

BOROUGH OF EAST GREENVILLE
BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2016

Call to Order: Council Vice President Ms. Hunsinger called the meeting to order at 7:46 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Attendance: The following Council members were present: Joseph Arahill via speaker phone, Tracey Hunsinger, Robert McCluskie, Ryan Pugh, Leon Steinert via speaker phone and Marita Thomson. Also present were Mayor Ryan Sloyer, Atty. Michelle Forsell, Solicitor, Atty. Barry Tomlinson, Solicitor; James Fry, Borough Manager, and Sharon Kachmar, Borough Secretary/Treasurer.

Ms. Hunsinger advised that an executive session was held at 6:30 p.m. due to litigation with police issues.

Approval of Minutes: A motion was made by Ms. Thomson to approve the minutes of the September 6, 2016, meeting. Seconded by Mr. Pugh and unanimously approved.

Visitors: 226 visitors signed in. Atty. Forsell advised that Council will be taking comments throughout the meeting. Those who wish to address council should state their name, address and whether they are a resident or taxpayer. Non borough residents will be heard time permitting and at Council discretion. The goal is to be constructive and express concerns to Council members. Speakers are asked to refrain from personal attacks.

Public Comment:

Richard Ottinger, 422 West Sixth Street, asked about the overgrowth of weeds and trees in the lot across from him called the Nature Meadow. He requested thistles be cut back since they are invading his lawn.

Jim Raftery, 319 State Street, asked if there was a vacant council seat and what he needs to do to officially apply.

Solicitor Items: Atty. Forsell advised that Resolution 2016-09 for the acquisition of Arlington Street lots owned by the Simmons estate has been advertised and is ready for adoption. Mr. Pugh made a motion to approve Resolution 2016-09 to purchase Arlington Street lots, seconded by Ms. Thomson.

Andrew Rock, 206 Fourth Street, asked about the property cost. Ms. Hunsinger replied that a grant will cover all but \$20,000.

Michael Mumma, 218 W Fourth Street, asked what will be done with the land. Ms. Hunsinger replied they are considering working with Love Upper Perk on community gardens to funnel food to Open Link or for local sports teams in the area.

Ed Bieler, 546 Washington Street, said he likes having open space, but in light of recent developments, was concerned if it was in the best interest of the Borough. He asked what budget item the purchase would come from. Ms. Thomson replied from parks and recreation with the transaction not occurring until next year. Mr. Bieler asked if a cost analysis was done on the property for making improvements and whether Council was aware that once it's purchased it becomes a non taxable property. Council advised they were aware of the tax implications.

Jamie Brinkman, 551 Washington Street, asked if the property would be maintained and where would parking be for a sporting event. Council advised that the Borough would maintain the property, and if it gets used for sports, decisions would be made about parking.

Branden Mininger, 323 Blaker Drive, asked why \$20,000 would be spent if there are budget issues. Council advised there is a grant opportunity available and not much open space in the Borough.

Jim Raftery, 319 State Street, asked where the grant came from. Mayor Sloyer advised that the property was under agreement last year but the grant didn't come through until this year so it was not purchased. Because there is very little open space in the Borough, Council decided to take advantage of the grant and purchase the property. Mr. Raftery asked if the grant is specific. The answer is yes. Atty. Forsell further explained that it's a Greenways Trails and Recreation grant to be used for open space.

Doug Criddle, 274 Washington Street, asked if when applying for the grant last year if the Borough was in the same financial state. Mayor Sloyer said when the Borough applied for that grant, there was an agreement not to hire another officer. Mr. Criddle asked why proceed with the purchase now that the officer is replaced. Council advised funding is needed for roads, public safety, and recreation. Mr. Criddle asked if there is grant money for roads and public safety. Mayor Sloyer replied that two recent grants were received to make the Borough Hall and clubhouse facilities ADA compliant and to reconstruct Second Street from Main to Washington Street. Grants for public safety are available for equipment but not to fund the budget. Mr. Criddle said he is 100% committed to police and not everyone can use Second Street. Mayor Sloyer reiterated that the Borough needs to maintain every part of the Borough including infrastructure and public safety.

Eric Grubb, 138 Main Street, doesn't want grant money spent unless there is a clear plan. He questioned the profit and loss of owning the Colonial Village clubhouse.

Monica Oswald, 219 Third Street, said grants are very specific to certain projects and she applauded Council for the finding and using of the open space grant.

Margie Gehlhaus, 209 Cherry Street, believes open space is nice, but if used by the Mohawks, they would need to prepare for parking and noise.

Lon Brinckman, 551 Washington Street, said the lots in question have been for sale for a long time because are no water, sewer or electric utilities to that area. He doesn't believe it's big enough for sporting events.

With the motion on the floor, a roll call was taken. Mr. McCluskie – aye, Mr. Pugh – aye, Mr. Arahill – aye, Mr. Steinert – aye, Ms. Hunsinger, Ms. Thomson – aye. Motion carried.

Jack Ramsey, 710 Hamilton Road, said people here just stated they didn't want you to buy it. Ms. Hunsinger advised that this has been on the agenda and had public discussion for several months.

Amy Gray, 521 Washington Street, asked if Council members ever stood upon the property. Ms. Thomson, Ms. Hunsinger and Mr. McCluskie advised that they walked the property. Ms. Gray said the property floods and believes sporting events would cause problems with water at her property. She asked Council to reconsider their plan to use it for sporting events. Council said they will take it into consideration.

Mike Schwenk, 112 Jefferson Street, asked if it will be taken into consideration tonight.

Jennifer Moran, 227 W Sixth Street, said she attended a meeting when Council talked about this property, and believes it would be a good idea. She volunteers with Love Upper Perk, and one idea was to use a greenhouse and plant food for the people in need in the community.

Donald Baker, 232 Cherry Street, was not in favor of dismantling UP police and didn't want to spend grant money on something not needed.

Jim Raftery, 319 State Street, said it doesn't make fiscal sense to buy a property without knowing what you plan to do with it or have a cost analysis for what you want to do. He asked Council to reconsider this purchase.

Steve Cunningham, part owner of Titanium Finishing Company, stated that when looking at grant money for Second Street you had to get final costs, and when planning to buy property, you need to look into flood plains.

Ms. Hunsinger asked for a motion to table approving the resolution. None was made.

Atty. Forsell said she will have a draft ordinance available for review at the next meeting to prohibit large vehicles from turning onto W. Fifth Street from Main Street.

Concerning the cable franchise agreement, Atty. Forsell advised the current contract expires in 2018 and the Borough is in the negotiation process with Comcast. She has an updated agreement in draft form and is working on details.

Water Committee: Ms. Hunsinger advised that the water billing for 343 Jefferson Street is being tabled until the next meeting.

Zoning/Planning/Codes: Nothing.

Road Committee: Approval is needed for Change Order #4 which is a reconciliation of contract bid line item costs with actual field quantities installed for the Second Street Reconstruction project. Payment Application #3 covers the remaining work less retainage in the amount of \$7,464.15 and Payment Application #4 is the final payment of \$7,024.74. Ms. Thomson made a motion to approve the Application of Payment #3 which has been reviewed by our engineer in the payment amount of \$7,464.15 to Floyd Hersh as well as Payment Application #4 which has been reviewed by our engineer in the amount being released of \$7,024.74, seconded by Mr. Pugh. Roll call: Mr. McCluskie – aye, Mr. Pugh – aye, Mr. Arahill – aye, Mr. Steinert – aye, Ms. Hunsinger, Ms. Thomson – aye. Motion carried. Ms. Thomson made a motion to approve Change Order #4 and final as prepared by our engineer Cowan Associates for work on Second Street with payment to Floyd Hersh for a net contract change of \$4,347.30, seconded by Mr. Pugh. Roll call: Mr. McCluskie – aye, Mr. Pugh – aye, Mr. Arahill – aye, Mr. Steinert – aye, Ms. Hunsinger, Ms. Thomson – aye. Motion carried.

Mr. Fry advised no update on the traffic light at Fourth and Main Streets. Waiting to hear from an engineer firm who did an evaluation to see if PennDOT will help fund reconstruction of the light.

A quote was received from Yarnall Paving, Inc. to restore the center part of Morris Road between Blaker Drive and Colonial Drive. It includes removing and hauling away existing blacktop, re-grading existing stone, placing a 2" base of blacktop and 2" top of blacktop for a cost of \$17,590.00. Two additional phone quotes were received; Hildenbrand for \$18,400 and A&H Paving in Schwenksville for \$30,000 to \$35,000. Mr. Pugh made a motion to approve the Morris Road quote of \$17,590.00 from Yarnall Paving, seconded by Ms. Thomson. Roll call: Mr.

McCluskie – aye, Mr. Pugh – aye, Mr. Arahill – aye, Mr. Steinert – aye, Ms. Hunsinger, Ms. Thomson – aye. Motion carried.

Mr. Fry advised that \$2,900.00 is available in the budget for street sweeping. Eight hours of sweeping and disposal of sweepings would come in under budget. Tabled until the next meeting.

Finance Committee: Ms. Thomson advised that approval is needed to accept the 2017 minimum municipal obligation (MMO) for the pension plan. The East Greenville Borough pension plan for 2017 is calculated by estimating 2016 W-2 payroll for covered plan members which comes to \$226,573. A percentage of this number is calculated with administrative charges and unfunded liability for a total amount of \$25,543. Ms. Thomson made a motion to approve the submission of our minimum municipal obligation in the amount of \$25,543.00, seconded by Mr. Pugh. Roll call: Mr. McCluskie – aye, Mr. Pugh – aye, Mr. Arahill – aye, Mr. Steinert – aye, Ms. Hunsinger, Ms. Thomson – aye. Motion carried.

Linda Taylor, 328 State Street, asked how many people are in the pension. The answer is five active members. Mr. Fry added that two full-time employees get half their wages paid from the water fund, which also supports a full-time water plant operator.

Personnel Committee: Ms. Hunsinger advised that Linda Wasser declined the crossing guard position and suggested the hiring of Paul Straut, who has been through the application and interview process. The position pays \$10.60 per hour. Ms. Thomson made a motion to approve the hiring of Paul Staut for crossing guard. Seconded by Mr. Steinert and unanimously approved.

Ms. Hunsinger read a letter from James Young concerning his resignation from Council. His reason to resign was not being able to give enough dedicated time to fulfill his position as president and council member. Ms. Thomson made a motion to accept the resignation of Jim Young. Seconded by Mr. Pugh and unanimously approved. It was announced that Council will be accepting letters of interest from East Greenville Borough residents to fill this vacancy. Interested persons should write about themselves, why they would like to serve on the board, and their community involvement. The deadline for letters of interest is Tuesday, October 25, 2016, by 4:00 p.m. A decision on the appointment will be made at the October 25, 2016, Borough Council meeting.

James Raftery, 319 State Street, asked how this decision will be made. Ms. Hunsinger replied that a decision is based on the letter of interest and involvement in the community.

Property Committee: Concerning the CDBG grant for ADA improvements to the clubhouse and Borough Hall, Mr. Fry reported that engineering is reviewing the design. The next step will be to get a review by the county before it's put out to bid.

The wayfinding sign for the parking lot at Bank and Washington Streets should be installed in the next two to three weeks.

A quote was received from John Membrino for soffit and fascia capping at the 433 Main building in the amount of \$2,735.00 as well as replacing gutters and downspouts for an additional \$495.00. Mr. Fry said the work can be completed this year. Ms. Thomson asked to inquire with the contractor how long the quote would be good for. Item tabled until next meeting.

There is a grant opportunity through PECO's Open Space Program for up to \$10,000. This grant can be used with other funding sources to cover expenses for land acquisition and improvements. The information will be sent to the Property Committee for review.

Mr. Fry advised there is a stewardship assessment scheduled for October 19, 2016, at 9:30 a.m. They will be looking at Bieler Park and Camelot Park.

Waste Management Committee: Mr. Pugh announced that trash collection proposals are due October 3, 2016.

Pennsburg Borough recently sent to check for \$1,000.00 to the joint Pennsburg/East Greenville Recycling Center account to cover expenses. Mr. Pugh made a motion to transfer \$1,000.00 to the joint account, seconded by Ms. Thomson. Roll call: Mr. McCluskie – aye, Mr. Pugh – aye, Mr. Arahill – aye, Mr. Steinert – aye, Ms. Hunsinger, Ms. Thomson – aye. Motion carried. Mr. Pugh made a motion to make a payment from the trash fund in the amount of \$1,837.28 to Pennsburg Borough, seconded by Ms. Thomson. Roll call: Mr. McCluskie – aye, Mr. Pugh – aye, Mr. Arahill – aye, Mr. Steinert – aye, Ms. Hunsinger, Ms. Thomson – aye. Motion carried. That payment is for heating and diesel fuel at the center.

Sewer Authority: UMJA is applying for a PA Small Water and Sewer Grant through the Commonwealth Financial Authority and has asked for a letter of support from the Borough. Their project is for additional infiltration and inflow rehabilitation projects. Mr. Pugh made a motion to send to UMJA a letter of support for the grant application, seconded by Ms. Thomson. Mayor Sloyer inquired if there was any commitment on our part as far as funding is concerned. The answer is no. Roll call: Mr. McCluskie – aye, Mr. Pugh – aye, Mr. Arahill – aye, Mr. Steinert – aye, Ms. Hunsinger, Ms. Thomson – aye. Motion carried.

Revitalization: Nothing.

Regional Planning: Mr. McCluskie reported that the next meeting is tomorrow night.

Emergency Management: Nothing.

Borough Manager Updates: Several requests have been received from residents to use the Borough skunk traps. Mr. Fry reported that there is one skunk trap left to borrow, and our animal control officer no longer accepts and removes skunks. He asked Council how they wish to proceed.

Angie Fegely, 501 Third Street, has a skunk who is digging under her fencing. She was told to call the office to put her name on the list.

Mr. Fry informed Council that he was notified by DEP that our NPDES permit will now require that we reduce phosphorus by 5% from the storm water being discharged. An appeal was written by our engineer but was denied. We are required to develop a pollution control and prevention plan under next year's budget. It is the responsibility of everyone discharging storm water to reduce the phosphorus load. Options are to perform street sweeping 25 times a year, clean every catch basin that empties into the reservoir and weigh all the waste, retrofit inlets, or do stream bank restoration. Provisions must be made in the budget for next year to develop the plan for complying with DEP's order. Implementation is slated for 2019 or maybe 2018. Mr. Fry will keep Council informed.

Atty. Forsell thanked the audience for their patience as regular business was conducted. She advised that the Mayor would give his Mayor's Report, Police Commission Report and then read a statement. Acting president, Ms. Hunsinger would read a statement on behalf of Borough Council, and then Atty. Forsell would read a statement. After that, the public would be invited to comment.

Police Commission Report: Mayor Sloyer said they recognized officers that were attacked in Philadelphia, Manhattan and Charlotte. They also thanked and recognized the East Greenville Fire Company and Officer Fisher for their quick response to the fire on Saturday, and UPPD for a drug bust this month. Financial reports were approved and bills were paid except Pennsburg Borough denied payment for solicitor bills. East Greenville Borough will pay their portion of that bill so we are not obligated legally for non payment. The 2017 minimum municipal obligation for the pension was passed in the amount of \$111,325.00. Minutes were approved for July and August because no one from Pennsburg Borough attended the August meeting. There was a statement on the decision to separate which advised that the division of assets is to be reconciled between the two boroughs and not to be a Police Commission topic.

Mayor's Report: Mayor Sloyer advised he will perform a wedding Friday night at Borough Hall.

[Mr. Steinert who was present via speaker phone disconnected at about 9:05 p.m.]

Mayor Sloyer read a statement to the residents of East Greenville. It is attached as Addendum 1 to the minutes.

On behalf of Borough Council, Ms. Hunsinger read a statement that is attached as Addendum 2 to the minutes.

[Mr. Arahill, who was present via speaker phone at the start of the meeting, arrived in person at 9:15 p.m.]

Atty. Forsell read a statement which is attached as Addendum 3 to the minutes.

Ms. Thomson made a motion authorizing the solicitor to investigate mediation on the condition that the Borough continues to move forward with the termination plan. Seconded by Mr. Arahill and unanimously approved.

Atty. Forsell indicated she will reach out to Pennsburg's solicitor about getting an independent mediator involved.

Public Comment:

Doug Bishop, owner of Mario's Pizza, inquired why there were no public discussions or deliberations which lead to the separation and that a lot of speculation was caused by the lack of transparency. He asked for a detailed plan including who a local police force would report to and the qualifications of that person. He inquired about the top five reasons to leave coverage and was worried about higher turnover with a small police force. He suggested becoming part of a larger force with no Council members on the commission. He asked if Council has considered the impact of less police coverage on the value of property and safety of community and disagrees that the relationship with Pennsburg Borough was doomed to fail.

Diane Criddle, 274 Washington Street, said she heard it said last night at the meeting that it would cost each taxpayer \$112 more a year to keep UPPD. Mayor Sloyer said that amount is an average based on property value. It would make the budget flat and not include increases. Ms. Criddle asked how something can be voted on tonight without it being on the agenda. Atty. Forsell explained that the Borough made a motion to allow the solicitor to get an independent mediator involved to explore the possibility of getting the two boroughs back

together without being forced to stop the process. Ms. Criddle asked about alleged comments made by the mayor.

Jim Raftery, 319 State Street, thanked the board for their statements saying it was a step in a positive direction, but he was not satisfied yet. He appreciated them exploring mediation with Pennsburg and was still disheartened by the land purchase. He asked Council to hold off on their police decision until more research can be done as far as costs to start another police force. He stated he believes they care about the community and need to figure out a way to get along or step down and let other people serve.

Lon Brinckman, 551 Washington, thanked the solicitor for trying to negotiate through this. He believes the Police Commission is broken partly because an odd number of members is needed to carry a vote. He stated we have a full-time police force with an average response time of 5 to 10 minutes and any replacement should have the same value. He implored Council to work past their issues, and resign tonight if you can't set aside personal agendas.

Dawn Leis, Jefferson Street, said she was proud of the police force and their skills in handling drug issues in the community and paying \$150 more in taxes a year that saves one child's life is worth it.

Chrystal Connolly, 425 Jefferson Street, was looking for an estimated budget for 2017. She noticed no tax increase in 2016 but saw expenditures were up for Borough Hall/Clubhouse Handicap Accessible Improvements. She asked if these were not needed, can it be used to offset 2017 expenses? Ms. Thomson advised that the line item in question is offset by grant money obtained. Mr. Fry added that a Community Development Block Grant was obtained for the Borough to make their public buildings handicap accessible. This improvement is important because unless the Borough can certify that all their public buildings are accessible, it cannot obtain future CDBG money.

Michael Schwenk, 112 Jefferson Street, questioned the mayor about alleged comments and asked him if he would step down as mayor. Mayor Sloyer advised he will not be resigning his term. Mr. Schwenk asked Council to change their minds about the purchase of the land.

Lynette Madden, 229 Main Street, mentioned dates of incidents where police responded, stating if it wasn't for the UPPD, there would be more problems, more death and more injuries. She said police were needed in East Greenville to keep drugs out of the valley. She would have the utmost respect for Council members if they would rescind the decision.

Keith Gerhart, 142 Cherry Street, said that the \$92,000 transfer in the budget appears as if it went towards police but \$34,000 went to police and the balance went towards roads in the budget. He believes the two boroughs need to get together and resolve issues as done in the past. He asked if the reason to withdraw was due to survey results. He asked Council members to raise their hand if they now regretted making the decision on September 6 to separate from the UPPD. Mr. Pugh raised his hand and Mr. Gerhart asked that the record show that one of them regretted the decision. He said the citizens expressed their opposition to purchase the land, but it was approved. He asked Council to resign their seats immediately since they are no longer fulfilling the duties they were elected to do. He then asked residents to raise their hands if they believe it's time for the Mayor to resign.

Joe Rock, 200 State Street, said the police force is the best he's ever seen. He is very disappointed by what he's seeing here and that a mediator is needed. He also addressed the audience and implored them to vote.

Melissa Molinaro, 206 State Street, said the police department does an amazing job and are role models for children.

Eric Grubb, 138 Main Street, addressed Ms. Thomson about the motion to allow the Borough to continue looking into the possibility of a single police force. Ms. Thomson responded that while we are willing to negotiate, the other side must be willing to cooperate which hasn't happened for several years. Nothing is guaranteed and the Borough must be able to move forward to do what's best for our community. Mr. Grubb was concerned about the timeline and would there be a penalty if we don't leave by March 2017.

Jenny Boyer, 138 Third Street, thanked the police for doing a great job in supporting us. She understands it's not fun to make an unpopular, tough decision. She suggested if you don't agree, get your name on the ballot and run. As far as the land purchase, it has been talked about for months and while there may not be an exact plan, she believes something good will be done with it.

Tanya Nicolai, 325 Blaker Drive, wanted to thank Council for putting in the time and effort in making decisions for the community. Concerning the police issues, she applauds Council for their efforts and believes they have the community's best interest at heart.

Ed Hummel, 410 Blaker Drive, says you can't have a response time of more than 10 minutes with the drug problems. He asked Pennsburg people if they would promise to work with East Greenville to solve their differences.

Grant Boyer, 438 Third Street, says he has no issues with the officers and is a previous employee for the Borough. He said Council makes a lot of tough decisions from recycling to the Arlington Street lot purchase to source water protection plans. Open space protects water for us and the township, and they are making a decision for the longevity of this municipality.

Kris Baccari, resident of Upper Hanover Township, asked about litigation with a broken police contract in March rather than December 2017. Atty. Forsell replied they are looking into that. He asked if anyone was looking into police grants for equipment and vehicles for a new police department.

Tony Bittenbender, 609 Gravel Pike in Upper Hanover Township, advised there are grants available on-line.

Mike Schwenk, 112 Jefferson Street, asked Council to overturn their decision until the lawyers can decide if this will work out.

Ms. Hunsinger asked for motion. Mr. Pugh made a motion to overturn the decision and work with Pennsburg Borough on mediation. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Barbara Green, 8 Cherry Street, said police are needed that know you personally and asked Council to protect the valley.

Tanya Nicolai, 325 Blaker Drive, said there is no guarantee the mediator can fix the problems, so they need to be prepared to continue on. She has heard from a lot of residents who support Council's decision.

Keith Gerhart, 143 Cherry Street, asked to put the police decision up to a public referendum. Mr. Arahill replied that public referendums in Pennsylvania are not allowed legally at the municipal level.

Bud Dinnell, president of Fraternal Order of Police for Montgomery County, asked Council not to give up on police officers who know everybody.

Eli Bernhard, 425 Third Street, mentioned there are renters in this community that didn't get their voices heard on the recent poll.

Barbara Horger, 609 Hamilton Road, questioned if they would be losing ambulance service. Ms. Hunsinger replied no.

Doug Bishop, owner of Mario's Pizza, wanted an explanation about the process of their decision. He asked how the public can support a decision that they know very little about and would be waiting for more information from Council.

Branden Mininger, 323 Blaker Drive, asked Council to follow up with ideas heard tonight.

Lon Brinckman, 551 Washington Street, asked Council to consider that police must secure a scene before ambulance can attend to victims and that officers are needed on the scene in 5 to 10 minutes.

Motion to Adjourn: Being no further business, Mr. Pugh made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. McCluskie. Motion unanimously approved and meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Submitted by:



Sharon Kachmar, Borough Secretary

Addendum 1**To the residents of East Greenville:**

For more than a year, Borough Security, and subsequent issues relating to the termination of the Upper Perk Police remain clouded with misinformation through the actions of Organized Labor, Social – Printed and Televised Media, and Word of Mouth Opinion.

It is imperative, that the Regional Public and Elected Officials in Harrisburg understand that the People of East Greenville fully support Law Enforcement officers both regionally and across the Nation.

The issue at hand is not a public attack on our police officers, or a comment on their performance.

Our officers are good people, many with families living here in the Upper Perkiomen Valley. We commend not only the Upper Perk Officers and their colleagues, but all First Responders for shielding our citizens from the many threats and challenges we face locally and throughout the Country.

Tonight I want to comment on 3 key issues that reflect:

1. The needs of our small borough and the present and future budgetary concerns for our residents;
2. The desire for the Borough of East Greenville to maintain its independence as a self-governing body;
3. And our goal to provide the residents and business owners of East Greenville with the highest rate of public services at the minimum cost to our taxpayers.

The first point looks at the security needs and budgetary hurdles of our Borough of East Greenville:

There have been many financial issues over the years regarding the police department, and East Greenville's ability to maintain service and manage the numerous needs of our community.

Our issues go back many years from the time of a regional police department with the Boroughs of Red Hill, Pennsburg and East Greenville.

Many things have changed over the years, but fiscal responsibility has always been at the forefront for the participating municipalities.

I don't want to hash out old history here tonight. I want to look at more recent events that when combined with other similar actions in the past few years brought us to our current police coverage decision.

As a near-term example, last year a former East Greenville Council president along with a former finance chair utilized \$92,000 from savings and \$30,000 from Road Improvement funds ...to balance the budget for 2016.

The result of this financial juggling act will result in an estimated 1.25 to 1.5 tax millage increase to balance our Borough budget for (2017);

- Mind you, this increase is before any other budget items are considered such as managing the maintenance of our crumbling infrastructure and addressing our obligations to overall community service in East Greenville...

These areas could mean even greater taxation.

The Officials in question approved the hiring of a 9th officer in December of 2015, which placed even more future financial obligation on the East Greenville taxpayers in terms of ever growing employee and operational costs.

I vetoed the 2016 budget in December 2015 stating I had concerns in the way council balanced the budget.

I also attached an email from October 14, 2015 where the two East Greenville Officials in question confirmed an agreement not to hire a 9th officer.

During this period, the regional boroughs as a body also agreed not to hire a full time officer for 1 to 2 years after a Sgt. retired.

- **An important point for East Greenville residents is that the 3 out of 5** council members who voted yes to override my veto have walked away from their responsibilities...washing their hands of the situation they created leaving both the present Council, and residents of East Greenville to bear the financial burden going forward.

I only mention this example to prove a point that there are long term consequences that come with fiscal irresponsibility!

To give you some perspective of East Greenville, The Upper Perkiomen School District provided me with the following statistics:

- We have a population 2985 people in East Greenville
- Estimates 5.1% of those residents live in poverty
- Estimates 7.7% are without Health Insurance
- Male Median income is \$37,778
- Female Median Income is \$25,789

Additionally, I've found that there are approximately 1102 parcels in East Greenville that pay property tax, which helps support our ongoing financial obligations.

If you only look at property (real estate) tax with the millage, the current police department cost is **93 Cents on the Dollar for property owners.**

If you add in other revenue such as Earned Income Tax, then the police cost is \$.49.3 cents on every one of your tax dollars paid to the Borough.

- **The only way the borough can obtain any revenue under the current spending program is to raise the property tax, which is not sustainable to our community, and certainly a burden on our property owners.**

Point number two

The need for the Borough of East Greenville to maintain its independence as a self-governing body

Although East Greenville has maintained a working relationship with its neighbors in Pennsburg, the relationship has become unmanageable over the past few years;

There is consensus among most East Greenville officials that East Greenville residents are no longer receiving fair and equal representation for their invested tax dollar.

We are an independent governing body, and it is our responsibility to insure our community is treated fairly in any contractual obligation.

Sadly, this is not the case. I offer just a few examples:

In 2012 we supported Pennsburg to lay off officers so they could manage their budget.

In 2015 Pennsburg would not support East Greenville with the same request!

In 2016 Pennsburg refused to pay for the Police Commission's solicitor, but would not provide East Greenville with documentation to support their claim of bias. It is East Greenville's position that there are no bias acts conducted by said solicitor.

In August of 2016 Pennsburg refused to show up for a Police Commission meeting that was advertised for 10 months! The result was that the commission could not have a quorum to pay its bills to our regional vendors and supporting entities.

Perhaps the most alarming action by Pennsburg came on April 25th 2016 at the Police Commission meeting where Pennsburg asked East Greenville to get out of the Upper Perk Regional Police Department.

Point number Three

Providing the residents and business owners of East Greenville the highest rate of return at the minimum cost to our taxpayers.

The current plan for the East Greenville Police Department will provide local police coverage by hiring a full time Chief of Police, fulltime officer or officers, and other part time officers.

They will be tasked with community policing, war on drug, partnership with the school district, and local ordinance and traffic enforcement. We will also augment our coverage with the Pennsylvania State Police.

For those of you that don't know, we are currently covered by the Pennsylvania State Police and 1 shared officer between both boroughs in cases of illness, vacation time, personal time, injury, etc., when The Upper Perk Police Department can't provide total coverage.

This isn't disclosed as far as timing in an effort to insure the safety of our officers, but the Pennsylvania State Police coverage in East Greenville and Pennsburg isn't anything new.

I want to talk directly to the residents of East Greenville now!

I understand you have concerns about East Greenville having their own police department.

Please remember that we are a small community with no outward growth potential and very little industry and commercial business to help support the overall increased tax burdens facing us in the future.

We cannot financially support the current law enforcement model. The residents of our town deserve a safe environment, but they also deserve and demand that their tax dollars commit to the town as a whole, and not to one segment leaving the rest unsupported and in disrepair.

Our plan will provide police coverage with 100 percent of the officer's time in East Greenville instead of partial coverage at a fulltime price.

Based on our ongoing research, the figures suggest that local coverage will save our residents hundreds of thousands of dollars in current and future financial expenditures when matched against the current policing model.

It is our goal to provide East Greenville residents not only a safe community, but also reduce long term obligations that free up funds to maintain our infrastructure and provide for the general welfare of our citizens.

As Mayor of East Greenville I respectfully ask for your patience and understanding as our borough goes through these import changes in 2017. Please remember, the issue at hand is not a public attack on our police officers, or a comment on their performance. Our law enforcement officers are good people and public servants.

In 2016 we know that East Greenville is at a financial threshold, and it is our duty as public servants to make the necessary budget changes for our community.

Remember our goal to provide the residents and business owners of East Greenville with the highest rate of public services at the minimum cost to our taxpayers.

East Greenville residents, thank you for your consideration and support during this difficult transition.

Addendum 2

BOROUGH COUNCIL STATEMENT

September 27, 2016

We as representatives of East Greenville Borough apologize for the trickle of information we have been able to put forth regarding our 6-0 decision to depart from the Upper Perk Police Association. We were caught flat-footed in our response because we were not expecting the vociferous concern of those that are served as well as those who are not-served by the Upper Perk Police district. We were expecting possibly a dozen moderately curious East Greenville residents but not much more. This is why.

During the April 2016 Police Commission meeting Pennsburg Borough representatives formally invited East Greenville to separate from the Upper Perk Police District. They stated, "...If that (leaving) is the sentiment of East Greenville, then I ask that you depart quietly and amicably; allow Pennsburg to become part of something greater." In addition, they stated, "It is the intention of the Borough of Pennsburg to pursue these new ideas and seek new opportunities. We will do so, with or without East Greenville." These words carry the same weight in a municipal partnership as they would if you used similar wording with your life partner. This is not the way you talk to a partner that you want to remain partners with. Nonetheless, East Greenville still had hopes that things could improve.

As East Greenville representatives, we were stunned by the open lack of valuing East Greenville as a partner. This sentiment was further solidified in the June police commission meeting when Pennsburg Mayor Lightcap stated that Police regionalization was a "Pennsburg Issue". East Greenville apparently had no place in these discussions and are viewed as a nuisance partner.

After the April meeting we were expecting the public outcry to save the UPPD that we are now seeing. This concern didn't materialize when one partner openly invited the other to leave causing dissolution of the Police district. Not a single soul questioned Pennsburg on this divisive decision to invite East Greenville to leave. Not a single "I support UPPD" sign or shirt was worn. Not a single marquee sign was altered to support the UPPD. Not a single town hall meeting by our state representatives was held. It was as if no one cared. From that point East Greenville was pushed even harder and further to the decision we were forced to make. Unfortunately, those that now care are questioning the wrong Borough Council six months late.

Borough Council **does** support the Upper Perk Police District. It is the Police Commission that has become dysfunctional due to financial impasses and a breakdown in communication among its members. The decision to terminate the agreement that established the Upper Perk Police District and in turn the Police Commission was not taken lightly, and was truly a last resort. It was a decision that was brought about by necessity and lack of options.

First, financially, the Borough has seen the cost of police rise over the last few years. For 2016, budgeted real estate taxes are \$659,305.50 and the budgeted police allocation is \$611,056.80 plus budgeted miscellaneous police items of \$4,450.00 for a grand total of \$615,506.80 spent on police. The Borough is spending 93.4 cents of every dollar received from real estate taxes on budgeted police line items. If we look at total revenues after subtracting out dedicated revenue line items (\$1,249,641.50), then the Borough is spending 49.3 cents of every dollar received as revenue on budgeted police line items. Either way, the Borough is still currently spending over \$615k on police, a number that has been gradually increasing.

Next, a breakdown in communication has occurred. Pennsburg Commission Members accused the Commission solicitor of bias towards East Greenville and against Pennsburg, but refused to provide any documentation or explanation to the solicitor or East Greenville Commission Members. When pressed for details, our Commission Members were told that they were not going to get any. Pennsburg then refused to pay any of their portion of legal fees to the solicitor. It's apparent Pennsburg feels their half of the partnership carries more weight than East Greenville's. Those of you who attended Commission Meetings heard this discussion on numerous occasions

Pennsburg's Mayor initiated a community-wide discussion of possibly establishing a larger regional police department, which in itself is a noble thing to do. Initially, East Greenville was not informed of any discussions or meetings, nor was the Police Commission. In fact, when the Police Commission Chairperson placed the item on the agenda for public discussion, Pennsburg Commission members refused to discuss it and stated that it was a "Pennsburg issue", not a Police Commission issue. East Greenville believes that any discussion about either a new police department or a change to the existing one, most definitely is a Police Commission issue.

Additionally, the Drug Task Force, another noble thing to do, was not brought to the attention of the Police Commission. A Pennsburg official reached out to some individuals including a councilman indicating he was looking for key players to participate. Since East Greenville council believed it to be important as a police issue, council was concerned about the liability to having Corporal Lavin take on responsibility of the lead role of the task force. To address this concern, East Greenville members of the commission made motions to approve insurance coverage for the officers involved until the details could be worked out. But again, when the Police Commission Chairperson requested an update at a public meeting, the Commission was told by a Pennsburg official attending the meeting that it was not Police Commission business, yet then demanded insurance coverage be continued as if it were a Police business.

These are just a few examples of how the deterioration between the Boroughs has grown..

Further, a governing entity with equal numbers often leads to tie votes and no mechanism to move forward. That is exactly what has happened over the last few months. Whether the system worked for one week or fifty years, it was doomed to dysfunction at some point.

These are a few examples of why East Greenville believed that it was in the best interest of both municipalities to terminate the agreement.

Addendum 3SOLICITOR REQUEST FOR MOTION FOR MEDIATION

I truly believe every person in this room cares about **our** community. I say **our** community because Barry Tomlinson and I, although we represent the Borough, both grew up here and continue to live here. We are part of this community.

Police issues have been contentious issues in the past, but the difference now is the existence of social media. Society wants information instantly and people are quick to respond emotionally. Unfortunately, the dysfunction and distrust have been festering for quite some time. Something like this does not happen overnight. I was asked the other day by a local business owner ---Who is right and who is wrong? My answer was simply BOTH. It takes two to argue and it takes two to make amends.

With that, I am requesting a motion to permit me to explore the possibility of getting an independent mediator involved and reaching out to Pennsburg's solicitor to discuss options.