C/P Kinney stated the estimated cost to finish Phase 2 is \$46,600, which means there is not a large area to be completed. C/P Reuning stated that Phase 3 is mostly the sidewalks that have been held back but not eliminated. C/P Kinney stated there are some questions regarding rights of way and other issues that need to be investigated. In response to a question from C/P Kinney regarding figures, Mgr. Bickhart replied that the sheet before Council contains three subtotals. C/P Christine asked if a maximum degree was determined for those sidewalks marked “difficult slope”. C/P Reuning stated this has not been determined. He stated that it is impossible to put a sidewalk on the left side of Bough Street. C/P Kinney stated that it gets complicated because in one place it goes down three steps and then goes down another step and then there is a doorway going into a building that is right up against a sidewalk. C/P Reuning stated the issues involve more than just a slope in a lot of cases. Mgr. Bickhart stated the comments on the report are pretty much footnotes for him to point out to the Committee the ones that were a little more difficult and why. These were all qualitative judgments made by viewing the sites and there were more factors than what he was able to write down on the report. C/P Reuning stating most of the projects are small connections that need to be made. The ones on Sand Hill Road are the ones that are larger and involve more money. On Alice Circle there is a corner house where Wayne Graybill used to live years ago that would have three pieces of sidewalk around it because it is along

Broad Street, then into the circle and then the whole area so the Committee decided to let that go for the moment.

Mgr. Bickhart reported a bid will be opened on August 18 for the University Avenue sewer reconstruction project. He does not have a copy of the plans yet but he should have them in the office in a couple of days. It is proposed that the bid be advertised and the bids opened and available for Council's consideration at the September meeting.

COMMITTEE / COMMISSION / BOARD REPORTS:

FINANCE & BUDGET COMMITTEE: C/P Inch, Chairman

Payment and Ratification of Bills – C/P Inch stated that the Finance Committee reviewed the bills and found everything to be in order.

Motion by C/P Inch to pay the bills. Seconded by C/P Kinney. Pres. Mengel called for a vote on the motion.

AYES: SEVEN (7) NAYS: NONE MOTION CARRIED

Statewide Tax Recovery, Inc. - Exoneration Requests – None

PUBLIC FACILITIES & SERVICES COMMITTEE: C/P Reuning, Chairman – No Report

BOROUGH ADMINISTRATION / PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT: C/P Kinney, Chairman – No Report

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS: C/P Handlan, Chairwoman – No Report

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE: C/P Christine, Chairman – No Report

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: C/P Hetherington, Chairman

C/P Hetherington reported that there will be a Safety Committee meeting Monday, August 22 at 7:00 p.m. to discuss new traffic standards and any other problems that might arise. C/P Reuning stated that out his way there are two big 16-wheelers parked and drivers cannot see up Tenth and Penn Streets because of one of them. There is also one on Sherman Street. He suggested discussion about a possible Ordinance to deal with these parking situations. C/P Hetherington stated this is hard to govern because it also affects people who have motor homes or travel trailers. He stated it will be discussed at the meeting.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON LANDLORD ORDINANCE: Pres. Mengel, C/Ps Handlan and Kinney

Discussion of review and comments on recommended Ordinance – C/P Handlan introduced Tom Sauers from CKCOG, who is at tonight's meeting to address any questions and to give Council guidance on implementing this new proposed Ordinance on rental occupancy regulations in Selinsgrove. She stated she has not heard any feedback from anyone opposing the changes that were made, or that were suggested to be made in eliminating a lot of things, so as to not place undue burden on landlords. The Committee also wants to ensure the safety of the students in the community. C/P Kinney stated the sentence on page 3 regarding regulating any and all residential units in the Borough bothers him. He thought the Ordinance was designed to protect the students, not everybody else. Pres. Mengel stated her understanding was that the Ordinance was for all rentals right from the start. Solicitor Cravitz stated the definition relates to regulated residences, which are only residences involving students. C/P Kinney stated he likes the Ordinance but he also hates the Ordinance because he feels it over-regulates but yet he sees the need and he feels inspections of some of the properties are long overdue, as some of the places he has been in are not fit to be rented. The students need to be protected because some of the landlords are taking advantage by using the rentals as a money scheme and not keeping the properties up to standards. C/P Handlan stated in January a landlord's meeting was held and she asked for

comments or concerns from landlords to be passed to Council or to Mgr. Bickhart. She has not received any comments from any landlords other than those comments that were made at the meeting that night. Many of those comments were taken into consideration when eliminating language from the recommended Ordinance. C/P Inch asked if the Ordinance is being proposed to be passed tonight and C/P Handlan replied that it is not ready yet. At last month's meeting many Council members had questions about how the Ordinance would be implemented, how often the inspections will be done, whether the landlords will have to have a permit every year, and how to roll out the Ordinance. Tom Sauers and CKCOG will play a big role in the implementation of the Ordinance. Mgr. Bickhart clarified that there is nothing in the Ordinance that specifies any frequency of inspection. It proposes an annual licensing and inspection fee but there is nothing in the language that talks about any frequency of actual inspections. C/P Handlan replied that this is one of the questions that was still on the table, as to whether inspections would be done every two years or whether inspections are needed every year. Mgr. Bickhart stated that in this case Council is talking about the Property Maintenance Code, which when adopted anticipated inspections to be done on a complaint basis. With the language in the recommended Ordinance this is also the way it will be at this point. The Ordinance does not even propose that there be an inspection for the first licensing and leaves it completely open. C/P Handlan stated that there had been language in the Ordinance that landlords had to post their inspection results. Mgr. Bickhart stated that in Bloomsburg when they adopted their Ordinance they also concurrently adopted the Property Maintenance Code and an inspection program. They actually had two ordinances. C/P Handlan stated the committee has not even considered yet what fees will be charged for these services. Mgr. Bickhart suggested that it would fall to the Finance Committee to recommend a fee structure that would cover the costs because Solicitor Cravitz has already advised Council that they need to break even without accumulating funds because then it would be a tax and not a fee.

C/P Handlan asked for any other comments. Brian Betz, a Borough landlord, introduced himself, stating that after the meeting in January he had the opportunity to meet with other landlords. They made recognized notes and recognized duplications to the concerns that were read in the Bloomsburg ordinance. However, C/P Handlan's email address and name were not on the sign-up sheet because everyone that was on that sheet was put on a broadcast email and Mr. Betz notified everyone. He stated if C/P Handlan's email address had been there these things would have been brought to her attention. He stated the landlords have collectively gathered a number of concerns that would be both safety issues and landlord issues. He stated he would like to be able to share this with C/P Handlan at least by tomorrow. C/P Handlan stated she would also share with Mr. Betz a copy of the recommended Ordinance that has a lot of the language eliminated since the January landlords' meeting. Pres. Mengel stated Council still needs to hear from Tom Sauers as to how the Borough will go about starting the inspection and licensing procedures.

Tom Sauers from CKCOG stated that CKCOG has been an enforcement agency for property maintenance licensing procedures since 1987. They do quite a few inspections in Lewisburg, Mifflinburg and Middleburg. This can be as complex or as simple as Council desires to make it. The COG looks for consistency in enforcing regulations, they do not get into selective enforcement, and they do not become the enforcement agency. If a person other than the owner of record is living in a structure they are subject to having the unit inspected. For a landlord this can become a lifesaving issue. There are currently about 3,000 licensed rental properties in Union County, including Mifflinburg and Lewisburg, with Bucknell University being the biggest contributor. The COG inspects these units annually. If the landlord has just put down new carpet or put up new wallpaper or just plastered a unit then they have a record indicating exactly what that unit looks like. When the tenant moves out if there is damage the landlord can go to the district magistrate with this third party agency verification to get money back from the former tenant. Last year 184 violation citations were given out by CKCOG in the Borough of Lewisburg alone. The COG already has been doing inspections in the Borough of Selinsgrove for the past year for Section 8 housing, as they are contracted with the Snyder County Housing Authority to do inspections. Landlords buy houses as investment properties in order to make money, and there are good landlords and bad landlords. The most strain that the Borough will have on the local utility services for rental properties are for police and fire calls because people just are not as concerned about a property that they do not own. Tom suggested that to implement the Ordinance someone will have to go through the tax records to see who is the owner of a property and who is occupying the property. This is a long

process which cannot be done overnight. A fee is almost always necessary to support the process. Lewisburg currently charges a licensing fee of \$25.00 a year per building and an inspection fee based on the hourly rate of CKCOG, which is currently \$48.00 per hour with a minimum charge of one hour per inspection. In State College the licensing fees range from \$25.00 per unit to \$150.00 or \$200.00 per unit. Bloomsburg is talking about increasing their fees and doing more with smoke detectors and other things. The fee should be enough to offset the expenses without generating a profit to the Borough. The police department is a good resource to determine where the trouble spots are based on number of complaints received. Tom Sauers recommended establishing a landlords' association or group of individuals who can work with the Committee so they can know what is going on. The good landlords will come forward to help address concerns. He also suggested putting information in the Borough newsletter so that the tenants know about the inspections. A property cannot be considered for Section 8 housing unless it has a permit. He suggested making the Section 8 agency aware of the implementation of the Ordinance. Lewisburg has had a rental property licensing program since 1988 and they still find a property every now and then that does not have a permit, or someone will sell a property and it will get turned into a rental property rather than owner occupied. Selinsgrove definitely has a need for this due to the number of university students who live off campus in rental properties. Tom also recommended that everything be documented. Once CKCOG is appointed by a municipality to enforce the property maintenance code, the COG becomes the enforcement agency. They usually will get a complaint from someone in the Borough, such as the Borough Manager, and at that point the COG takes over to ensure that the enforcement activity is consistent. One person should not have total authority; there is a set of standards and that person has to work within those guidelines. Whenever a complaint is filed the Borough Solicitor is the first person who is spoken to. The Borough needs to set a precedent as to how long a person has to correct a situation, whether 10 days or 30 days. After that everyone is treated the same no matter who they are. By having a third party agency such as CKCOG involved it keeps the elected officials isolated from the process; however, the officials need to know what is going on. The process for complaints would involve the Borough Manager turning in the complaints to the enforcement department, such as the COG, who then takes over the process in conjunction with the Borough Solicitor to ensure consistency. When the property owner signs the application for the permit he will be informed in writing, right on the application, that he is responsible to notify the Department of any changes he may have in occupancy. The property owner also signs an agreement to allow annual inspections. A minimum notice of 24 hours is required for inspection of a property. If the person has a problem with an inspector coming onto the property then the inspector does not go onto the property without a search warrant. CKCOG sends out notices 30 days ahead of time letting the landlord know that inspection for his property is coming due. Lewisburg requires the landlord to be within 30 miles of the property or to have an agent that is located within 30 miles of the property. The COG also keeps a list of the number of tenants on a property. If there is a fire then the fire department will know how many people should be in the building. Tom suggested that the Committee work closely with the solicitor on non-family limitations. Lewisburg has a requirement of three unrelated persons in a unit. This means that even though some apartment units have 2,500 square feet only three people can live there. There should also be information included such as off-street parking for tenant cars, etc. C/P Reuning asked if all inspections are done annually and Tom replied that if the Borough chooses to use CKCOG they would like some leeway on this issue. Annual inspections are to be done annually, not to exceed three years. If there is a building boom one year and there are not enough inspectors to do all the inspections that are due, the COG will go down through the list and the properties that have had no problems over the past three or four years may be bypassed for inspection. The property owners will pay the licensing permit fee but not be inspected for that year and will not have to pay the inspection fee for that year. This is an incentive for the property owners to take care of their properties and have tenants who are not problems for the police department because then they can avoid paying extra fees. In this scenario license fees are due annually but inspection fees are due when inspections are done, at least once every three years. A problem property can run into quite a bit of expense. There was one property in the Borough recently where three men were there for six hours. The COG inspectors are very good at their jobs. They can tell as soon as they enter a property if there will be problems. Some inspections may not take much more than a half hour to complete. An inspection is not done without notifying the landlord and the tenant to make sure someone is there. The COG inspectors will not walk into an empty house. The inspectors have a checklist that they use that says "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory". Tom reported that Lewisburg has about 500 to 600 students who live off campus and he meets with them and gives them cards of which properties are deemed

satisfactory. Mifflinburg has about 500 people in rental properties. All municipalities are finding that rental properties are increasing. Nice homes are being turned into multi-unit rentals. C/P Inch asked what the lead time is when someone remodels a property and then needs it to be inspected. Tom replied that his inspectors will be available within 24 hours of notification. When the COG is notified to do an inspection for Section 8 housing in the Borough they usually get the notification on a Wednesday and the inspection is done on Thursday. There are hundreds of these properties in Union and Snyder Counties, as well as some in upper Northumberland County. C/P Reuning asked what Section 8 is. Tom replied that it refers to housing that is subsidized by the federal government, HUD. Mgr. Bickhart stated it is housing that is in Section 8 of the HUD code. It applies to qualifying individual properties on a case by case basis for occupancy by tenants who qualify for Section 8 funding.

Pres. Mengel stated that the Committee will do more work on this. C/P Handlan stated she will get the comments from Brian Betz and then the Committee can get back together again.

PLANNING COMMISSION: Earl Moyer, Chairman – Mgr. Bickhart reported that the Planning Commission addressed Brian Farrell's conditional use. It was on the agenda but Brian had called to indicate he was out of town. The issue was discussed a bit and tabled to the next meeting.

ZONING HEARING BOARD: Glen Rohrer, Chairman – No Report

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION: Wilhelm Reuning, Acting Chairman – C/P Reuning reported that Bill Swartzlander has put a name forward to fill George Praul's place as chairman. That person is George Cravitz.

Motion by C/P Kinney to approve George Cravitz as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Seconded by C/P Hetherington. Pres. Mengel called for a vote on the motion.

AYES: SEVEN (7) NAYS: NONE MOTION CARRIED

C/P Reuning stated the Civil Service tests will be administered on Saturday and he will proctor them. There are 12 applicants for the open position in the police department.

PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD: Richard Norman, Chairman – No Report

SHADE TREE COMMISSION: Mark Vergauwen, Chairman – No Report

BOROUGH ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:

MAYOR: Garry Beaver

Mayor Beaver reported that in regards to the problem at the railroad station, the property owner has been contacted and instructed to take care of the problem and it is being worked on. Chief Garlock stated the weeds are down and there are some cars on the property that are not the owner's cars so he is working on getting them removed.

Mayor Beaver also reported that the Loving Care property had some trouble with garbage in the rear of the property, a warning was issued, and the situation has been taken care of.

C/P Kinney stated that on East Bough Street Coby Cressinger has two abandoned cars on the lower part of his property.

C/P Handlan stated there are two old Cadillacs along Liberty Alley with no plates on them and weeds growing up around them.

C/P Kinney suggested having Gary or one of the crew go around town to get a list of properties with weed issues. The police would then enforce it. Mgr. Bickhart stated that the procedure that is used is that Gary

takes a survey and gives Mgr. Bickhart a list. It is converted to property owners' addresses and is given to the police department for follow-up and citations. There is a property that is for sale on East Pine Street and the realtor has been notified but has not responded.

BOROUGH SOLICITOR: Robert Cravitz – No report

BOROUGH ENGINEER: J. A. Coukart & Associates

Mgr. Bickhart reported on the letter received from Coukart. The interceptor metering chamber project is underway and the contractor has started some things. The streetscape project will start August 15. The street program paving will be done August 15 and the alley paving program will be done this Wednesday behind the Borough building. There is a bid opening at 11:00 on August 18 for the University Avenue project.

Gary had asked Coukart to go along and look at the Weiser Run situation where the piece of sanitary sewer is exposed where improvements had previously been made by the Selinsgrove Area School District. Coukart is suggesting an improvement beyond the area which was originally stabilized and beyond the area that was originally eroded. This could be presented to the SASD but it would be above and beyond what they did and what they had permission to do before, so the Borough may not have the authority to make the SASD improve it further down. The natural stream channel is narrower just below the point where it stops, which is at a section where the stream is wider. C/P Kinney expressed his displeasure at the lack of cooperation from the SASD. Mgr. Bickhart reported that he wrote to the school district back in December and Solicitor Cravitz wrote to them at Council's request in May and nothing concrete has come from the school district, even verbally, about a time schedule. C/P Reuning asked if Council could put a time limit on this and Solicitor Cravitz replied that Council should do that. C/P Hetherington stated he understands from Gary that Gary and Mr. Varner from the school district have ideas but they do not know exactly where to start. Mgr. Bickhart stated that the Borough just spent money to have the Borough engineer look at the situation and he has no fault with that because it is something that needed to be done, but the SASD never invited the engineer who designed the work to come and look at it. He thinks Council needs to set a deadline for the school district to respond with a schedule to resolve the problem. He stated that on Council's behalf he put the school district on notice of his concern about continuing damage, stating that if the sanitary sewer pipe is disturbed it will be a much bigger problem and it will be at the school district's expense. They were notified in December that this is a potential problem. It is a plastic pipe, not a metal pipe, and there is enough of it exposed that a joint could be exposed and the joints have to be restrained from moving sideways. As soon as a joint moves out sideways it can separate. C/P Inch asked if a paper trail can be established on this issue and Solicitor Cravitz replied that this can be done. C/P Kinney stated that when the stormwater was changed for the construction of the Intermediate School, Tommy Walker had problems from day one. He has erosion and the school district built on his land, causing him to have to re-deed part of his land. He has had to threaten lawsuits on numerous occasions to get the school district to come in and do little things and they have ignored him right up to the very end. This is the same type of problem and it is ongoing. He stated there is a paper trail that goes back quite a way with the SASD. C/P Hetherington suggested sending a letter stating that it has been over six months and Council would like to see some results, preferably the entire job completed, by the start of the new school year. C/P Reuning suggested setting a deadline date and after some discussion of dates C/P Hetherington suggested September 12, which is the next Council meeting night, as the deadline for a plan to be in place. It was decided that Solicitor Cravitz will send the letter as a follow-up to his previous letter.

BOROUGH MANAGER / SECRETARY / ZONING OFFICER: Mgr. Bickhart

Fisher Property on Front Street – Mgr. Bickhart stated he has a meeting tomorrow with Tom Bresenham from SEDA-COG concerning the re-rating study and the definitions of minor improvements and substantial damage so this can be clarified. On Friday he has a meeting with Don Girton from CKCOG to go over his knowledge about this property. All the data will be put together for a decision of what to do next. Pres. Mengel stated she understands that Janet Powers will also be involved in the meeting with Don Girton.

Mary Searer Property – The attorney was given seven days a month or more ago. The attorney was not in a position to do anything. He invited the Borough via letter to do what has to be done to keep the property in compliance and send him a bill to be paid at settlement. The attorney is in the process of trying to sell the property. He has a couple proposals and he may be waiting for court approval. According to an informal conversation Mgr. Bickhart had with the judge, the judge has not seen this matter yet. There is a rumor that the attorney has one appraisal and he has to have a second appraisal before he can take it to the judge. Pres. Mengel asked Solicitor Cravitz to get in touch with the attorney to see where this stands. Mgr. Bickhart stated he understood Council's feeling from last month was to let this lie. C/P Hetherington asked about the Ordinance violations regarding weeds and Mgr. Bickhart and Solicitor Cravitz both responded that every day is a separate violation.

BOROUGH ENGINEER: J. A. Coukart & Associates

Curb/Steel Plate Installation on Eighth Street Project – Identification of Other Contractors –

C/P Kinney stated he talked to Coukart on this issue and Coukart stated that no contractor that he has talked to is even willing to touch this because it was made clear that if any harm comes to the trees the contractor would be held responsible for it. C/P Kinney stated he is not of the opinion that Council should let those people off the hook when other people have been made to remove trees to put curbing in. Something should be done to rectify this. If a contractor cannot be found to install the steel curbing then other options should be explored. Pres. Mengel asked if anyone has spoken to the people at Penn State, where this has been done before. C/P Kinney stated that Coukart has talked to several people and they are concerned that they will be held responsible for any tree that would die. C/P Christine asked how this differs from someone who puts in a sidewalk too close to a curb. The contractor who replaces the curb runs the risk of damaging the sidewalk and contractors can be found to do these projects. C/P Kinney replied that the Borough has a right of way but the property owner is responsible for the sidewalks. Solicitor Cravitz stated that the tree owners had stated that if the Borough agreed to save their trees then they would sign releases to indemnify everybody. C/P Reuning asked if the property owners can be told to get someone to do the curbs. Pres. Mengel suggested putting it back to the Shade Tree Commission to figure out a solution to this. Mgr. Bickhart stated there are other solutions that have already been discussed but the steel plate was the solution that maintained the curb line and involved the least excavation. Displacing the curb one curb width and constructing a new curb was an alternative. Another option was to come out three feet to construct the curb, thus taking away the parking spaces. Other options were flip-flopping curbs or a making the street a one-way street. These alternatives would allow the contractor to put in a curb line without coming too close to the tree roots. A contractor would be willing to put a new curb right outside the existing curb as long as he did not have to touch the existing curb and disturb the tree roots. There are five 100-foot trees in a row that weigh tons, with root structures that are substandard to begin with. The contractor knows that if a tree goes down after he has been there it will be seen as his fault, whether it actually is or not. C/P Christine asked if the Shade Tree Commission was in favor of the steel curbing and Mgr. Bickhart replied that they were in favor of anything that does not disturb the trees. C/P Kinney stated that anything that Council decides to do now, other than putting in curbing, will start a precedent which will create a lot of problems. At Pres. Mengel's suggestion for a recommendation from the Shade Tree Commission, Mgr. Bickhart stated that they are not able to make a recommendation. They might recommend moving the curb line out three feet but Council might be opposed to that idea. C/P Christine asked what the engineer's best solution is for this. Mgr. Bickhart stated that the Borough engineer would probably advise a compromise position of constructing a curb just in front of the existing curb and leaving the existing curb untouched. C/P Kinney stated he would be concerned about the old curb pushing out the new curb. Mgr. Bickhart replied that this will eventually happen as there is no way to prevent it. C/P Kinney stated to do this will require digging up the street which will result in a patch job on a new street. He stated the street should never have been paved until this issue was settled. Pres. Mengel stated Council knew from the start that this would happen. She asked for a recommendation from C/P Reuning's committee for September's meeting so that this can be resolved. C/P Kinney stated he would also like the engineer to be at the meeting to help with this. C/P Reuning stated the engineer could attend the committee meeting.

Sassafras Street Sanitary Sewer – consider increase in pipe size

Motion by C/P Kinney to increase the pipe size of the Sassafras Street sanitary sewer. Seconded by C/P Inch.

C/P Kinney stated that for \$3,000.00 it would be foolish not to do this as it will be money well spent. Pres. Mengel called for a vote on the motion.

AYES: SEVEN (7) NAYS: NONE MOTION CARRIED

BOROUGH TREASURER: Sharon Badman

Review Treasurer’s Report for July 2005 - Pres. Mengel asked if there were any questions on the Treasurer’s report. Hearing none, she stated that it is on file for audit.

BOROUGH MANAGER / SECRETARY / ZONING OFFICER: Mgr. Bickhart

Non-Police Matter Suggestions Update – No additions to list

Update of PROPERTY TRANSFERS and BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED, Janet Powers, Deputy Zoning and Permit Officer – Nothing further

Consider accepting Cooperative Agreement with PA Fish and Boat Commission for proposed improvements and maintenance of Boat Ramp – C/P Kinney expressed his deep dissatisfaction regarding the cooperative agreement, which basically states the Borough is responsible for everything and the Fish and Boat Commission is responsible for nothing. He stated the Daily Item newspaper lists an existing building that will redone but there is no building at the site. Pres. Mengel stated the plan is to build a bathroom. C/P Kinney stated that the most vandalized thing, whether it is at Kidsgrove, in the Borough building or in Anthony Selin Park, is a public bathroom. He stated the Borough would be responsible for this building and would have to heat it in the winter. He wants to know where the money will come from. Mgr. Bickhart replied the building would not be heated in the winter; it would weatherproofed and closed down. C/P Kinney stated it did not say that in the proposed agreement. Some Council members expressed concern over the fact that after the construction is completed the Borough will be responsible for maintenance and upkeep costs. C/Ps Kinney and Inch stated they are 100 percent opposed to the cooperative agreement as presented. C/P Kinney stated the Borough currently has an agreement with the Fish Commission, who was to do improvements to the boat ramp and they have not done anything for 15 or 20 years. C/Ps Inch and Kinney expressed concern over the wording of the proposed document which states that if the Borough slips up at all on anything they will have to pay back the \$65,000 grant. C/P Hetherington wondered whether, due to the flood conditions at the boat ramp, a stable parking lot could be built at all, let alone a flood wall and restrooms. Repairs will need to be made and paid for every year by the Borough. Pres. Mengel stated that this is one of the priorities of SPI for revitalizing Selinsgrove, to afford improved access to the waterways. C/P Kinney stated he does not want to take tax dollars for this project. He stated 75 percent of the project would be covered by the \$65,000 but there is a lot of work that is being proposed and he feels it is too much. He stated he would like to see the boat ramps improved and he would like to see Bowersox off the Borough’s land completely. One good result of this agreement is that if this project is done then Bowersox will not be able to have anything on Borough land any more. However, under the circumstances C/P Kinney stated he will not go along with this proposal. C/P Handlan asked if C/P Kinney would approve it if there were portable toilets brought in. C/P Kinney asked who would pay for them. He stated the more he read the proposed agreement the more disgusted he got. Pres. Mengel asked how long Council has to accept the agreement. Mgr. Bickhart replied Council can take whatever time they need to think about it, but Pres. Mengel stated SPI does not want to lose the grant. To get things under way, C/P Inch stated he would make a motion.

Motion by C/P Inch to not accept the agreement with the Fish Commission. Seconded by C/P Hetherington.

C/P Reuning asked what the alternative is and Pres. Mengel replied the boat ramp area would stay the way it is. C/P Handlan asked what specific part of the agreement some of the Council members are not in favor of. C/P Inch replied that he objects to the Borough laying out money and taking a burden upon themselves, and if the Borough accepts the money they have to pay it back. In addition, he is concerned about vandalism to the restrooms and the Borough is agreeing to maintain them. C/P Kinney stated that another concern he has is that this is one of the lowest areas on the Isle of Que; it is the first area to flood. C/P Handlan asked how they would feel if the restroom was not part of the agreement. C/P Hetherington stated the \$25,000 the Borough has to put to the grant could be used for a lot of other things, it is money the Borough does not have, and he will not vote for any tax increases just for a boat ramp. C/P Inch stated Council does not even have usage figures for the number of Selinsgrove residents who use the boat ramp. C/P Hetherington stated there are times when the parking lot is pretty full. C/P Handlan stated the purpose of this is also to draw people to the Borough other than just Selinsgrove residents. Pres. Mengel reminded Council that the \$23,800 is donated money and will cost the Borough nothing. C/P Kinney disagreed and Mgr. Bickhart explained that it is being donated as in-kind services with SPI underwriting the grant. C/P Hetherington asked how much SPI can take on under their financial responsibility. If SPI would fold then the Borough will be stuck with the costs. Pres. Mengel stated that Council needs to understand that the \$23,800 is in-kind money and will not be a financial burden to the Borough. C/P Kinney stated he does not care where that money is coming from. He is looking at the long-term maintenance and repairs and the money that will come out from the Borough in the future. It is like someone donating money to the university to build a building. The donor gets his name on the building but then the maintenance of the building has to be taken over by the university. Pres. Mengel stated the Borough does the same thing at Kidsgrove and C/P Kinney stated Kidsgrove is a private corporation. Pres. Mengel called for a vote on the motion.

AYES: FOUR (4) – C/Ps Inch, Christine, Kinney and Hetherington
NAYS: THREE (3) – C/Ps Handlan, Reuning and Pres. Mengel
MOTION CARRIED

C/P Kinney stated that if the proposed agreement would be rewritten as something that will share responsibilities he might consider it, but he will not assume all the responsibility with a gun held at his head and he feels that this is a gun held at the Borough's head. C/P Hetherington stated he feels it should be a 50/50 partnership as far as responsibility is concerned. C/P Christine stated perhaps some items could be cut out and a new proposal made. C/P Handlan suggested leaving the bathrooms out. C/P Hetherington asked if the Borough still has a copy of the agreement that the Fish Commission came up with when the boat ramp was put in originally because they promised a lot back then and basically did not do anything. Solicitor Cravitz read from the original agreement with the Fish Commission, which stated in Paragraph 2 that the "Commission will develop the project which will consist of recontouring, landscaping, parking areas, boat launching ramp and such other development as the Commission may consider suitable. 3) Additional Development: Borough may be permissible, at its own expense, to perform such additional development as may be appropriate to more fully utilize the recreational potential of the site. However, the Commission reserves the right to review and approve such change." He stated the Fish Commission is in no case responsible for replacement, repair or maintenance of any additional development. Regarding maintenance, "Borough at its expense will assume full responsibility for maintenance of the project immediately upon notification by the Commission that construction of the project has been completed. This mainly shall include, but not be limited to, routine mowing of grass, trash pickup and removal from the site, removal of debris from the parking area and river shoreline, routine repairing and reseeding of areas which may be prone to erosion, timely and proper grading and patching of all roads, maintenance of road shoulders, drainage ditches, head walls in good condition, repair and maintain all paving, structures in attractive and useful condition, policing, sign repairs and other necessary work to maintain the entire project in a tidy, sanitary and presentable manner in keeping with good recreation practices as determined by the Commission." Solicitor Cravitz read further that "nothing in this agreement shall be construed to limit the Commission in any way in performing at its own expense such inspection, repair and replacement maintenance as it considers advisable. The Commission at its expense shall be responsible for replacement or repair of structures installed or erected by the Commission for damages therefrom not the result of vandalism, negligence or failure to conduct proper

and timely maintenance with supervision of Borough.” C/P Inch stated that the Borough would have to carry insurance on any improvements. C/P Kinney stated he believes the Borough has blanket liability coverage. Pres. Mengel asked how long the old agreement is in effect and Solicitor Cravitz replied that it goes through 2012; it was for 25 years starting October 26, 1987. The new agreement would replace the old one. Pres. Mengel asked what it would take for Council to approve this. C/P Inch asked what is meant by the \$23,800 being an in-kind contribution. Mgr. Bickhart explained that this would be donations of materials and services by people who have already indicated their willingness to participate and donate their services. That is how this was proposed for the grant. C/P Christine stated he would like to see the restroom building removed from the proposal, along with the proposed connections to the sanitary sewer and water supply. He would also like to see no electricity except for in the parking area. C/P Kinney stated there is already lighting in the parking area. C/P Christine stated he would approve paving the trailer and vehicle parking area, constructing steps, adding benches and picnic tables, stabilizing and improving the river bank, precast concrete wall – basically numbers 1 through 9 and 13 in the proposed agreement, taking out numbers 10, 11 and 12. Mgr. Bickhart stated he thinks the proposed construction can be modified without altering the grant. It will alter the grant amount but the Borough should still get the grant. The money is to do the design and the construction. C/P Christine stated this is an opportunity to be taken advantage of in order to improve something that the Borough already offers but not to the extent that the current agreement proposes. C/P Kinney stated he would like to see what the minimum requirements are that the Fish Commission will agree to in terms of the agreement. Mgr. Bickhart stated he thinks this would be pretty much as spelled out in the proposed agreement; he does not think these requirements are negotiable, although Solicitor Cravitz could call to find out. Pres. Mengel stated this will be readdressed by SPI. She asked for ideas or suggestions and Mgr. Bickhart stated that his only suggestion would be to come up with different ownership, a different entity that would be grant eligible, and then the property would be sold to them for development. C/P Kinney stated he is not in favor of the Borough selling the property unless it would go back on the tax rolls. Pres. Mengel asked how many times the Borough has had any contact with the Fish Commission since the old agreement has been in place. C/P Kinney replied none and Pres. Mengel asked why Council thinks the Fish Commission would be interfering now. C/P Kinney replied the Fish Commission did not do anything that they were supposed to under the old agreement. Pres. Mengel stated that SPI wants to do this now. There was discussion about how much the boat ramp is used, with some Council members stating that at times there are 12 to 20 cars in the parking lot. Pres. Mengel stated she will take Council’s opinions to SPI to see what they recommend as a next step. C/P Inch stated that Council finds out about things from SPI at Council meetings when they suddenly find they have to make a decision on something. Pres. Mengel stated there has been discussion at the last couple meetings about the boat ramp. Judy Spiegel came to a Council meeting to inform Council of things that SPI was looking to do. C/P Kinney stated those were general things and now there are specifics which are stating basically that the Borough is responsible for everything and will have to pay all the bills. His concern is where the money will come from to keep it going in the future. The only reason he voted for the Sprenkle/Buckley apartment buildings was because of the tax base. The Borough needs a tax base desperately.

SELINGROVE MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY – No Report

EASTERN SNYDER COUNTY REGIONAL AUTHORITY – No Report

NEW BUSINESS:

COUNCIL MEMBERS – Nothing

MAYOR – Nothing

OTHERS

Mgr. Bickhart stated he gave Council a copy of Snyder County’s proposal to create a hazard mitigation plan and an invitation to a meeting. He stated he has no idea what this is all about. The Borough has its own extensive and well thought out hazard mitigation plan. He does not know if this dovetails or not.

Mgr. Bickhart reported that on August 9 at 10:00 a.m. the Penn Valley Airport Authority is having a groundbreaking ceremony. They called and asked Mgr. Bickhart to invite all Council members to attend the groundbreaking ceremony for the runway extension project.

Pres. Mengel asked who attended the fire company regionalization meeting at the middle school. Several Council members attended. Mgr. Bickhart stated he is expecting an invitation to a meeting that is proposed to be held on August 16 but he has not yet received any notice of a subsequent meeting. C/P Kinney stated that he left the meeting with the feeling that there really was no explanation of how a regionalization would work. There are several ways to approach it, but with the questions that were asked he left with the feeling that no one is yet ready to give up their kingdom. C/P Reuning stated that he agrees. The local fire companies are a long way away from regionalization. This was a meeting to open discussion on it and get people to think about it and perhaps push it. One fire department is outright against it. Hummels Wharf worked things out with Monroe Township so they do not have money pressure on them now. It will take a while for people to think this through. C/P Kinney stated this needs to be pursued and he also feels that police departments will have to one day look at regionalization in order to have needed coverage and shared expenses with neighboring municipalities. He stated that until the fire companies really hit the wall with their finances there will not be action on regionalization. C/P Reuning stated a personnel crunch may be more of a factor than money.

ADJOURNMENT:

With no additional business, the meeting adjourned to an **Executive Session** at 9:15 P.M. for discussion of **Personnel Issues**.